NAME OF THRONES

by

CODY MATTHEW CANNON

(Under the Direction of BARUCH HALPERN)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the gradual development of angels in the Hebrew Bible. Scholars often attempt to homogenize the definition of an angel before considering the Bible's understanding of the topic. The majority of scholars use a concept of what an angel is, instead of defining a word, this study takes a new approach. The Hebrew Bible contains three periods explaining the development of how angels are perceived. By first identifying an angel according to the Hebrew Bible, one will see the stages in which the development of angelology takes place. The goal of this examination is to see how angels are viewed as a hypostasis of God in the earliest strata of the Bible, but by the latest period angels are separate divine beings. This method offers a complete definition of how angels were viewed in the Israelite religion during the authorship of the Hebrew Bible.

INDEX WORDS: Angel, Angels, Gabriel, Michael, Daniel, Zechariah, hypostasis, history of authorship, authorship, and Hebrew Bible.

NAME OF THRONES:

HOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANGELS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE GO FROM AN EMANATION TO PRINCES

by

CODY MATTHEW CANNON

AB, University of Georgia, 2013

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2017

NAME OF THRONES:

HOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANGELS IN THE HEBREW BIBLE GO FROM AN EMANATION TO PRINCES

by

CODY MATTHEW CANNON

Major Professor:	Baruch Halpern
Committee:	Richard Elliott Friedman
	Sandy Martin

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2017

DEDICATION

To my parents for their unwavering support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible if it were not for my main advisor Professor Baruch Halpern. He has helped guide my research in a direction with a clear focus and goal. I am grateful for his many hours of reading various stages of my thesis to allow me to write a work of which I am proud. Over the last three years, he has shown me how to read more closely, how to ask the right questions, and how to express my ideas through writing. He did all of this with a smile on his face, creating an environment that allowed me to grow into a more articulate scholar. I am grateful he was willing to listen to any idea I had without immediately shutting it down, and for this, I believe my thesis was able to develop into the work before you. Thank you very much Professor Halpern, I will always be grateful for your kind words and many hours of work you have put into me. I feel blessed to not only know you as a professor but to also call you my friend. Thank you.

I would also like to thank Professor Richard Elliott Friedman. He will never know how grateful I am for his tedious notes on each paper that I wrote for him. For the various meetings over the years that started as I was an undergraduate. It was his initial idea of an angel that inspired me to understand what the Bible stated the divine figure was. This question has been in my brain since the first class I took from him and is the very reason for why I wrote this thesis. It is without a doubt because of him that I am the scholar I am today. He has pushed me harder than any other person has pushed me to be a better scholar. With every page in this paper, I thought about how he would have confronted the problem and question, and I believe it made my work better as a result. Thank you very much Professor Friedman, I am proud to be a product

and student of both you and Professor Halpern's. The two of you make a team that is second to none.

To Professor Medine, I wish the absolute best. She is a person to whom I am grateful to have met. Anybody who has ever encountered her knows that she is one of the sweetest and most wonderful people on this planet, and it is her encouragement that has allowed many of us graduate students finish his/her degree, I am no exception. Any time I have felt like I could not finish, and was able to meet with her, I would leave feeling like I could conquer the world. Thank you for always supporting me and encouraging me to follow my dreams.

For the other teachers in my life who have inspired me, I would like to thank Dr. Robert Foster for being the first one to help ignite this thesis. Dr. Rachel Nabulsi is the wonderful person who introduced me to the academic field of Hebrew Bible and practically told me to take Professor Friedman's class, for that I am very grateful. I would like thank Amanda Smith for helping me realize that I can learn any language I wish, and that I am capable of doing so. She is the one who taught me how to approach a language correctly and gave me the confidence needed to learn Hebrew as well as any other language I encountered. By extension this applies as well to Dr. Karin Myhre as she has guided my study of Classical Chinese in the same way as Amanda. Finally, I would like to thank Professor Sandy Martin, as he was willing to step in last minute to fill a role in my thesis defense committee, thank you very much Professor Martin.

I would like to thank my family for being supportive of me no matter what I choose to do. My father has been the most influential figure in my life, and I could not ask for a better man to look up to. Whenever I was unsure of what to do during my life, I have always turned to him for guidance and seeking advice during my thesis, and my academic career is no different. Thank you dad for everything you have done. My mother has always been there for me when I needed

help and always been one to motivate me to finish what I have started. She has always seen the best in me and made me feel like I could do anything, thank you very much mom. I am also grateful to my younger sister, Amber who has been there to listen to help direct my thoughts. Finally, I would like to thank my grandfather, George Nelson (whom I call Poppot). Although I have been busy with school these last few years, it has always been a relief to come home and talk to you. Our many long random conversations have always kept my spirits high. I thank you for everything you have done for me, and I couldn't ask for a better grandfather and role model. Thank you for everything, I will always be your little buddy.

I would like to thank my colleague Tyler Kelley as he has allowed the entire graduate department feel like a family. He goes out of his way to make sure we all are friends, encouraging our ideas and continually challenging any possible idea there is. This department would not be the same with you, and quite frankly I do not think many of us would love our field as much as we do if it were not for you. You have a unique charm about you that very few have, and I look forward to having a friendship that lasts many years with you. Thank you for everything Tyler. Matthew Vanauker, you and I have had many late nights in Peabody hall typing, swapping ideas and inspiring each other. Thanks for always putting up with me, and I certainly appreciate your company when nights got real late in Peabody as we were able to motivate each other to finish our work. Finally to my friends and colleagues Jason, Nasim, and Drew. Thank you guys for everything, between scholarly conversations or just having fun, you made my time here worth it.

The last ones I would like to thank are my friends who have supported me and gave me the motivation to finish this thesis. Ricardo Abend and Brandon Hill, you guys, are the best friends a man could ask for. Ricardo, I appreciate you always being ready for me to call you late

at night to hash out a new idea, or to help me finish my paper. I can not express how much help you have been in my life. Thank you for literally everything you have done for me. Brandon, no matter where I go in life, you have always been by my side helping me get through it. Thank you for always pushing me to do better and knowing that I can always improve myself. Growing up, nobody helped me more than an associate pastor of mine named Cici Nickolich. Year after year she would meet up with me and talk about various questions I had in the Bible. It is because of her and Dr. Robert "Bob" Winstead that I felt comfortable asking questions about the Bible. I would like to thank both of you for the various meetings we had, as it shaped me into the man I am today.

Finally, and likely most importantly, I would like to thank Russel Kirkland. If it weren't for you, I would never have discovered the love I have for the academic field of Religion. You have taught me so much as a teacher, scholar, and as a person. I can not express my gratitude for the meetings we had when I was an undergraduate, and for the many times, we had gotten together when I was no longer your student, and I was in graduate school. You introduced Eastern Religions to me, as well as how to approach the academic field. I feel lucky to have had you as my professor, but more importantly to have you as my friend. You have forever left your imprint on me, and I just wish I had more time to have taken more classes from you. Thank you for everything you have done. You inspire me to chase my dreams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

Angels – The Emanations of God

Angels, one of the most misunderstood divine figures in the Bible, yet they are in everybody's vocabulary. Angels are often defined as any divine being located in Heaven other than God, but how accurate is this definition? Can Cherubs, Seraphim, heavenly messengers, and even children of gods all be considered angels? If one's definition is that all divine figures other than God are an angel than yes. The Biblical definition is considerably more narrow and not so generous. Unfortunately, prominent scholars like Carol Newsom, William H.C. Propp, Jack Sasson, Saul Olyan, Gillian Bampfylde and Theodor Gaster have all fallen victim to the same trap and have defined angels inclusively.[1] This essay will instead provide the reader with a more refined working definition for angels. By both looking at the usage of terminology in different times and as a single homogenized term, as found in the Hebrew Bible, an angel will be defined as a hypostasis of God.

Term and Etymology:

The etymology for the English word angel derives from the Greek word (ἄγγεδος) which means messenger. In Hebrew, the word for messenger is מלאך**,** but when combined with (Yahweh, or Elohim) it most often means angel.[2] The translators of the Septuagint, one of the

[1] Gillian Bampfylde, "The Prince of the Hosts in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, v. 14 no. 2. (Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers, 1983), 133-134. Theodor Gaster, "Angels," *IDB* 1:128-134. Carol Newsom, "Angels," *ABD* 1:248-253. Saul Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1993). 15-30. William H. C. Propp, *Exodus I: 1-18,* AB 2 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 198-199. Jack M. Sasson, *Judges 1-12,* AB 6D (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 177-184.

[2] There are examples when it does not need the rest of the phrase, and מלאךis enough (See Zechariah). Examples can also be seen when the exact same phrase is used, and it does not represent an angel. (See Malachi and Haggai). In chapter 2 (page 18)

many Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, used ἄγγεδος as a direct translation for many words including messenger, angel, and unfortunately some other words like בני-אלוהים, which literally means children of God(s). So instead of looking directly at the Greek's understanding of its all-encompassing term, one must deal with how the Hebrew writers defined this word. Unfortunately, most scholars have used a collection of words to define an angel as if they are all synonyms.[3] Some of the terms attributed to angels by scholars include: בני-האלוהים, Cherubim, Seraphim, מלאך-יהוה or מלאך-אלוהים, קדושים(holy ones), שר(prince/commander), צבאות(hosts, army).[4] As a result the definition becomes so vast that it can encompass as mentioned earlier: every divine figure the scholar wishes. By the later historical periods of the religion, this may be so. It is not the case in the Hebrew Bible, especially the earliest examples in the Hebrew Bible. This mistake is made as scholars often try to homogenize concepts that have similarities to one another over millennia and then apply it to one word. In the case of angels, scholars have often used a later understanding of the word/concept to reflect the entire period and more importantly the Hebrew Bible's definition. Angels can be thought of as a dentist and divine beings are doctors. Every dentist is a doctor, but not every doctor is a dentist. All angels are a type of or example of a divine being, but not all divine beings here are angels. Interestingly enough, even the term that will be used to define an angel follows the same analogy. While all angels are messengers of God not all messengers of God are angels. Therefore the scholar must be cautious when defining an angel. Hebrew and Greek have no separate word to differentiate between the two types of messengers. It is left up to the context. One has to recognize the differences

[3] It depends on the period, as to whether this is an appropriate manner to translate the word. In the later Second Temple Period words like "watchers" (Aramaic עיר) or קדושים(holy ones) may work, but these words are not definitive for angels until very late in the Biblical world. Only during the Second Temple period can these words be included, among other terms that will be discussed in later chapters.

[4] T. H. Gaster, "Angels." *IDB* 1:129. Carol Newsom "Angels," *ABD* 1:248. Propp *Exodus I:1-18,* 198. Sasson *Judges I: 1-12,* 178.

between the divine metaphysical messenger and any human delivering a divine message. This ambiguity in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint appears to be resolved in the Vulgate when two different words were used to differentiate the two types of messengers. Carol Newsom in her definition of an angel, elaborates on this, "It was only with the Vulgate that a systematic distinction was made between angelic emissaries (Lat *angelus*) and human ones (Lat *nuntius*)."[5] Therefore it is important to be careful when one confronts the word מלאךin the Hebrew.

Learning to Define and Recognize an Angel:

Carol Newsom's definition, along with most scholars,[6] of an angel can be credited to any divine figure possibly within the divine court, excluding only Yahweh (and debatably even other gods).[7] She appears to be conveying a concept more so than a definition. The concept should only be understood after the definition is identified. Newsom's definition should be put to the test, especially when Richard Elliott Freidman has a more exclusive definition. If one was to attempt to homogenize the word throughout the entire Biblical Period then Friedman's definition appears to be more accurate. He states that when discussing the Bible,

> "These texts indicate that angels are rather conceived of here as expressions of God's presence. The consistent biblical conception of God is that God cannot possibly be seen by a human ("A human will not see me and live." – Exod 33:20)… God, in this conception, can nonetheless make Himself known to humans by a sort of emanation from the Godhead that is visible to human eyes. It is a hypostasis, a concrete expression of the divine presence, which is otherwise unexpressible to human beings. What the human sees when such a hypostasis is in front of them looks like 'people,' like a 'man.' And the word for such a thing is 'angel.'"[8]

Friedman and Newsom's understanding of an angel is very different. They likely arrive at these antithetical definitions from how they approach the *concept*. Newsom, along with most scholars, defines an angel by looking at a collection of terms and ideas. She is approaching the definition

[5] Carol Newsom "Angels," *ABD* 1:249.
[6] T. H. Gaster, "Angels." *IDB* 1:129. Carol Newsom "Angels," *ABD* 1:248. Propp *Exodus I:1-18,* 198. Sasson *Judges I: 1-12,* 178.
[7] Carol Newsom "Angels," *ABD* 1:248-250.
[8] Richard Elliott Friedman. *The Disappearance of God* (Boston: MA, 1995). 12-13

from what she already believes an angel to be and by extension adding terms that explain this definition. Friedman's approach is fundamentally different. He seemingly approaches this by looking at only one word – מלאך, and by extension, the concept can be later applied to other figures without the term. It is possible that Newsom's definition derives from her expertise with Second Temple Literature.[9] During the Second Temple Period, the religion went through a restructuring phase, resulting with the Ancient Israelite religion being interpreted differently in several subjects by those living in the Second Temple Period. Frank Moore Cross discusses this issue in response to how creation myths are later used in the Israelite religion in relationship with the introduction of the kingship in Israel. There was a second wave of this *recrudescence of myth* during the Exile which helps to explain some developmental phases of the religion.[10] As Newsom's expertise is in Second Temple Period literature, it would naturally skew her viewpoint of an angel during the entire Biblical period. She, like the authors of the texts, would be interpreting an angel from a later date and not in the period in which it was initially written. A significant corpus of external literature was discovered that sheds light on the development of the religion in a later period, much of this contributes to how the later development of the religion viewed angels. This material does not necessarily tell the readers of the Bible how the Biblical authors <u>viewed</u> angels. It is highly likely that Newsom is influenced by these external and much later works.[11] The consensus states that most of these external works that have been found were

[9] While she is published on many periods concerning the Biblical Period, her expertise can be seen in certain works relating but not limited to: Daniel and Qumran Scrolls such as the Songs of the Sabbath. It should also be noted, in her dictionary definition, she mentions that she is aware that angels are seen differently depending on different time periods, but she doesn't actually describe differences, just separates them in periods and assumes one will understand the differences.

[10] Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 135.

[11] Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice is a work she has done substantial work on. This is just one example from which her understanding of what an angel could have derived. This is a work that was composed in the late Second Temple Period roughly around 100 BCE. This text references according to Newsom various different phrases that are meant to be seen as angels including the above mentioned phrases discussed. Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985), 1-38.

produced around the same time or later than the book of Daniel. Daniel is the latest book in the Bible by a few hundred years. This is not sufficient evidence to explain what the authors of the Bible from a thousand years earlier understood angels to be. One has to look closely how angels are used in both period to see if the concept is the same. One cannot assume that angels are the same, or different, it has to be tested. Newsom's definition is not necessarily wrong. She attempts to show that there is a different understanding of what an angel was during different time periods. Unfortunately, she applies the same tools and words that are used for the material found in the Second Temple Period, for her homogenized definition. She arrives at the above-stated conclusion. Friedman's research primarily focuses on texts written in the earliest periods in the Bible and not on the Second Temple Period.[12] This allows for his definition to be based solely on Biblical sources, which allows him to have the more refined definition, more closely related to the Biblical angel. While Newsom may have attempted to create a Biblical definition, hers instead shows a later developmental phase of the term. For one to homogenize a definition, one must see how the Biblical authors used the word and when the word was used.

Biblical Authorship and its Significance: J/E and the מלאך

Friedman's definition works best with the material in the Bible when homogenizing one definition to fit the entire Hebrew Bible corpus. His definition though seems to be most accurate from before 701 BCE[13] (the oldest material in the Bible), which at least provides a more precise early definition of what an angel is.[14] While it does work with the later texts like Zechariah and

[12] Friedman's research is most notably focused on the Torah and related literature. He has published in other areas as well, but typically sticks within Biblical material and periods.

[13] There ends up being a period between 701 BCE and 540 BCE where the metaphysical מלאךis not mentioned a single time. I will elaborate on this in the next chapter, but when angels do begin to be discussed again, it is here that angels are portrayed in a different manner. It is likely that when these angels return in the Bible, that this is the contributing reason for why they become perceived differently by different scholars.

[14] This will be elaborated in the next chapter, where the focus is on how on the term angel changes in its historical context which leads to new concepts that develops from it.

Daniel, these books begin to show a different perspective of what an angel does. Since terminology and the time period are important in understanding the concept of an angel, it is best to analyze historically and compare why the terms are so important and relevant to their period in history.

For several hundred years, scholars debated the authorship of the Torah. A little earlier than the 19th century it became more apparent that the Torah was not compiled all at once, but instead gradually put together by multiple contributors.[15] While many authors contributed to the Torah that is currently in use, the majority of the Torah was assembled from four primary sources. Only found in the two oldest sources, documents identified by scholars as J and E a term is used for a divine figure called an angel (מלאך). The theological implications for why this word is not used in later sources to reference a divine being, while interesting, is not the scope of this paper. Instead, what is necessary for this research is to ask what these authors assumed to be an angel, to better understand what word *or words* can be used to define one.

The oldest of these four documents is J, likely written around 950 B.C.E. Within this source there are only a few examples of what an angel is, but it helps to shed light on this topic. The first appearance of an angel found in the entire Bible is in Gen 16:9-14.

> "And the *Angel of Yahweh* (מלאד יהוה) spoke to her, 'Return to your mistress and be humbled under her hands.' And the *Angel of Yahweh* (מלאד יהוה) said to her, 'I will really multiply your seed, and it cannot be counted because of its abundance.' And the *Angel of Yahweh* (מלאד יהוה) said to her, 'Here, you are pregnant, and you will bear a son, and you will call his name Ishmael because Yahweh heard of your affliction. And he will be a wild donkey of a man, his hand against all, and every hand against his. And he (Over-before) all of his brothers he will live.' And she called the name of Yahweh, who spoke to her, 'You

[15] For more information on the subject of authorship as this is the most complete collection of evidence compiled int a brief summary of scholarship. See: Richard E. Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (New York, NY: Harper One, 2003) 1-30. To see a summary of the history of scholarship see: Richard E. Friedman, *Who Wrote The Bible* (San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997) 17-32.

> are 'El-Roi' (God Sees) because she said, 'Here also, I have looked at him who sees. On this, the well will be called, 'Beer-Lahai,' here between Kadesh and between Bered."

This passage is J's account of how Hagar's son will come to be born. One should not gloss over the fact that the figure identified as the angel of Yahweh, acts as if he is Yahweh himself. Granted any messenger delivering news would act as if he/she is the speaker, but in this scenario, the reader, and more importantly, Hagar is confused as to whether this is just an angel or Yahweh. One thing Hagar is certain about, is the divinity of the angel. Friedman's proposal supports the idea that this being could very well be the form that mankind encounters God.[16] If one were to replace '*Angel of Yahweh*' with Yahweh, the meaning in the story is the same, a litmus test that can be used for angel. This begins to show the author of J's understanding of what an angel is, and by extension the entire Bible.

In Genesis 18-19 (also J) angels appear to Abraham, but now there are more than one. Genesis 18 will be elaborated a little further in this essay, but to summarize, Genesis 18 has God (or three mysterious figures) banter with Abraham about how many moral people are necessary to prevent Sodom from being destroyed. Abraham has a vested interest in this location because his cousin Lot is residing there. After a number is agreed upon Gen 19:1 opens with, "And two angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting at the gate of Sodom. And Lot saw them and rose up to meet them and he prostrated his face toward the ground." Gen 19:13 states that Yahweh sent them, the two angels, to destroy this town and in verse 14, Lot turns to his sons in law and declares that Yahweh will destroy this city. "The town will be destroyed, and it is ordered by Yahweh, so His angels prepare Lot and those that are close to him to leave. (Gen 19:13-18)" Sodom ends up destroyed, due to the angels' encounter with the corruption of the town. Yahweh and the angels are responsible for destroying the city. Even though two angels are

[16] Friedman, *Disappearance of God*, 13.

shown, it does not imply that these two angels necessarily have to be entirely separate figures or just perceived in this manner by man. It will later be elaborated how this story contributes to Genesis 18 and how the theological understanding of these angelic figures is meant to be portrayed to the audience. Genesis 19 shows the continuation of the idea that God can but rarely reveals himself with multiple emanations.

By looking at another author and source from roughly the same period, the murky picture begins to clear up. Genesis 21 is a story resembling Genesis 16. The author of E tells the story of its first angel in a similar light as J's first angel. Here, the story, mentions Hagar and an angel appearing to her once again. The angel (not God) says, 'in him; I will make a great nation.' While J's version speaks of the birth of Ishmael and even tells her to name him as such; E does not mention the name of the child instead it is the child's voice that God and the angel of God hears. (Gen 21:17-18) "And God heard the boy's voice. And an *Angel of God* (מלאך-אלוהים) called to Hagar from Heaven, and He said to her, 'What is (wrong) for you, Hagar? Do not fear, for God has heard the boy's voice in there where he is. Rise, and carry the boy and hold him in your hand, because in him I will make a great nation." Once again, the confusion of whether or not this angel is separate from God can be seen here as well. It speaks on behalf of God as if it were God promising a nation, but it is coming from the angel. If the angel is the hypostasis of God, then it would make sense for the angel to speak on behalf of the deity, as it is the deity. The only other option, is if the angel is seen like a diplomat of God, therefore the angel's words are spoken on behalf of the deity. In both cases, the conclusion is the same, the angel is in essence the form which God allows himself to be reveal his message to the individual. As this can be seen when the angel states that it is God who has heard the voice of Ishmael (or the child of

Hagar as no name is provided), but the angel is the one who appears. So, by using the litmus test, replace the angel with God, the story remains the same.

The story of *Jacob's Ladder* (Gen 28:10-22 J and E are contributors) contains a brief mention of angels. It does not elaborate on the perception of an angel (Gen 28:12 [E] --מלאך אלוהים) except they are seen traveling up and down on a ladder where Jacob claims this must be the house of God. It is here where he makes a pillar and vows to make Yahweh his God (still E, Gen 28:18, 20-22) so long as God looks out for him and watches over him.[17]

As a fulfillment of this vow, in Genesis 31, God revealed himself to Jacob. Laban becomes Jacob's father in law two times over, by tricking Jacob into marrying both of his daughters. Jacob attempts to get his father in law back, by taking his livestock resulting in Jacob leaving with a fair amount of wealth. God reveals himself in the following manner:

> "And an angel of God (מלאך-אלוהים) spoke to me in a dream, 'Jacob!' and I said, 'Here I am.' And he said, 'Raise your eyes, and see all of the male-goats going over the streaked speckled and spotted livestock. Because I have seen all that Laban does to you. I am the God of Bethel, where there you vowed (different word) the pillar where you made a vow to me. Rise and go out of this land to return to the land of your birth.'" (Gen 31:11-13)

When the E document presents this story, once again, it speaks as if the angel is the God himself.

[17] This implies that there are possibly more than one god. Alt discusses different epithets possibly used in the text to identify gods of certain regions and their ties to specific individuals. To learn more about the concept of multiple deities in the early Biblical years. Frank Moore Cross *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic,* and *Epic to Canon* where he critiques Alt with an attempt to revise the material. There are multiple examples of this including the earlier passage in Genesis 16, where this *god* could be called El-Roi. This could even be seen as another possibility with much the same meaning, in that it is a local representation of the God, in the way an avatar in Hinduism could appear with a particular representation of the deity depending on the scenario, or what is seen in Exodus 3, where God appears in the bush as an angel (this will be discussed more in depth in the following section), and is known for appearing on Mount Sinai (or Horeb). See Albricht Alt, *The God of the Fathers,* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967), 1-100. Cross, *Canaanite Myth Hebrew Epic,* 1-12. Baruch Halpern "Brisker Pipes than Poetry: The Development of Israelite Monotheism.*"* In *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel.*(Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1987), 77-115.

He even calls himself *The God of Bethel* (13).[18] Once again replace angel of God with God, and the story does not change. He, the angel or God, has seen what Laban has done and felt that He should step in and help Jacob. Once again, confusion arises, is this God or just an angel. Following this in Genesis 48, when Jacob asks that the God that had blessed him and his fathers do the same for his children, the same angel that had redeemed him earlier he wishes for it to do the same for his sons (48:15-16).[19]

Another passage in E (Exod 14:19A and 20), an angel of God is sent as protection for the Israelite camp.[20] "And the angel of God (מלאך-אלוהים) journeyed going before the camp of Israel and went behind them, and it came between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel." When an angel is sent by God for your protection, it is to be treated in a particular manner. The reader acquires this detail in the next instance of angelic protection.

> "Here, I will send an angel (מלאך) before you to keep you on the way, and bring you to the place that I have established. Watch in front of him and hear his voice and do not make bitterness against him, because he will not lift up your transgression because my name is within him. But, if you *hear* his voice and you do all that I say, then I will be an enemy to your enemies, and an opponent to your opponents. When my angel will go ahead of you and will bring you to the (list of enemies), and I will obliterate them." (Exod. 23:20-23 - E)

This passage can be a little confusing in identifying if this is an angel. By breaking it down into three main parts, it will be more apparent that this is an angel and Yahweh/God. 1) Yahweh's name is within the angel. 2) You must "*hear* his voice, and you do all that I say then I will be an enemy to your enemies" implying there is a connection to the words that come from the angel

[18] Some scholars have noticed this, and as mentioned in an earlier note, this could be seen as an identifying marker that these people believed there might be more than one God. There are different titles that can be attributed to different gods. Examples could be *God of Bethel¸ Yahweh of Jerusalem, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob* could all represent a separate god. For more on this see note 17.
[19] There most famous example of Jacob encountering an angel/God will be elaborated in a moment, but it will also contribute to this passage as well. Gen 32:26-33.
[20] Exod 14:19B is actually J and is not mentioning an angel, this will be worth noting in a moment.

and what Yahweh says. 3) The angel will be what is protecting you as it is what is going ahead of you and guiding you. Yahweh states that He will bring you to the (list of your enemies) which He will then obliterate. Through these three pieces it can be assumed that when Yahweh speaks about his angel going ahead of you, whether as protection or as a guide, it is Yahweh.[21]

RJE combined:

J and E become combined by the first major Redactor, and the original combined work is identified by scholars as RJE. The Redactor occasionally adds pieces of material to the story like in the sacrifice of Isaac, Genesis 22. This story is famously remembered as Abraham's loyalty to God and willingness to sacrifice his son, Isaac. Isaac's survival though is as a result of the redactor/editor. This segment was not necessarily a part of the original work, though it is unknown whether or not the original work had Isaac get sacrificed. The text consistently uses the term אלוהיםwhen referring to God, and then suddenly just as he takes his knife to kill his son, the entire disposition changes. "And an angel of Yahweh (מלאך-יהוה) called to him from the heavens and said 'Abraham! Abraham' (Gen 22:11)" Suddenly, Abraham is told to put down the knife, it is no longer necessary to sacrifice his son. Friedman states that this segment (Gen 22:11-15) was added by RJE,[22] and most scholars would agree. This is a logical conclusion especially since, even as he states, here the term Yahweh is used to reference the Deity whereas earlier in the story it was consistently Elohim. When the E narrative returns, it is problematic to identify whether or not Abraham sacrificed his son. The segment taken from Gen 22:11-15 is unlikely to be either E or J. The wording does not flow with the story found beforehand in Isaac's sacrifice story (E-source). This small addition also has no place that could be used in the J-source that is seen up to this point. While it can make sense in the E-narrative at this point, the most likely

[21] For more examples of angels as protection see: Exod. 32:34; 33:2. The angel leads you to the location where your enemies are, and then drives out the enemies. Just as Yahweh states he will drive out your enemies.
[22] Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed*, 64-65. _____

scenario is the redactor RJE. It is possible that the RJE author added this small passage. The RJE author's addition could be used to clean up the sacrifice story and make it sound as if it never happened.[23] The other option is it could also explain why Isaac does not get sacrificed if the E source believed he didn't. The second case is difficult to prove, as E never has Isaac appear once more in its entire narrative, but he is still referenced as being the father of Jacob later on. RJE makes the angel responsible for why Isaac is not sacrificed. The angel is also used as if it is aware of Yahweh's happiness with Abraham's intent. "And the angel of Yahweh called to Abraham a second time from Heaven. And he said, '**In me, I have sworn, declares Yahweh**, you did this thing and had not withheld your son, your only son.' (Gen 22:15-16)." Once again the angel speaks as if it is Yahweh, referring to itself as Yahweh and not as an angel. RJE still uses the concept that God/Yahweh and the angel are the same figure and not separate divine entities. Whether this is as earlier mentioned the diplomat of Yahweh, or Yahweh's actual emanation, Abraham accepts the word provided as if it were Yahweh speaking verbatim.

RJE does not always consciously try to change the theological implications of the story like in Genesis 22, but sometimes in other scenarios, when this redactor edits passages combined with J and E, it helps to explain what the audience already accepted of an angel. When the redactor of RJE combined texts, it seems as if he attempted to keep as much of the original documents as possible with the combined work. In Exodus 3, Yahweh reveals his name for the first time in the Bible. It is here where E's story reveals the divine name and therefore begins to use Yahweh in its narration. In verse 2, **J** states "an angel of Yahweh (מלאך-יהוה) appeared to him in the flames of a fire from the midst of a bush." It switches to **E** in Exod. 3:4B "And God called

[23] Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed*, 65.

to him from inside the bush, and he said, 'Moses, Moses.'"[24] Here, in this passage already both God and an angel are seen as being in this bush. Is God in the bush or an angel in the bush? Different authors (authors of J and E) say different things, but in essence, both are correct as both represent Yahweh. The redactor assumes the audience would not be confused. "And He (God) said, 'I'm your father's God, Abraham's God, Isaac's God, and Jacob's God." And Moses hid his face because he was afraid of looking at God." (Exod 3:6 - E). It continues in the words of E that God's name is revealed (Exod 3:14-16) and that is how he is to be remembered forever. This is the revelation of His name and the story of His revelation. The readers, writers, editor, and community as a whole must have assumed that God and the angels were the same. At minimum, the angel is the diplomate of Yahweh, with Yahweh's exact words. Yahweh speaks through the angel. While RJE's reaction towards the equation of angels is shown here, in a later historical period, this is not the case.[25]

As a result of the inquiry about angels, one more interesting piece of evidence arises from the research: the editor of the J and E combined narrative must have operated before 701 BCE.[26] Seeing as this redactor not only deals with literature that contains angels but helps to contribute to this confusion that an angel is Yahweh, leads one to believe that this work was published during an era when angels would have been in the literature and in use. The redactor adds more material containing angels as was shown with Gen 22:11-15. It was apparent that this sliver of

[24] This is taken from Friedman's understanding of the passage. He is one of the leading figures in Source Criticism, and I am following his separation of the sources. Friedman, *Bible with Sources Revealed,* 64-65.
[25] Friedman shows that when looking at how P deals with the combined narrative JE, the P author tends to ignore any passages that contain the divine intervention stories. P (shown by Friedman) follows the JE framework and outline when writing his *Torah*. When passages that differ from his theological framework, for example in Gen 22 with a human sacrifice story, this gets ignored by P and he does not include this story. Other instances of this include examples from the early works of Genesis whenever angels are mentioned (think Gen 31, the Hagar accounts Gen 16 and 21, Sodom in Gen 18-19) they become ignored. Similarly when other events take place that include other divine figures like the Genesis 6 story with sons of gods having human wives, this similarly gets left out. For more information about how the later β-period material responds to angels and quotes see my next chapter. For Friedman's response on P-s theological changes see: Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?,* 190-206.
[26] In the next chapter I will argue for how angels disappear from the Bible for a period of 170-200 years. This disappearance will explain what I mean for why RJE wrote before 701.

work was not a remnant of either E or J. His reason for adding this is unknown, but it helps build the argument that angels were still in the literate community. This becomes an even more discernible conclusion when seeing how he contributes to the confusion of the divine figure in the bush of Exodus 3. Once again, there is no real confusion; this angel that is here in Exodus 3 is also Yahweh who at this moment reveals His name. The result of the two sources being combined by RJE means that he was not working outside of the theological framework. It only supports that this is how an angel is viewed. This is different than the editor/redactor who combined the older historical material from the former prophets and the historical material written by DtrH. Nothing has been published or shown that this author contributed to angelic material, just simply combining the sources already provided.

The final story found in the Torah concerning angels is the passage of Balaam and his donkey. Num 22:21-41 found in the E-source, in this passage an angel of Yahweh (מלאך-יהוה) appears in front of a donkey belonging to a prophet named Balaam. This passage neither contributes nor discredits either definition of an angel, but instead is a rather large passage that is worth mentioning. At first, only the donkey can see the angel, but then the animal begins to speak magically, which apparently doesn't surprise Balaam. While the speaking animal did not shock Balaam when his eyes were opened (ויגל), or it was revealed to him that there was an angel (or God) before him and he immediately bowed. A brief conversation is held where the angel states that it will provide a message for him to deliver and that he must repeat what he is told. When Balaam arrives at his destination, he states that God puts words in his mouth and he is required to speak them (Num 22:38). When Balaam is givn the word to speak verbatim he is a human messenger for Yahweh, but not the incarnate form of Yahweh. We see this in the passage wth the angel, as the angel is revealed, and is clearnly a metaphysical being, not like Balaam.

These are the only angels mentioned in the Torah, neither P or D have a single angel mentioned in their texts. When searching outside of the Torah, angels are mentioned, but once again they are typically only found in the material written before 701 B.C.E. with the main exceptions discussed at the end of this paper. For the moment, one must continue with the narrative material (former prophets) as it is important before analyzing the Major and Minor Prophets.

When looking at the books Joshua, Judges, 1st and 2nd Samuel, and 1st and 2nd Kings; there is a fair amount of instances when angels are referenced. Even one of the four oldest pieces of the Bible, Judges 5, known as the *Song of Deborah*, briefly mentions an angel (Judg 5:23). The angel is just seen cursing Meroz for not helping fight on Yahweh's behalf. This list of angels continues throughout the rest of those books as well. In each instance, it is found in the older strata of material.

While Joshua contains no angel, the book of Judges provides a few examples of angels which are seen in the larger more complete and detailed stories. Angels are seen in Judges 5 (Song of Deborah), 6 (Gideon), and 13 (Samson). As Jack Sasson states, "In most contexts, the distinction between human and angelic emissaries is clear even if not immediately so to the protagonists, who meet them. In Judg 2:1, however, settling the matter is difficult."[27] Sasson believes this passage to be a human emissary but still, leaves it up for discussion. The words of God were delivered to the people, and he was upset with them. Sasson seems to be correct, as this passage does share what is seen in other passages of what an angel may be, in the sense that it is speaking on behalf of Yahweh, but there is nothing to discredit that this is not merely just a physical being and simply a human messenger. This character comes from Gilgal.

[27] Sasson, *Judges 1-12*, 1:178.

> "[1]And a messenger of Yahweh came up from Gilgal to Bochim. And he said, '**I brought** you up from Egypt and brought you to the land that **I swore** to your fathers, and **I said I will never break my** Covenant with you. [2]And you shall not make a covenant to the inhabitants of this land. You shall tear down their alters, but you did not listen to **my voice**. Why have you done this? **[3]I also say I will not drive them** from before you and they will be adversaries[28] to your side, and their gods will be a trap to you.' [4]And it was as the **messenger of Yahweh spoke these words** to all of the children of Israel that the people lifted their voices and they wept. [5]And they called the name of that place Bochim, and they sacrificed there to Yahweh.[29]" (Judg 2:1-5)

This passage seems to support the idea that this was a being speaking on behalf of Yahweh, but does it represent the angel or a human messenger? Angels in the Bible only appear to one or two people at a time, in only one other instance does an angel appear to many people, and that is in Genesis 19 with the two angels in Sodom. In the Genesis 19 example though, there is not a message that is passed onto a multitude, just a very few select people. In the case here it represents everybody who is present is meant to hear Yahweh's message,[30] which seems more closely related to that of a prophet versus an angel, who typically speaks to a select few even if it is in front of many people. But, this is a passage that as Sasson states, is one that could be up for debate because it shares traits that relate to the angels seen thus far. The dating of this passage is troublesome, but if it is DtrH, than it is the sole outlier of an angel. And the ambiguity seems to be intentional.

Gideon's angel appears in Judges 6. An angel appears before him sitting under an oak tree. When the angel appears to him and makes his presence known to Gideon the angel states, "Yahweh is with you (Judg 6:12)." Gideon seeks proof that it is Yahweh and not just some

[28] The Hebrew seems to be missing a word or has a different meaning in this passage. Often people translate this as an adversary by looking at the Greek or Latin translations.
[29] The bold faced and underlined words are done to signify that God is the one speaking.
[30] Sasson *Judges 1-12,* 1:179. George W. Savron, "Theophany as Type Scene," in *Prooftexts* v. 23 no. 2. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press) 2003, 126-128.

random person. Much like the Genesis 18 story, a sacrifice was prepared for the deity, but here the angel has fire appear and cooks the meat from the tip of his match-staff. Upon seeing this, Gideon watches the angel vanish, resulting in his doubt vanishing as well. Judg 6:22 “O Yahweh God, for now, I have seen the angel of Yahweh face to face.” Following this statement, Yahweh tells Gideon he may relax, for he will not die, as people seem consistently think of the passage much earlier in Exodus. This trend appears to stretch across the various angelic stories. It is evident that this angel is both Yahweh and the hypostasis form of Yahweh, the manner in which one will not die upon seeing. This is continued with Samson’s birth in Judges 13, as before the birth of Samson an angel of Yahweh appears to his mother and instructs her in how to raise her son, as a Nazarite. Samson’s mother was terrified by the encounter, and after the angel left, she tells her husband that she believes she met an angel. This angel ends up appearing multiple times to Samson’s mother and Manoah his father. Manoah responds much as Abraham and Gideon did, and offers to make a sacrifice for the angel. Creating another connection to a previous angel, Manoah seeks the name of the angel as well, and this is evaded much like it was with Jacob in Genesis 32 and his encounter with the angel of a god. With the flames of the sacrifice, the angel vanishes, and Manoah worries he will die for he has seen God (Judg 13:22). Seeing as Manoah did see the divinity, his fear is not ungrounded, but because he saw an angel, this may be the way to see the divinity without dying as one can see a basilisk through a camera lens and live. Manoah’s wife reassures him and states they will be fine, as Yahweh did not seek their life, he blessed it (Judg 13:23). Elijah also encounters an angel in 2 Kings 1, and in verses 3 and 15. In both of these instances, the angel is speaking on behalf of Yahweh and delivers a message and prediction to Elijah. 1 Ki 1:3 and 15 the angel informs Elijah that messengers from the king of Moab will be coming to inquire Yahweh whether this king will survive his illness. Yahweh and

by extension his angel tells Elijah that the king will not survive his illness because there is no God in Israel. When Elijah delivers this message to the king, he is unhappy with this response and sends people to come retrieve Elijah, twice Elijah had the king's messengers vanish in fire.

The pivotal year in angelology takes place in 701 BCE. This will be discussed more in depth in the next chapter, and this significant date will build an argument as to why angels are seen differently depending on the era in which they are written. What is important though, this event is spoken of three times in the Bible and each of these three cases has an angel saves those living under Hezekiah. The Assyrians are marching south to Judah, and the people are reminded of how a few years later the Assyrians took over Israel. Hezekiah devises a plan to protect his people and help bring them out of harm's way. Those living in Judah at the time were saved, and they credit the event to God sending his angel down to protect them. 2 Ki 19:35, 2 Chr 32:21 and Is 37:36 state that an angel of God came out and killed 185,000 Assyrian men.

In every instance where the angel appears, the angel is seen as either being confused with God, delivering a message of God on his behalf and by extension is speaking to a very select few people. This confusion as to whether or not it is God is important because as Friedman explained, it was initially meant to be seen as Yahweh in His hypostasis form. Being able to distinguish what the word meant in the Hebrew Bible is imperative, because as this has now been done, one can then go to the next step. One can now apply the definition that has been derived from the Bible to see if in instances when the term מלאךis not applied to a character to see if it is intended to be seen as an angel.

When the Phrase is not used, can the same answer be derived?

Now that angels have been defined by analyzing the word מלאךone can then look at the less obvious examples, the ones missing the descriptive title. In Genesis 32, there is a famous

passage found in the E source of when Jacob is alone in the wilderness at night, and a strange, mysterious figure appears to him. In Genesis 32, this figure is never called an angel, and much like Genesis 18, by lacking the word מלאך it allows the reader to experience some of the confusion as the main character at play. This will be covered more in depth when discussing Genesis 18, but before that let's look at how Jacob responds to the mysterious figure. The response by Jacob is to wrestle with the figure for the entire night. At dawn, this mysterious figure tells Jacob he must leave, but Jacob refuses to let him leave without knowing the figure's name and being blessed. This figure refuses to give Jacob his name but agrees to bless him. The figure's blessing was to rename Jacob. Jacob's name becomes Israel and Jacob then calls the place where he fought with this figure, Peniel (Face of God) because he strove with ***God*** and prevailed. Nowhere in this passage does it state that Jacob fought an angel. Instead, a man is seen appearing, refusing to give his name (it isn't time to reveal the name of Yahweh yet), and he fights with Jacob. Angels nowhere else are directly seen as fighting the main character. Instead, we see angels referenced as being protection for the children of **Israel** (Exod 14:19A 20-22; 20:20-23; 32:4; 33:2), and here an angel fights with a man named Israel. Instead, in many cases in the Bible, angels are seen as being like men, delivering a message from God, on God's behalf, and finally, the person confuses the angel for God.[31] Everything is similar to the instance here with Jacob.[32]

[31] While Hosea identifies this figure as an angel and Yahweh, one cannot assume he had read this passage or vice versa. While Hosea can be dated, E is still in question. If Hosea had read this source then we would assume he read the combined RJE narrative as he takes pieces from both fragments. If the author of E had read Hosea, then he is missing part of the story. What can be said is both were aware of a common story, and that is essentially about it. Both Hosea and the E-source must be taken independently first to see how they interpreted the scenario, not as one work.

[32] I am not attempting to take credit in stating this figure is an angel and God, many people have identified this Friedman also references this and this is one of the many points to his argument to an angel is a hypostasis of God. See Friedman, *Disappearance of God*, 10-13. The reason I am reviewing this material and bringing this up, is to show that there is a method to defining the figure, and one must be capable of doing this. They have to take this

What does Jacob actually see here in this passage? The term מלאךis missing from this passage, and instead what is shown is a figure who wrestles with Jacob and then when asked to bless him, he renames him with a phrase the author understands to mean *man who fights with God*. Which God is this author talking about, Yahweh (God) or just a god? To define the nature of monotheism and its many different intricacies involved would go beyond the scope of this paper. Monotheism has dozens of books and articles dedicated to it, detailing the nature of monotheism and how one should approach the topic.[33] The question that is worth asking though is how did Jacob understand his encounter? It is evident that Jacob in this story believed he encounters a god, and if one were to think about it, he isn't wrong. Baruch Halpern points out that even in the modern interpretation of how one views an angel it resembles that of a god. If one were asked whether they thought it was a god today though, they might disagree, but why? "Do angels not live forever, enjoy supernatural powers, exist in a dimension different from the inhabited by mortals."[34] Angels share a lot of what seems to be a god in other cultures, and the Israelites were no exception. Jacob doesn't call this figure an angel, and his name is not changed to a *man who fights with angels*; Jacob believes he fought with a god. Earlier in Genesis 28, also the E-source, Jacob encounters a god which he vows will be <u>his God</u>, this is what he calls the God of Bethel and in Genesis 31, the same god appears to Jacob in a dream identifying himself as the God of Bethel, whom he had met before. Be aware, the oldest portions of the Bible portray a religion that is not a strict monotheism, but instead one that may have multiple different gods. It is entirely plausible that Jacob believed that this could have been a different god, or another

seriously, so that they do not fall into the traps that seem to plague other scholars where they believe many words can be linked to an angel in every instance in the Bible.

[33] Kaufmann has a great argument to understanding monotheism in the period of Ancient Israel. For more about monotheism and what it actually means see: Yezekel Kaufmann *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to Babylonian Exile.* (Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 127-131 and 229-231. Albricht Alt *God of the Fathers*, 1-100. Frank Moore Cross *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 1-12., and Baruch Halpern, *Brisker Pipes than Poetry*, 77-107.

[34] Halpern, *Brisker Pipes*, 78.

possibility is he wasn't confused who this being was; he understood this as being the angel of whatever god he encountered. When comparing this event to other incidents in the Bible with angels, the angel seems to represent Yahweh or the God whom they worship. Monotheism will become central to the Israelite identity in a slightly later date,[35] and seeing as this figure resembles the angels that have been mentioned thus far, it should be understood as being an angel and a god. Who is this god for Jacob? The same god that Jacob vows to be his god, the God of Bethel, whom he met in person once more at Peniel where this god blesses him with a new name.

In Gen 48:15-16 (E), Jacob asks that the God that blessed him (possibly taken from this story) also to bless his children. The following verse he requests that the angel that has redeemed him redeem his sons, and finally Jacob asks that they are called by his name as well. God blesses Jacob in this story (Gen 32:25-31 - E), by renaming him-Israel. Jacob names the place that he wrestled with this figure 'Peniel' because he saw God face to face (Gen 32:30) and somehow doesn't die, contrary to what Exod 33:20 says, 'A man will not see me and live.' Jacob asks that the angel who has redeemed him to also redeem his sons. Angels/God consistently redeem Jacob. In Genesis 31 (E) when Jacob leaves Laban, Genesis 32 where Jacob is redeemed of himself and also when he and his family is saved from the famine. Which as shown earlier, is the same figure, the same god, the same angel. According to the story, he is about to meet his brother Esau for the first time in more than a decade, and the last time the two of them met Jacob is running away from Esau because Esau wished to kill him. This *being*, an angel, redeems Jacob possibly by giving him the strength and confidence to know that he can finally confront his brother. Jacob is capable of fighting with God and survive, his reward is a new name. He is a new man, no longer the same *Jacob* that he was before, he is now *Israel*. Finally, the next request that Jacob

[35] Halpern, *Brisker Pipes,* 88.

asks for is to have his children (offspring and heirs) be called by his name as well. This is a reference to the blessing given to him by the God and the angel that he met in Genesis 32, changing his name, and the name signifies redemption. His children become known as 'the children of Israel.'[36] There is also a famous passage from the prophet Hosea referencing this event. Admittedly, Hosea may not have read this passage, but the story is at least known to the prophet. What is also worth noting, that if Friedman is correct in his claims that E's writer was from the north (Israel vs. Judah), then it is interesting that Hosea a prophet also from the north references a similar story.[37] Hosea mentions a divine being that wrestles with Jacob, so it is at least referencing the same event, but in Hosea, it states what the divine being was: God and an angel,[38] and he also speaks of Jacob as synonymous with Israel (Hos 12:12). With all of this evidence, it is clear that the mysterious unnamed figure in Genesis 32 is an angel, and it is a god (the God of Israel). But why does the author simply not call this being an angel? Likely for the same reason as the J-source not initially directly identifying the angels in Genesis 18 as an angel, this ambiguity has a purpose.

In Genesis 18, three mysterious figures appear to Abraham, and it takes Abraham a while to figure out who they are. The audience and readers never know for certain whether or not he knows who all three of them are by the end of the story. The narrator of the story does something brilliant as well; it keeps these three figures anonymous for its reader. It is much simpler to just in the narration tell the reader that these three are angels or God. The audience is given the

[36] It should be noted this entire argument was built off of passages found solely in the E-source.
[37] Concerning the E-source's author from the north/Israel see: Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible,* 70-88. Concerning the Prophet Hosea also being from the north/Israel see: Francis Anderson and David Freedman, *Hosea,* AB 24. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 40-52. One could even speculate that the JE combined narrative might have happened before Hosea wrote, as he references both events in his passage. This is only speculation, and it would be very difficult to prove this. He may have simply heard a third story where all three stories had been blended in a manner. This is simply unknown, but to speculate that it is possible that JE might have been combined at the period of his writing is not too far-fetched.
[38] Hosea 12:2-6. The Hosea account also mentions Jacob grabbing his brother's heel in the womb (J), striving with God (E), meeting God at Bethel (JE), and speaks of Jacob as synonymous with Israel (Hos. 12:12).

knowledge that at least one of these figures is Yahweh. Instead, the other two are left ambiguous. This ambiguity allows for the reader to be put in the same position as Abraham, just like in Genesis 32 both Jacob and we as the readers are unclear who the figure is. The audience, like Abraham, can determine at least one of the three characters is God, but the other two remain unknown both to Abraham and us. The sense of the confusion that Abraham must have experienced is then passed onto the reader. Never in this scene is the reader told who the other two figures are, it isn't until the next chapter and scene that the opening lines say that two characters left. These characters are then identified as angels. Just because the next scene/chapter identifies these two as angels, does not mean the reader should miss the intricate detail that the author purposely lacks the identities of these figures. In the story, they are only called men (Gen 18:2). We don't even know if they look similar or different. Gen 18:10, the mysterious figures tell Abraham that his wife will give birth to a son, this is shared in instances like Genesis 16 and Hagar [J], as well as Judges 13 with Samson's mother [possibly J], a joint claim and blessing is given by angels to men. Then all of a sudden in Gen 18:13, "And Yahweh said to Abraham, 'Why did Sarah laugh?'" in response to the comment of her ability to give birth. All of a sudden we the reader are told that one of these figures must be Yahweh. The passage continues using singular and plural verbal forms to create even more confusion in the passage as if Abraham is referring to only one figure, or three. The same applies as to if Yahweh is only one of the figures or all three of them. Abraham never once finds out if any of these individuals are called an angel. In fact, never once in the entire Hebrew Bible does a single angel ever call itself an angel. Only in the narration does the reader find out. **No biblical character is ever told that a figure is an angel by the divine figure itself. He/she just assumes they either saw God or an angel.** This is because the angel is the actual emanation of the deity, and the deity wouldn't call itself an

angel. This may be a signifier to the reader that God's presence is there without him actually being there. When the term is missing, it provides a new layer of depth to the story, allowing the reader to understand the same confusion as the character in the story. The hiddenness is a significant stamp, but if the scholar analyzes the instances in the story where the term מלאך appears, then the scholar can find when the phrase is not used that it references such a being as it is in both Genesis 18 and 32. This same method is used when looking at the term's usage when it is not referencing an angel.

So when aren't they Angels: Human versus the divine figure.

Just as one can determine when these characters are angels when the term מלאךisn't used, one must be wary not to jump to the conclusion that every time you see מלאך**,** this figure is to be understood as an angel. Most of the time when it is in use, the term just simply means messenger. Prophets are voices of God/Yahweh and are the deliverers of his messages. They speak as if they are Yahweh Himself, and even in rare cases, there are examples of identifying themselves with being a messenger of Yahweh. "And Haggai, the *messenger of Yahweh* (מלאך יהוה), commissioned by Yahweh spoke to the people saying, 'I am with you, said Yahweh (Hag 1:13).'" Here though one can see that even if the prophet is called the *messenger of Yahweh*, it is also apparent that it is not an angel. Priests are called messengers of Yahweh by Malachi, "So the lips of the priest should keep knowledge, and the Law/Torah they should seek from his mouth because he is the *messenger of Yahweh* (מלאך יהוה) of Hosts (Mal 2:7)." Therefore, one must be careful not to jump to the conclusion that messengers of Yahweh are always angels, instead read with a careful eye. These people can be seen as Yahweh's messenger, and they are to be respected as if it were Yahweh speaking, but it is also clear they are not quite the same thing as the metaphysical creature known in English as an angel, and they are not the same figure

discussed throughout this essay. These people who are prophets are messengers, and share a similar duty, but they are not an angel. When defining an angel, one must be very clear what the Biblical authors understood the character to be. Only then can one see if other terms apply, and what doesn't apply. The Hebrew language in many cases shares the same word for various related tasks, as can be seen with prophets and angels. Both are messengers of God and share the same word, but both are not the same metaphysical and divine figure. Similarly, once one understands how the divine figure identified as an angel in the Bible is portrayed, can other words like בני-האלוהים be analyzed to see if they fit the same usage.

Why terminology is so important:

Now that a clear working definition of what an angel is in the Bible has been identified, are other terms applicable in reference to the same being? Scholars have often mentioned the phrase בני-האלוהים and applied it to angels. This phrase literally translates to 'children of God(s).' William H.C. Propp states, "Admittedly, sometimes angels are independent divine beings and are even called 'gods' (Ps. 82:1, 6; 95:3; 96:4) or 'sons of gods/deity' (e.g., Gen 6:2; 32:29, 31; Deut 32:8; Ps 29:1; 89:7; Job 38:7)."[39] Propp continues and states that angels can also be manifestations of the deity.[40] But it is important to be consistent with one's definition; are they manifestations or separate beings? Propp like others is working off of an idea based upon what they understand an angel to be, not a definition compiled through looking at the Biblical evidence. One's preconceived idea is not important. Instead, it is the words itself that matter. Look at the first two examples in each of these cases to see if they apply to the מלאך as found in every instance provided above. Due to the ability to give an estimated period in which Genesis 6 was written, it is imperative to discuss it as this gives weight to the argument because it is

[39] Propp, *Exodus 1-18,* 198.
[40] Ibid.

comparable to other sources written in the same period where angels appear, as opposed to Psalm 82. This Psalm cannot verifiably be dated, therefore it is best to start with the Genesis example, but even if one focuses on the Psalm example, this doesn't represent what is shown for angels anywhere else in the Bible.

Gen 6:1-4 is written by the first author looked at in this study, the author of J. "And it was when mankind began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them, and the Children of God(s) (בני-אלוהים) saw (Qal Imperfect plural) the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they took them as their wives from all that they chose. And Yahweh said, my spirit will not remain in mankind always and also in his flesh, and his days will be 120 years. The Nephilim had been on the earth in those days, and also after that when the sons of the god(s) (בני-אלוהים) came to the daughters of mankind, and they bore them the same great ones who were of old, men of the name." The figures here in Genesis 6, look nothing like any of the angels mentioned above. To start, they are a separate figure than Yahweh. When encountering angels, if one were to replace the word angel with God, the meaning of the sentence doesn't change, here with the *children of God* example, it doesn't make any sense. It shouldn't be confused where in verse 3 it states Yahweh will not allow his spirit to remain in mankind forever and also in his flesh, as if Yahweh had made children with multiple human wives. There can be two simple explanations for this. The first is in the Genesis 2 account of mankind's creation (J-source). God breathes into man giving him life (also man lives for hundreds of years starting here with Adam). The second is Yahweh's children, or just sons of gods are marrying the daughters of men it does not say, angels. So why should one assume that these are angels? As mentioned earlier, this religion has not hashed out a *strict monotheism* as of yet. This very well could have been seen as the actual children of God, not Yahweh himself. Just because the בני-אלוהיםis seen as a divine

figure here, does not mean they share the characteristic of an angel. It is important to note; it is the *Children of God* that found these human women as beautiful and seeking them for their wives, not God. God is not seen here as looking for a wife from these women, and the passage implies there is at least more than one child (god or divine figure) who pursues a wife from mankind. Nowhere does this resemble the angelic characters shown in every other instance in the Bible. So, why would Propp mention this case as representing angels? In later Judaism, **several hundred years later**, texts arose that looked back to this moment in Genesis and applied their theology to this story. Books that called these children of God(s) 'angels' included 1 Enoch 1-36 and Jubilees.[41] But as mentioned earlier, just because a later community might have recognized these as being angels, does not mean that the original author did or for that matter an earlier community. While a Greek translation[42] may also support Propp's statement; the Masoretic Hebrew, and the Greek Septuagint both imply that it would have been sons of God(s), and from this investigation, it shows that angel would not have been an accurate functional word.

Leading into the text that cannot be accurately dated, Psalm 82 contains another famous and controversial example. Contrary to what Newsom states, the Septuagint does not call the *gods* in this song angels (ἄγγεδοι).[43] This is the passage of the death of the gods. While later religious texts see this as a passage about the fallen angels, there is nothing to give this implication with the song's initial intended reading. Psalm 82:1 reads, "God stands (singular) in the council of El, in the midst of the gods he judges (sing.). (2) 'How long will you judge (plural) unjustly? And before the wicked you (plural) be partial?" Ps 82:6, "I, I have said you are gods,

[41] It is also worth noting, that the word to identify these בני-אלוהיםas angels did not use the word מלאךinstead עיר was used.
[42] The Greek Translation "Alexander" has angels of God, whereas the Septuagint retains children of God.
[43] Newsom, "Angels" *ABD*, 248-249.

children of the most high, all of you." Nowhere in the Bible do angels judge,[44] and so this passage is not about angels, it is about something else, most likely gods as the words in Hebrew imply. In verse 7, God tells them they will die like men. This is an excellent follow-up to the Genesis 6 reference. How do either of these examples in this chapter once refer to being an angel? As it has been established that the term Yahweh/God can be substituted with angel and the meaning remains, one should try it with Psalm 82. Replace the phrase at question with God, and the passage makes no sense. Once again, this does not look at all like the Biblical understanding of an angel. Angels are never seen as dying; they are only seen as either delivering news/commands, blessing people, and finally fighting on behalf of Yahweh. Therefore, בני-אלוהים does not work as a definition for an angel, and neither does אלוהים(God). There is only one exception to this rule, and it will be elaborated upon when discussing Daniel.

Newsom and Gaster both state that Cherubs and Seraphs are angels. Cherubs and Seraphs are divine figures, but unfortunately are not the same class or type of divine figure as an angel. If all dentists are doctors, it does not mean all doctors are dentists. Angels here are dentists, whereas Cherubs and Seraphs are a different type of doctor/divine figure. Is 37:16 has Hezekiah praying, he references God as being enthroned above the Cherubs. Ezekiel refers to cherubs as figures with multiple heads and with faces of different animals (Ez 10:14). Cherubs are more often than not described as being what the Ancient Near East calls a sphinx, but the cherubs in Ezekiel seem to have a different appearance, in either case, it does not resemble what has been shown to be an angel up to this point. While cherubs do not seem to look the exact same in every scenario, it becomes apparent that an individual knows that this is a cherub, and does not mention the word angel in association with cherub. Ezekiel has many passages about cherubs in

[44] The angels are not the ones who are judging in Genesis 19, they simply are just there to experience the town, to see if it is worth destruction. God is the one who judges the destruction of the town.

its book, it gives detailed descriptions of what they look like, but he never confuses them with being God. In Ezekiel 10, God is speaking to a myserious figure in linen (often associated with an angel, but the term is never used here and does not resemble what has been described up to this point), and gives him instructions concerning divine beasts called Cherubs. Ezekekiel describes these figures as having 4 different heads (Ez 10:14), hands (Ezek 10:8) wheels (Ezek 10:6-10, 13), everything is filled with eyes (10:12), and finally very powerful wings (Ezek 10:5, 8). This divine beast resembles God's power, as its'wings can be heard far away like God's voice (10:5), Ezekiel never confuses this beast with God. He knows it has a *cherub* factor to it. When Cherubs are referenced in other places in the Bible the only thing that Cherubs do have in common is that they all have wings and are a divine creature (2 Sam 22:11; Psalm 18:10). They do not share anything else in common with angels. Angels are only described as having wings (if they are an angel) in Daniel when referring to the holy ones that Daniel sees in Daniel 8, but this is the only instance in the entire Bible when a possible angel has wings. Seraphim, on the other hand, are described as having wings (Is 6:1-8), and while they may partake in a similar task in this passage by purging sin, they are also known as being fiery serpents (Dtr 8:15). They are not seen as contributing much nor delivering Yahweh's messages. The Seraphim instead are only seen as crying out "holy holy holy" to God, and they speak as if God is a separate figure. The passage in Isaiah states that the prophet hears God's voice, with nothing to imply that the seraphim were the ones speaking at the moment nor could they be God, it portrays the scenario as God is separate from the Seraph. Nothing else could be used to support that Seraphs are angels.

Since the definition for an angel is מלאך, people in earlier times did not view other beings as angels. The word מלאך(in reference to an angel) never once appears in the books of Jeremiah

and Ezekiel. They are also never mentioned in P or D. These four works are important because they are all very long and contain stories that with Newsom's and others' definition would include angels, but these authors are consciously avoiding the word. The cherub is the most important example as it is seen in Ezekiel throughout most of the book, but the angel is not. It is evident these authors have a different theological approach to what this word means. They also are feeling as if this divine figure is no longer associated with Yahweh.[45]

Angels sharing the same idea, but also slightly different depending on approach: Zechariah and debatably Daniel.

The only time in the entire Bible that uses a child of god in parallel with an angel of god is found in Daniel 3, but here there are many issues which arise with this example. Daniel is written very late. Scholars date it in the 160s BCE. Many subjects over this 1000 year time span from the earliest document to Daniel changed in the religion. From what monotheism meant to religious laws much of the religion had changed. The perception of an angel followed suit as well. This outlier in Daniel using בני-האלוהים and מלאך synonymously is not sufficient in stating the Bible uses these terms as synonyms. By extension a single exception, it is too uncommon for it to be concrete. Next, it is not unusual for words to have different meanings depending on the period and historical context in which they are used. Therefore, seeing as the book of Daniel is the latest book in the Bible, this example has even less validity. Think in Genesis 3, the serpent that tempts Eve to eat the fruit is only called a serpent in the Bible, but in later theologies, it is identified as being the Devil/Satan. Psalm 82 (unknown date) has been defined by many people as an example of angels. This may be the case in a later theology, but there is no rhyme to reason for one to take that assumption comprising the entire Bible. Following up with Genesis 6, is

[45] This will be elaborated in the following chapter about the lack of angels, and the implications that come from this attempted theological shift in the religion.

another excellent example of how a later theology interprets an earlier work. This passage with the Nephilim hybrid children of the בני-אלוהים, and human women become later identified as fallen angels.[46] The first occurrence of an angel is in Gen 16, and while this is the same author, it takes place hundreds of years later. The later theology identifies the Nephilim and believes that they were intended to be seen as angels, but this only reflects how they interpreted it, not the original author of J. The book of Jubilees is a book written hundreds of years later than J, and so is Enoch. Therefore, the authors of these later books understanding of this passage do not necessarily reflect the original. Daniel is no different as it is separated in history by nearly a milinia.

The book of Daniel, 160's B.C.E., is written incredibly late in comparison to the earliest sources of the Torah. In Daniel 3 there is a parallel between לבר-אלהין(בני-אלוהיםthe Aramaic equivalent to this phrase Dan 3:25) and מלאכה(the Aramaic cognate for מלאךDan 3:28), and they are identified as being the same figure, by Nebuchadnezzar a Babylonian, not an Israelite. In either case, this is the only example of these two words used as a synonym. The term angel appears twice in Daniel, chapter 3 and 6, and in both cases, it is unclear what the angle is doing there, but they can arguably still be seen as partaking in the hypostasis theory that Friedman so elegantly proposes. If you replace the word for an angel here, with God, it could still work as his hypostasis. The figures Michael and Gabriel also share characteristics of angels, even though they are not called an angel, but they show characteristics of angels used by only one book in the Bible, Zechariah. As Friedman mentions, "No angels are seen by any prophet. The prophet Zechariah has a vision in which there is an angel, which the prophet refers to as 'the angel who speaks in me' (Zech 1:9, 14; 2:2, 7; 4:1, 4, 5; 5:5, 10; 6:4). Interestingly, Yahweh is heard

[46] For more on this see the Book of Jubilees and 1 Enoch 1-36.

speaking to the angel in Zechariah's vision, and then the angel speaks to Zechariah."[47] In the instance with Zechariah, he only hears Yahweh's voice and sees the angel. This passage doesn't necessarily discredit the idea that it could still be a hypostasis of God. Instead, it is more likely that Zechariah shows a later development of the religion and its understanding of an angel, a topic that will be continued in the next chapter. If one were to wish to do so though, the angels in Zechariah could possibly still be the emanation of God.

Conclusion:

The Only term in the Bible that can be used to define an angel therefore is מלאך, not בני-אלוהים, nor any other word unless it has an unambiguous definition that arrives at the same conclusion as how מלאךis presented. With every instance in the Bible where an angel appears it represents itself as if it is Yahweh. The angel could even be replaced with Yahweh and the passages meaning is unchanged. Friedman is correct in stating that this is a hypostasis of God. It is how God reveals himself to mankind. The other terms found that other scholars identify as being an angel represent a later stage of the religion and not representative of the Bible. Once a working definition is used, only then can you find cases where the Bible lacks the term, like in Genesis 18 and 32, but the same conclusion could be derived. If one were to homogenize a word that is used for well over a millennium then by simply observing how the Bible presents an angel, the best definition that can be derived is: Angels are the ***Emanation of God***.

[47]Friedman, *Disappearance of God,* 63.

CHAPTER 2

THE ANGELIC TIMES: HOW NAMES ARISE IN DANIEL, AN EXPLORATION OF THE BIBLE

In the Bible, only one word should be translated as angel, (מלאך-יהוה מלאך-אלוהים) meaning *messenger of God* or *Yahweh*. While not every (מלאך) is an angel, the identifying figure is determined in the previous chapter, and once this figure has been defined, one can begin to see how the term is used during the Biblical period.[48] Scholars have unfortunately missed the proper mechanism to identify what an angel is. This problem lies in the period in which the angel is discussed. Richard Friedman's definition is one that most closely defines the word known in Hebrew as angel, but even it has its flaws.[49] Most scholars follow the general understanding, one that contrasts Friedman's perspective, and is laid out by Carol Newsom.[50] The belief corresponds with the more standard definition accepted by the Jews, Christians, and arguably even Muslim traditions. This definition is more inclusive and follows the modern opinion. Newsom's definition follows a historical model that has its roots in the Post-Exilic Period but more articulated in the Second Temple Period.[51] Newsom starts off by identifying an angel, in its modern context while at the same time not entirely agreeing with herself with her definition comprising the entire Biblical period. When she rightfully states that angels differ in a different period, her recognition is not enough to be correct. She doesn't identify what an angel is in the

[48]For this paper, it is specifically referencing the period in which the Hebrew Bible takes place. I am not referencing the period that occurs during the New Testament, nor am I talking about material that is not directly associated with literature only found in the Bible.
[49] Friedman, *Disappearance of God*, 9-13.
[50] Newsom, "Angel*," ABD*, 248-250.
[51] Newsom, *"*Angel*," ABD*, 249-253.

separate periods. She states that an angel in the Pre-exilic period resembles that of the entire ANE's understanding of the divine court. "Yahweh was envisioned as a king, and at his service were divine beings who served as counselors, political subordinates, warriors, and general agents."[52] This leads her to state that a number of figures can and should be translated as angels.[53] Newsome states Yahweh acted as a king with many divine beings serving him; and these beings resemble a divine court. This does not mean that all of these beings in the hypothetical court were angels. Passively, she as well as another Second Temple Scholar, Saul Olyan, claim that divine figures like Cherubim and Seraphim are angels.[54] She along with other prominent scholars have stated that even the term (בני-האלוהים), [55] literally meaning 'children of god/s', is a synonym in most cases for an angel. Newsom states that for the Hebrew Bible this was a term that was used to "denote their divine status." This idea very deeply contrasts with Friedman as he identifies an angel as being a hypostasis of God.[56] A rather different perspective. The previous chapter showed that by analyzing each instance containing an angel, the angel can easily be understood as being a representative of God himself, and is seen this way by the protagonist in the story. While Friedman's *Biblical definition* is seemingly more concrete than Newsom's, there is also evidence supporting Newsom. The problem lies in identifying which period one is discussing, and how that period understands what an angel to be. One can see a steady shift in both the religion and how terminology is used in the Hebrew Bible, seeing as it is

[52] Newsome *ABD* 249.
[53] Ibid
[54] Newsom, *ABD*¸ 252. It should be noted that she does not state that the original meaning certainly meant this, but instead claims that the later texts meant that cherubim and seraphim are angels. In the literature provided by the Bible, and more importantly in the time periods in which they appear, nothing suggests that these authors believed them to be angels. She has it attributed to the Second Temple Period, but when we see these beings originally appear it is in the Exilic Period where it is the most interesting. She has her argument about these divine figures and their angelic status outlined in her Second Temple Period discussion. But, references the beings found during the Exile. Saul Olyan also mentions that Cherubs are angels and are the only class of angel recognized in the Hebrew Bible. Olyan *A Thousand Thousands Served Him,* 16.
[55] Newsom, "Angels" *ABD*, 248. Propp William H.C. *Exodus 1-18,* 198. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* 63-37. Gaster *"*Angel" *IBD*, 130-131.
[56] Friedman, *Disappearance of God*, 13.

a compilation of literature pieced together spanning over 1500 years, and while many ideas are shared, without a doubt they evolve and become understood differently depending on their context. One of these ideas is how they perceived and wrote about angels. By identifying when an angel is in the story, one can then see how the author portrays an angel. The most interesting part is that these authors when broken up by the time in which they write, provide a clue as to why an angel today is understood differently than how Friedman defines one. It also explains why these divine figures in the later Biblical Period will become independent thinking entities which in some cases will acquire a name. The term angel evolves over time, becomes a more inclusive term, and evolves into a separate divine entity.

Historical Periods of the Bible

While other figures may be an angel, they should not be translated as *angel*, contrary to what scholars like Newsom and T. H. Gaster imply. Because angels are not used in the same sense throughout the entire Bible, simply by researching the term and its usage throughout nearly a 1500 year history, a hypostasis is the closest conclusion to which one could arrive. Scholars like Carol Newsom, Saul Olyan, T. H. Gaster and others[57] agree that most divine figures in the Bible (that is not explicitly Yahweh) are an angel and this conclusion is not absurd. It just does not fit the Hebrew Bible's definition. Once the terminology for an angel is rightly understood, one begins to learn more about how angels are used in different periods in the Bible, and ultimately how named metaphysical figures like Michael and Gabriel are in truth angels. One even begins to see the parameters that allow other divine figures to adopt the position 'angel' even if they were not initially conceived as one. This chapter will consist of three parts: angels in

[57] See Footnote 54

their historical period, how this leads to Zechariah showing a revival of angels and his new perception of an angel, and finally by using the Bible as the only tool Gabriel and Michael should be understood as angels even if they are not titled as such.

When outlining every instance in the Bible, one can see by looking at **Chart-A** angels are not incredibly prevalent in the Bible, but there is no shortage of them either. When one begins to look more closely, there is a small period in history spanning roughly 160-200 years where they are not mentioned once.[58] I can't explain why there are no angels in these books theologically (without much speculation) during this period while still containing divine beings,[59] instead simply point to the evidence. If Friedman's dating of the Pentateuchal sources is correct, then I can pinpoint whose hand is responsible for this conscious lack of angels, the author of the P-source. If the P-source is as early as Friedman proposes, then P significantly influences the authors of other texts, whether directly or indirectly, and this text's impact for our purposes is observable here with angels.[60]

By breaking the Bible down into three main segments of time, for the sake of angelology, it becomes apparent that angels have different functions pertaining to the time period in which

[58] I am being conservative in my estimation of the time frame recognizing that dating sources is an art form. Regardless if it is 160 years or 200 years, the fact still remains that angels were consciously ignored for several generations. This will lead to interesting conclusions that will be discusses as follows.

[59] Friedman has his reasoning why **P** does not have angels, and it is as follows. It is well accepted that the author of P was likely to be a priest (reason for our title to the text as **P**). Because a priest was the author, and many extra theological points were either added or edited by his hands, one of which included lacking the term angel. God becomes less anthropomorphic and prophets also begin to disappear from the picture. Magical events become eliminated including talking animals, dream interpretation etc. What is seen is that there is only one way to contact and understand God, this is through the priest. The priest is the only mechanism to reach God. No angels, no prophets, no nothing. Just Priests. On dating and of **P** see: Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible*, 210-216. Concerning angels and theological positions see: Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible*, 204-206.

[60] I am following Friedman's reasoning that this dating is during the Hezekian reign. It should be noted that the typical dating is much later, and even if it is as late as some scholars speculate, in the post-exilic period, that this does not affect the overall issue with this argument. Instead it simply would only make the argument that it may not have been **P's** hand who changed the course of history.

they are written.[61] Angels in the early material while sharing some traits are different than those in the latest material.[62] The different periods are as follows: α – early period and material (before 701-ish BCE), β – mid period and material (starting with P, and going through the Exile to about 538 BCE), and finally γ – later period and material (starting around the time of 538 BCE).

α-Books and Authors: (*Only texts containing angels*)

Early to 701 BCE.

J, E, the early historical books author from Judges- 2nd Kings (Friedman calls it *In the Day*),[63] Hosea, and 1st Isaiah.

β-Books and Authors: *No angels*.

Mainly 701 BCE – 538 BCE. (Focusing on the large and more influential works)

(While P may or may not fall into this period, the influence of this text is fundamental to the following texts), Deuteronomy (While the entire book contains no angels, I am focused on the material written by the later historian and not the earlier poetry), Deuteronomistic history that is written by the Dtr/later author, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, (and 2nd Isaiah.).

γ – Books and Authors: (*Focused on the texts containing angels*)

538 BCE to the end of the Bible.[64]

[61] Difficult or nearly impossible texts to date like Psalms and Job will be referenced in the essay, but dating will not be the issue with them.

[62] While I may not be the first to note that angels differ depending on their period, nobody has to my knowledge mentioned that angels disappear entirely from the Bible for over 100 years. Newsom and Gaster both mention that angels are seen differently according to their period. See: Newsom *ABD* 249. Gaster *IBD* p. 129-134.

[63] Friedman, *Hidden Book in the Bible* (San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins Press, 1998), 69. Friedman believes that the author of J was not solely the material as found in the Torah. He believed that this author's work continued and made a larger compiled text which he titled, *In the Day*. He chose this title for reasons that resemble modern titles of ancient works are often chosen from the first few words of the work. Examples can be seen with the Enuma Elish and even in the Bible with many of the books including the Torah.

[64] The dating of Chronicles has been under debate for several years. The arguments seem to lean that the earliest material is likely 520-515 as Cross and Freedman have initially proposed, but the dating stretches from the years 538-330 BCE. The likely timeline for angels really seems to get picked back up around 520 BCE, but it is best to be

Zechariah, Chronicles, Daniel, and debates are in the air with Haggai and Malachi. (Debatably Job[65] ~unknown dating likely later than most scholars identify, and possibly Ecclesiastes),[66] and 3rd Isaiah.

The majority of the angels in the Bible are found in the *earlier* α-texts. These sources heavily influence Friedman's deduction. Most of his research focuses on material in the earlier history of the Bible, and while he does deal with literature not directly Biblical, it is not where his main area of research is focused. His work titled, *The Disappearance of God* was a book not directly focused on angels, but the gradual development of the religion as a whole as seen historically in the Judeo-Christian community. The focus of the first third of the book is about the changes that appear throughout the Hebrew Bible. Essentially he shows that God is all over the place in the beginning and eventually disappears by the end of the Bible. Angels end up indicating a relationship to how one understands the separation and physical aspect of God in the lives of the people that encounter the divine. This approach helped Friedman reach the correct conclusion of what an angel was, but also, may have contributed to a slightly misguided understanding that this idea is consistent through the entire *Biblical period*. Friedman interprets

---

conservative with the dates to make a stronger argument and show that this gap in history does exist and is quite prominent. See Note 42 for a list of scholars who discuss dating Chronicles.

[65] Dating of Job is tricky, especially considering the language and theology etc. Dates have been coined as far back as 2100 BCE – 2nd century BCE. The oldest of these dates are more comical and mainly Rabbinic in nature. It is most likely that scholars as Ginsberg and Pope are correct in dating it in the Persian period. Scholars are all over the place when dating this work, this comes from the inability to distinguish whether this is Hebrew or a closely related Semitic language, the many haplax-logamana, the time period in which it is set and other issues with the work. The use of angels leads me to believe it is later, and likely in the Persian period but I will not argue in depth for this controversial book. (My comment later how angels are used supports my theory and the theory of some scholars, but as mentioned, this is not a reason to date this source as such, nor am I a *Job* expert.) For the dating issues of this text see: Mark Larrimore, *The Book of Job*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013) 16. Marvin H. Pope, *Job*, AB 15 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), XXXIII-XL. H. L. Ginsberg, "Studies in the Book of Job" (Hebrew), *Leshonenu* 21(Jerusalem, 1956), 259-264. For the Linguistic in Job see: Walter L. Michel, *Job in the Light of Northwest Semitic*, (Rome, Italy: Biblical Institute Press, 1987), 1-10.

[66] Note: Not likely an angel in Ecclesiastes.

an angel as being a hypostasis of God, the mechanism in which God reveals himself in the physical or metaphysical realm. Friedman's definition is accurate for the α-texts.

On the contrary, some of the other scholars mentioned are focused on later literature and have much of their research invested in material that is not directly Biblical. Examples include the Qumran scrolls, Apocryphal and Deutero-canonical Literature, Talmudic Studies, or even the New Testament, and therefore deal with material that is much later than the majority of the Hebrew Bible's composition.[67] Saul Olyan's work *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, speaks about the relationship to named angels throughout the later observations in the religion. He does make some claims that other figures are angels, and how angels are portrayed in the Bible, but the main focus of the work is to discuss the different named figures in the later religion.[68] By backtracking named angels seen in a later portion of the religion, he reflects on the origin of their names. One example includes a later angelic-like figure named *Mastema* and his relationship in other parts of the Bible.[69] They will even add him to their older text to help elaborate the meaning; a common example would be Genesis 22. He states, "Jewish exegetes were able to derive new information about angels and their sphere"[70] by looking at their understanding of an angel and referring back to instances in the Hebrew Bible that might explain their new meaning. While *Mastema* is the most well-known example, Olyan gives other examples and how they become used in later sources: Cherubim, Shinanim,[71] Tapsarim,[72] Degalim,[73] Gedudim,[74] among

[67] Scholars like Carol Newsom and John Collins are focused more so in the second temple period. Collins famous for his extensive work in Daniel and Apocalyptic Literature, whereas Newsom tends to work on material in Qumran material but recently has published an in depth work on Daniel. She has spent her career focused on the Second Temple Period, but like Collins are well versed in the earlier Biblical material.
[68] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 19.
[69] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 27.
[70] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 30.
[71] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 50.
[72] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 53.
[73] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 55.
[74] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 58.

others. These words are often seen as difficult to define, and later become understood as divine figures and angels.[75] He doesn't necessarily identify all beings as an angel but instead is pointing out a late aspect of the religion. This allows for a person who studies later versions of the Jewish religion to understand how these divine figures acquired names and used the Hebrew Bible as a reference point. They borrowed the names from the Bible regardless if this is what the Biblical author had initially intended, most directly seen with Mastema as it shares the root for Satan and will later be seen as an opposing force to Yahweh.[76] This gives authority to the name and the figure at play for the later audience. Newsom's primary focus of research is literature written during the Second Temple Period. This also gave her the false impression of the development of the religion that took place. She seems to hint at it in comments like: "Although references to angels occur in the oldest strata of the OT (in early Pentateuchal narratives and in early poetry), there is an apparent increase in speculation about the heavenly world in prophetic writings from the exilic and early post-exilic periods. It is in the late Second Temple period, however, that the most developed speculations occur." but she hasn't quite articulated her position entirely as of these definitions and what she means by a developed speculation.[77] She doesn't even define the differences between them, what is an angel from the early period versus what an angel is in the later periods. She just hints there are differences between the two. Most scholars wouldn't disagree with this statement that there is a difference between the two periods of angels, but she doesn't explain what the differences are. Moreover, Newsom does not discuss the disappearance of angels in the Hebrew Bible literature which is imperative for understanding this difference. Instead, she attributes it mainly towards the Exilic period being the core reason

[75] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 68.
[76] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him*, 66-69.
[77] Newsome, "Angel," *ABD*, 249.

for the shift in angelology.[78] Attributing it to the Exile is more likely a part of the third developmental phase and not the initial cause. This is how the author's interpreted the past and not the reason for which they make the change.

It is not difficult to see where one's research may sway his or her understanding of either Biblical passages, or even Biblical figures. Later traditions, like Christianity and the later Jewish communities, recognize other figures as angels as is shown, but not every source or author would have initially agreed with this conclusion. The problem lies with the 160-200 year period that everybody has either ignored or missed (~701-538 BCE). While it may not provide all of the answers, instead it finally allows for the scholar to ask the right questions. It begins to guide one in the right direction to finding reasons why later religions and traditions identify most divine figures as an angel. Just as an example, the figures that become later identified as angels include: Cherubim (Cherubs), Seraphim, the Satan, Mastema, Gedudim, Children of God, a term known as fallen angels, and most importantly for this paper the Archangels (although never appearing with this title in the HB) like Gabriel and Michael.[79]

The α-period of time ends right around 701 BCE. This date is chosen not because the final text is written in this year, but instead, an event takes place, and after this event, it becomes the last instance an angel is seen in the older sources. Two Biblical sources in the α-period reference this event.[80] This event is alluded to once more in the Bible in another book documenting history, written either during or after 538 BCE [81] and so, this seems like a logical time to have the α-period end. In 722 BCE, the Assyrians destroyed and conquered Israel.

---

[78] Ibid.
[79] The Behemoth and Leviathan are not necessarily angels nor ever alluded to being one. For more information to understand the different classes of angels in the later periods of history see Saul Olyan's work *A Thousand Thousands Served Him.* This is the focus of the text, to understand the different classes of angels and how they develop into such.
[80] 2 Kgs 19:35, Isa 37:36.
[81] 2 Chr 32:21

During the destruction of Israel, many of the Israelites moved south to their neighboring and nearly identical brothers, those living in Judah. The Israelites claimed to have a shared history, literature, language, very similar religion, and geographical location which was momentarily safer. It is during Hezekiah's reign that the Assyrians move south towards Judah. Friedman proposed that the P-source is a Hezekian document, and therefore written between 722 and 687.[82] Friedman suggests that within the pages of the P-source, there is a call to a centralization of worship including an attempt at only one altar allowed for sacrifice (even if Solomon's altars were not destroyed), a focus on an Aaronid priesthood with an assumption that there are two distinct priesthoods (the priests and the Levites) a distinction found in other documents during this era, and of course the theological evidence mentioned earlier accompanied with new refined laws that seem to suit the Hezekian agenda.[83] Most scholars would argue against this hypothesis and believe that the P-source was written after the exile, and some evidence is built up to support this. This evidence originates with Julius Wellhausen's early influential work *The Prolegomena of the History of Ancient Israel.*[84] Wellhausen bases much of his evidence and reasoning based on how Israelite festivals and their pastoral life are historical reminiscences and cultic ceremonies, an inferiority to the Levites as a priestly family, a monarchy vs. a theocratic church based culture, and by using Chronicles one can see the development of the religion in a later period which more directly supports P.[85] While, I follow Friedman's proposition and the Hezekian history of this document, it does not really matter whether the document is during this

[82] Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible*, 91-96, 208-216.
[83] Friedman *Who Wrote the Bible* 210-216.
[84] This becomes picked up and supported by many scholars even until the contemporary era. They end up following either Wellhausen's interpretation or are so influenced by it that many even date it later than him.
[85] For a good summary on Wellhausen's argument see Kaufmann *The Religion of Israel* 153-157. For the entire argumentation provided by Wellhausen see: Wellhausen, Julius *Prolegomena of Ancient Israel* p 34-38, 52-82, and 153-170.

period, post-exilic, or somewhere in between.[86] The fact that this document does not mention a single angel, and it flows with other famous and influential texts written during this period supports the idea that there is at least something fishy going on here. If Friedman is correct about P's time period, then it is probable that the books of the Bible that follow and are written in the β-period, are influenced by the P-source, and therefore the P-source may be responsible for this new theological perspective and its association with angels. P has a narrative that follows the initial JE combined work, and seeing as the author consciously ignores stories that initially contained angels and other divine intervention stories, it seems to be the first case in the argument. Whether or not P was the first book to not use angels and other authors followed suit is only important if P were the prime mover of losing angels in its narrative. It seems to be one of the first clues.

Evidently, this is a rather large gap in history between scholars' views of when this text is written. Therefore, the concept of dating should be addressed. Dating any ancient text is not an exact science, but one can logically deduce a rough period in which a book was written. It is dependent on evidence found within the text encompassing many measures (linguistics, historical figures mentioned, historical events, conforming to ideas or rejection of ideas and therefore seeing the evidence in the literature, etc.) and when compiling the evidence, the dating can become more accurate. The problem though relies on how closely one reads the text and his or her interpretation of the evidence and event. Realizing that many events in history can point to a scenario in which an event could have influenced the writing. To illustrate imagine 1000 years from now, if someone (hypothetically named Bob) were to argue about religious freedom in the United States and a text discusses the significance of this bill of right. There are various periods in history in which this could have been a hot and important topic. If Bob were to try to discover

[86] It only matters if P was the 'prime mover' so to speak, of angels and the theological refinement.

when book "X" was written, he could choose many different times based upon when ***religious freedom*** was a hot topic. For instance, he could choose: 2017 with Trump's *travel ban;* after September 2001 when the twin towers were attacked; in 1967 during the Vietnam war with Muhammad Ali and his refusal to be drafted claiming Religious values and his understanding of racial tensions in the US at the time; in 1993 with two Native Americans usage of peyote for a religious ceremony leading to a bill titled the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993,[87] dozens of examples could be chosen to represent time periods in which religious freedom was in jeopardy. Our scholar, *Bob*, could even have opted for the period in which the bill of right was written. So, if this was the main reason for why *Bob* chose whatever date he selected, a logical argument could be built for why he chose this date. Of course, this single piece of evidence is not enough and to piece the puzzle back together it takes much more than just one bit of evidence. Similarly, scholars today and in the past have had trouble dating texts, and many have good reason to believe he or she is correct. Keep in mind; these scholars are attempting to pinpoint dates that were written down ~2,500 years ago. Remember, it is not a hard science but more of a scientific art form. One has to see the evidence for themselves to understand why this scholar chose *X* date and not *Y*. But do not be fooled, dating any source is not an easy task or one to take lightly. Many scholars base their entire career attempting to prove when a document may have been written, as this can be seen with Source Criticism and the Bible. In most cases, it takes something extreme like what is shown with Friedman's understanding of the Documentary Hypothesis, to challenge the consensus. Therefore, for most of this paper's argumentation, a reliance on the consensus is used for the later texts and their dating. A summary for why each passage is dated the way it is will be provided for reference.

[87] Representative Charles E. Schumer, "*H.R. 1308 - Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993,"* 103rd Congress (1993-1994) doi: https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/1308.

By following Friedman's conclusion that P was written during the reign of Hezekiah, and seeing how angels are not mentioned, one should ask why this is the case. Why do we not see angels in P? ***Hezekiah and his reform.***

701 BCE and its importance

701 BCE is important. Assyria had already destroyed Israel, and in 701 Sennacherib, the Assyrian king made his way further south to Judah. Hezekiah prepared for this event, and with his attempt at centralizing the religion and the financial capital in Jerusalem, it could be argued that he succeeded in saving his people. Both Sennacherib and the Hebrew Bible claim a victory takes place during this battle.[88] More important for this reason is how the Hebrew Bible interprets the event. The Jews claimed they were saved by an angel of Yahweh (מלאך), who came down and slaughtered 185,000 Assyrians, resulting in the Assyrians return home. (Older source – α-period: 701 BCE 2 Ki 19:35 and Is 37:36.) This event becomes referenced once more in the Bible, with the same conclusion found in 2 Chr. 32:21. The dating of this source is up for debate, but scholars agree that this source (and most of the text) was written around 538 BCE or later (Chronicles more likely 520-515 BCE as Cross and Freedman proposed).[89] The event that took place in 701 will be the last instance an angel will be mentioned for 160-180 years.

[88] The Assyrian account is found on the *Prism Inscription of Sennacharib* that was discovered in the capitol of Assyria in Nineveh.

[89] The general discussion of dating Chronicles spans over the years 538-330 BCE. While I am inclined to lean towards David Noel Freedman's and Frank Moore Cross's argument and dating that the earliest segments were compiled between 520-515 BCE, it is important to see the various opinions. For discussions on dating the Chronicles books see the following scholars: Gary Knoppers *1 Chronicles 1-9*, AB 12 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003). 101-117. Knoppers has a great overall up to date summary of evidence discussing the various arguments over dating. Jacob Myers *1 Chronicles*, AB 12 (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1965). LXXXVI-XC. David Noel Freedman, "The Chroniclers Purpose" in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23, no 4. (1961), 436-442. Frank Moore Cross "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration" in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975) 3-18. Steven L. McKenenzie *1-2 Chronicles*, Abington Old Testament Commentaries. (Nashville, TN: Abington Press, 2004). 29-33 and 520-400.

The dating for the other "early" instances in which angels appear will now be outlined in detail along with their dating. The earliest source that contains an angel is Judges 5 (5:23) in likely one of the oldest pieces of literature in the Bible 11th century BCE.[90] David Noel Freedman and Frank Moore Cross state, "the Song of Deborah, a victory hymn, the occasion of which is known, and the proximate date quite certain, i.e., ca. 1100 B.C."[91] The angel in this passage curses Meroz for not assisting Yahweh and standing by Yahweh's side in battle. While not much is learned by this passage, it becomes apparent that in the earliest written Hebrew in the Bible the terminology and a concept for of an angel was already in use. Entering into the earliest prose ever written, scholars will encounter the next eldest work of literature in the Bible, of which also contain angels. Both J and E include angels. It is problematic to tell whether J is older or E, and most scholars have difficulty differentiating the two texts as they are incredibly similar in style and linguistic function. Friedman has created one f the best tools in scholarship to date, and his experience will be relied upon for this investigation, specifically separating J from E. Regardless from which text they derive, both texts are before 850 BCE.[92] J has been attributed to likely have been written around 950-900 BCE,[93] with evidence to support a date near the reign of Solomon. It is also important to note, that while scholars may not be able to differentiate between J and E, it is relatively easy to distinguish the JE combined narrative as opposed to the

[90] Scholars date it this early because of the poetic structure and linguistic analysis of the words found within the text. This poetic structure resembles that of Ugaritic Poetry, which is very old. They make comparisons based upon metrical and strophic patterns of this poem along with others that are very old. For more information see the following sources: Cross and Freedman *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997) 2nd Edition 3-14. In Halpern's analysis, he even states that it wouldn't be unlikely if this passage was written as early as the 13th century. Baruch Halpern, "Brisker Pipes than poetry: The Development of Israelite Monotheism," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) 88.
[91] Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, 3.
[92] If one were to be curious about the proposed angels written by specific authors found in the Torah, the following passages would be broken up according to Friedman as such. **J**'s angels are found in: (Gen 16:9-11; 18; 19:1, 15; Exod 3:2; Num 20:14-17) and **E**'s angels (Gen 21:14; 28:12; 31:11; 32:1, 25-31; 48:16; Exod 14:19; 33:2; Num 22:21-41).
[93] Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible,* 42-49 and 61-63. Friedman *Hidden Book in the Bible*, 350-360.

later P-source. Concluding the Torah literature, not a single angel appears in P or D, not one at all.[94]

The books between Joshua and 2 Kings also contain a few angels.[95] Like the Torah, these books were not written as one unified work. They have various sources that contributed to their construction. (Look at the Dtr-History) Martin Noth proposed that the author of Deuteronomy wrote more than just this singular book. [96] Noth proposed that this author wrote a significant portion of the books following Deuteronomy. He calls this the Deuteronomistic History. The same author writes not all of the work that follows Deuteronomy. Halpern has written about the phenomenon of the authors of the historical texts. [97] There are older sources that contribute to the history and the author of Deuteronomy also contributes. This leads one to ask, what was written by this author and what is less likely. Friedman reaches an exciting conclusion.[98] The earlier source (mostly identified as B by Halpern)[99] Friedman attributes it to being written by the same author as J, He believed that it becomes one larger work, that he calls "In the Day." Whoever wrote the text, while very important, is not the focus of this paper. It could be the author of J, E, or another older document. Instead, it is imperative to recognize that these scholars have all noticed and concluded that there is at least older material mixed with the later Deuteronomistic material. It is only in the older source material are angels found, and not in DtrH. This is a surprising and unintentional find, but just as was discovered in the studies based on Torah literature; it was an interesting result of the examination. This phenomenon strengthens the

[94] While angels may appear in the following historical texts associated with Deuteronomy, the material that is by the same author as Deuteronomy, do not contain angels. It is only the older sources. This will be elaborated upon.
[95] References: (Judg 5:23; 6:11-24; ch. 13; 2 Sam 24:15-17; 2 Kgs 1:3, 15; 19:35). Possibly also Judg 2:1-5.
[96]Martin Noth, *Uberlieferungsgesschichtlich*, trans. Jane Doull (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 4-11.
[97] Halpern shows portions of his source division as shown in his text: Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King*, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001), 263-266 and 277-279. Many conversations with Halern have also contributed to my understanding of the older source – *B*.
[98] Friedman's *Hidden Book of the Bible* discusses his argument that the **J-author** not only wrote the material found in the Torah, but was also the author of the earlier sources in the Historical documents.
[99] See note 97.

argument of multiple authorship and the assertion that they are written in separate periods. Friedman believes that the segments written by our older author in the historical texts, are writings reflecting the times of Solomon's reign and he alludes to these similarities as possibly connecting with the J author.

Concluding with the prophetic texts, the list containing angels diminishes. Only two prophets of the early α-period reference angels: Hosea and 1st Isaiah. The 8th century prophet Hosea famously mentions an angel.[100] This reference is in relationship to the angelic/man figure in the E-source (Gen 32) that wrestles with Jacob. The author of Hosea, whether aware of E as a text or not, was at least aware of the story that took place. Hosea believes the wrestling figure to have been God or in typical Hebrew poetic structure also an angel. God and the angel are set in parallel with each other. [101] "**2**And Yahweh has a strife with Judah, and he will punish Jacob after his ways. And he will return to him according to his deeds. **3**In the womb he had restrained his brother, and with his strength strove with God. **4**And he strove with an angel, and he prevailed, and he wept and sought his favor in Bethel, and there he spoke with him. **5***Yahweh God of Hosts* is his memorial. (Hos 12:2-5)" 1st Isaiah has two references.[102] The first recalls the 185,000 person massacre referenced in 2 Kings. The other *possible* reference is in Is 14:32. In this chapter, the prophet is stating that Yahweh will protect and see over Judah. His protection will lead to a downfall of Babylon, Assyria, and Philistia. Here after it predicts a fall of Philistia, the verse states, "And how will he answer the messengers of the nations? Yahweh has founded Zion, and the afflicted will seek refuge with his people." It is uncertain what is going on here, whether

[100] James D. Newsome Jr, *The Hebrew Prophets*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984), 30-43.
[101] Or a manifestation of a god. (Whether Yahweh or not is unknown, and some scholars have argued that this is the god of this location). Instead if we are talking about Hosea's interpretation, it is safer to say that he believes it to be Yahweh. As this text is using in the typical poetic fashion where Yahweh is identified as being equivalent to this angel.
[102] 1st Isaiah's prophecies range form the years 742-701 BCE. Scholars: Newsome, *The Hebrew Prophets*, 58-78. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah I: 1-39*, AB 19 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 98-105.

it is physical human messengers or Yahweh's angels, for either conclusion, it is worth referencing.

The γ – Period Texts

It isn't until at earliest 538 BCE that an angel-character reappears. Scholars like David Noel Freedman, Frank Cross, and Gary Knoppers have reason to believe that the compiled work of the Chronicles historical texts was completed about 520-400 BCE.[103] This book contains only a couple of angels, including the example taking place in 701, referenced twice before in Kings and Isaiah, found here in 2 Chr 32:21. The other instance is in 1 Chronicles 21:12-30 in a very odd story with David and an angel. David was apparently experiencing troubles concerning issues with both Israel and his capitol in the south Jerusalem. David in this chapter had sinned greatly, and his '*seer'* Gad was told by God to give David options for his punishment. An angel was initially sent down to destroy Israel, but was halted by God. Instead another punishment was given to the land and people. The angel once it becomes halted, by what seems to be God, David sees the being and talks with it for he fears it will destroy Israel instead of the other option David had asked for as punishment. The story essentially concludes with the angel not physically attacking Israel, and David fearing the angel's sword. This passage is admittedly very difficult to understand but is still written during the γ-period and so this is worth a mention. When reading this story, it also seems as if the angel is separate from God, but it is difficult to verify. While this book may have had access to older sources, and could be drawing upon another historian's story, it is still written in the later γ-period. The possible source that it is drawing upon and its historical period is completely unknown.

[103] See note 89.

A few texts are controversial in dating include: Ecclesiastes, Job, and Psalms. Ecclesiastes 5 has a מלאך, which may or may not be an angel. In this passage, it is talking about not to make a vow to God if you can't fulfill it. In Ecc 5:6 it just states, "Do not let your mouth lead you into sin, and do not say before the messenger/angel that it was a mistake. Why should God be angry at your words, and destroy the work of your hands?" This could play in either place whether it is God's hypostasis or a separate figure. Even if this is an angel it does not contribute to our understanding of the angelic figure. Regardless, its dating is likely during the Persian period or even later. Job also has a מלאך, and this is likely an angel. Unfortunately, it is incredibly difficult to date. There is evidence to state that this was written during the Second Temple Period and this evidence could be elaborated with his use of angels resembling the later understanding of an angel.[104] In either case, this book will not be discussed as a result of the wide range of dates that scholars attribute to it. Psalms contain nine direct references to an angel, but the dating of any Psalm is entirely speculative and so will not be largely discussed in this chapter for the difficulty of dating. While these texts are abstract with dating, the next text that has a fair amount of *angelic* involvement is a text that *can* be accurately dated, Zechariah.

There are texts written during this period that debatably could contain angels, but even if it happens to be an angel, while I disagree with it, they are written late enough that it would only support this theory. Both Haggai and Malachi are often texts that people reference as possibly containing an angel, whether they are talking about a prophet or an actual angel as mentioned, they are dated late enough that it doesn't challenge this theory.[105] Many even believe that they should be seen as one larger work. Malachi, Haggai, and First Zechariah are all written right

[104] See note 18.
[105] Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi*, AB 25D (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1998) 16-18, 80-84, 171, 212-213. Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, AB 25B (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987) XXIX-XL . Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016) 17-23, 26-36.

around the same period.[106] The first is probably Haggai, and while it may have been written alongside First Zechariah as one work, it is more important to recognize that these were written in the same period within only a few years of each other. In the introduction to Haggai it states that it takes place during the second year of Darius.[107] The book that is often seen as written at the same time or only briefly later is 1st Zechariah. Therefore, the fact that angels do reappear in First Zechariah (and with a vengeance I might add) we get a chance to see that this period of time and their authors/audience will see a different view of what an angel is. Even if nobody else agreed or thought of an angel in the same manner as the author of First Zechariah, it does affect the following generations' perspective of an angel. Haggai and Malachi do not impact my argument in any way shape or form. If they reference an angel (as possibly the case with Malachi) it is still written late enough to support the hypothesis that angels were not referenced for over a hundred years in the writing that is in our body of literature with which to work. It is unlikely that either of these texts really state anything about an angel, but on the off chance they do, the dating of these two works and their close relationship to Zechariah only helps to support the hypothesis. If a scholar were to see these as angels, as the characters might loosely resemble an angel, it would not affect the argument of angels reappearing in the γ-period, and disappearing in the β-period. These books are all written during the γ-period.

Zechariah will be discussed more in depth in a moment, but it should be noted that the angels found here, are in 1st Zechariah. There is plenty of evidence to discuss the dating of 1st Zechariah is 520 BCE and this is where the majority of scholars date the work.[108] Finally, the last book that directly references an angel is Daniel (160s BCE), the latest book of the entire Hebrew Bible. It is here where one sees the rather extensive development of what an angel is understood

[106] Hill, *Malachi*, 15-18. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 25.
[107] Haggai 1. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 25.
[108] Scholars don't typically date 1st Zechariah earlier than this.

to be, with the characters Michael and Gabriel. Neither character is identified as being an angel in the text and instead alluding to this conclusion they share characteristics to that of the angel figures in Zechariah.

Texts of the β – Period

Once these references to angels are pointed out and shown in which period they appear, does the gap in history become more compelling. While the Bible may not be littered with angels, when it comes to larger texts, they typically appear, at least in α-period and γ-period. There are significant texts written during the β-period, 701-540 BCE none of which contain a single reference to angels. What is even more confusing is that they still contain divine beings other than Yahweh. The large texts written during this period include the P-source, Deuteronomy/Dtr-History, Jeremiah, and even the most surprising Ezekiel. These texts contain divine figures like Seraphim and Cherubim.[109]

It seems as if with P, which can be followed up more vigorously with the later Jeremiah that he was attempting to have a more monotheistic religion. P and Jeremiah are not by the same author; they just show a gradual development of the religion. With the author of P being a priest, he wished for there to be no other mechanism to communicate with Yahweh than through himself; it is only through the priest that one can.[110] As earlier mentioned, I do not know why, but it is something someone should address, especially since the earlier term of an angel seems to be a hypostasis of God. It is at this point the term angel indeed disappears from the text and the

[109] This is really where Newsom's argument is flawed, and why it becomes inaccurate. While Newsom is not at this moment arguing for the angel-hood of Cherubs or Seraphs, she is stating that an angel is taking place in Ezekiel. This is a common misconception, as there is plenty of evidence to support that because Ezekiel does not use the term for angel, the author meant something else. While later readers would interpret this as an angel, it is highly unlikely Ezekiel meant for this figure to be one. Newsom, "Angels" in *ABD* 1:251.
[110] Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible,* 190-192.

lexicon of this period. While Ezekiel has cherubs he never uses the term for angel in his book.[111] The importance cannot be understated as Newsom's definition states cherubs alongside angels in her text. It is evident that for Ezekiel that does not apply. He never calls a cherub an angel, never states angels ride cherubs, and to support that even further Ezekiel does not mention the term angel. These cherubs do not resemble an angel of the past's literature, so why would one assume that Ezekiel thinks a cherub is an angel? There is only one possible reference to an angel in his entire work, and this is often seen in Ezekiel 9 and 10, with the men in linen. While later sources like Zechariah may have interpreted this as an angel, there is nothing to support Ezekiel would have believed this to have been one. The real question which is much more pertinent, is what happened to the angels? Divine beings are allowed and are not the issue, the angels are. Because these authors do not perceive cherubs as angels, the term angel was reserved for something different. Whatever the authors of the β-Period thought it meant, they ignored using the word until Zechariah's time. Zechariah revives the term in the 520s. This lack of trust in the term for angel occurs before the Exile, and so while the events of the Exile may have contributed to the new belief of an angel, it is not the Exile's doing as Newsom proposed. When angels return, they have a new persona, or at least an added trait that is not seen in the earlier segments.

Zechariah and the clues here.

Friedman's definition for an angel, while functional with solely a Hebrew Bible's understanding, is not entirely correct in its historical background for the figures found in *Zechariah* and *Daniel*. It can work, but the question remains, is it fully appropriate in the context as it is shown in Zechariah? This issue is important because it is not whether all authors had the

[111]There are multiple examples of cherubs in Ezekiel's text. Exodus 1 and 2 describe these figures. Ezekiel confirms that these figures that he had seen were cherubs in Ezekiel 10. The mysterious man of linen, there is no confirmation.

same assumption of what an angel was throughout the entire Biblical history, but instead, do we see a difference in interpretation of this divine figure at a later period? Newsom recognizes there is a different outlook on this figure, and while she sought the correct question, her answer is slightly off target. This is as a result of failing to recognize the consequence of the transitional period. Zechariah is the text that is responsible for making the waters murky for creating a complete Biblical definition for an angel. With this new perspective, scholars can then understand the named figures in Daniel, but first one must understand Zechariah's angels.

Angels are one of the most important features in 1st Zechariah, and they only appear within a dream described as a vision.[112] In the instances when the word/voice of Yahweh comes to him, it never mentions anything that implies he saw something outside of the dream. In the dozen or so times that an angel appears in 1st Zechariah, every instance is within a dream. These dreams are the medium for which Zechariah works within and has his prophetic visions. Unfortunately, Zechariah is not capable of understanding these visions alone and needs an *Angelus Interprus* to explain the meaning of the visions he has. In walks the new and improved angel. When angels appeared in the Bible, more specifically in the older α-period, most often they appear in a physical form to the character that sees or speaks to it.[113] It should also be noted that in most cases when the angel appears in the story, the story takes place many years before that particular text is written. Even in the examples in Samuel angels are only referenced as an example of benevolence when comparing a king to an angel. As these examples do not contribute or denounce the argument of the definition for angel, the focus will be on angels that

[112] There is one reference of an angel in 2nd Zechariah. This appears in Zech 12:8. Scholars believe this is an insertion by a later editor of the work. See: Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah II: 9-14* AB 25C (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993), .38.

[113] Every instance in the α-period an angel is seen appearing physically: **Gen** 16:7-11; 18:1-33; 19:1-15; 21:17; 22:11, 15; 31:11; 32:1, 25-31; **Exod** 3:2; 14:19; 23:20-23; 32:34; 33:2; **Num** 20:16 (maybe); 22:21-41; **Judg** 2:1-5; 6:11-24; **2 Kgs** 1:3, 15; 19:35; **Isa** 37:36; **Hos** 12:4

take place as a manifested figure in the story, as one of the characters, like what is shown in Zechariah. Only two instances occur where an angel appears in a dream during the α-period. Every other instance is in person where the angel appears to the character. It has a physical form. This illustrates that while angels do appear in dreams, it is not often or common for the character to do so, but it opens the door for 1st Zechariah to utilize this mechanism for his usage of how the angels will appear. With this information, the author or 1st Zechariah is therefore not developing a new medium for a revelation to appear, but as Friedman points out, *This shows a further step away from the relationship with God*.[114] Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer elaborates by explaining how far this step is. Each vision found in 1st Zechariah contains multiple layers of reality. Three levels of reality to be exact. The first level is with the narrator and Zechariah's point of view, and this is where the oracle is given.[115] The second level and third level can be fluid and move back and forth between each other. The second level is the dialog within the dream/vision, and the dialog involves Zechariah and the angel. It implies or in some instances blatantly states that Zechariah is asleep.[116] A new level of consciousness is therefore provided for the reader. For individuals who have read Dostoyevsky's *Brothers Karamazov* they may recall a scene similar to this with the chapter entitled *The Inquisitor* where there are multiple layers of consciousness and reality at play both by the individuals in the deeper layer of the story, the main characters in the book, and the audience reading the material. It is not just the layer of the reader and Zechariah, here what is seen is a step deeper where it is a vision within a different state of consciousness than the "awoken world." It is here that the "angel asks Zechariah what he sees, Zechariah responds by describing what he sees, and the Angel identifies what he sees."[117] The third and final level is

[114] Friedman, *The Disappearance of God*, 61-65.
[115] Lena-Sophia Tiemeyer, *Zechariah and his Visions,* (New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015), 45.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.

the world in which the vision takes place. Tiemeyer relates this to a movie playing, and the audience is watching the movie, this is how the third layer of reality is portrayed to the reader.[118] She continues to state that layers/levels two and three are so similar that the angel can move between the two depending on the scenario and how the vision is meant to be seen.[119] Zechariah is working within the parameters of what an angel can do, and isn't breaking any rules per se. He is influenced by the angels in deram passages. This author then takes it one step further to show that mankind is even further removed from God both physically and in a level of reality. These angels of the past are reborn. Instead of the hypostasis of God, a new form emerges. They are entirely separate from God. It did not matter what the ancient interpretation was, the author of Zechariah perceived them as being distinct from Yahweh. No longer appearing in person. Instead he solely utilized dreams as a method of revelation with these *separate* divine figures. This is not unique to Zechariah, actually this is quite a common practice, to see something form the past, and reinterpret it in its more modern context. Frank Cross points this out by how Biblical authors use material from the past and elaborate upon its meaning, in essence creating a new meaning for the passage. This allows one to see the development of the religion as a whole by reading separate periods material. Cross points out that,

"myths of creation and kingship became recrudescent with the introduction of kingship and its ideology, especially in the Solomonic era with the institution of the dynastic temple. The Exile was a second era of the recrudescence of myth in the rise of proto-apoclyptic. In this era, however, notably in the poetry of Second Isaiah (including Isaiah 34, 35) and the Isaianic "apocalypse," the myths were transformed and combined with historical themes in order to

[118] Tiemeyer, *Zechariah and his Visions,* 46.
[119] Tiemeyer shows that the visionary world is a layer that is often forgotten about and rather important for understanding the material presented. To see an in depth analysis of each vision and how Tiemeyer describes each one, see: Tiemeyer, *Zechariah and His Visions,* 45-57.

formulate an eschatology, or a typology of "old things" and "new things" in the drama of salvation."[120]

This information is vital for understanding what Zechariah is doing. He is doing precisely the same thing as Isaiah is with its material. Similarly in hopes for salvation for the community at play, this proto-apocalyptic work is written with a new interpretation of something old. It isn't necessarily the creation-myth that Cross is discussing, but using a previous concept and revitalizing it for the current period and people.

How does 1st Zechariah become influenced by the dream interpretation?

Angels in the early α-period have various functions all seen as the emanation of a God. There are angels portrayed as an interpreter of a vision, as can be seen in Genesis 31 with Jacob having an interpretation of a dream consisting of how Jacob will acquire wealth from Laban. This is also a personal miracle story as well, speaking to the one individual.

While there are angels that appear in dreams in the early segments of the Bible, they take a new role in Zechariah. These angels share similar language leading one to understand that the authors who wrote Zechariah were influenced by these earlier occurences. For example, Genesis 31 has an angel appear to Jacob in a dream. Gen 31:10 Jacob: "lifted my eyes and say in a dream (ואשא עיני וארא בחלום),[121] "and an angel of God spoke to me in a dream (ויאמר אלי מלאך אלוהים בחלום),"[122] 31:12 the angel tells him to "lift up your eyes and see … (שא נא עיניך וראה)," identifies itself as being God (31:13). Then in Gen 31:17 Jacob wakes up/rose up (ויקם). This passage allows the later reader to see the resemblance to that of which is seen in Zechariah as every vision that Zechariah has taken place in a dream. While the dream is not

[120] Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic,* 135-136.
[121] This can be contrasted with the next scene and how Zechariah does not need to lift his eyes to see an angel, Jacob just starts wrestling.
[122] Gen 31:11

directly referenced, each of these pieces can be viewed in the first vision while a similar formula is used: Zechariah states “I saw in the night (Zech 1:8 ראיתי הלילה)”, the angel says “I will show you (Zech 1:9 אראך)”, and Zechariah states “I Lifted my eyes and I saw (Zech 1:18 ואשא את עיני ואראו)” and then an explanation of a vision is taken place by an angel. Both instances a dream takes place, and both use an explanation given by an angel. The above example shows that a relationship between raising ones’ eyes and seeing a vision in a dream can help lead to a possible *Angelus Interprus*.

Even with Zechariah having an *Angelus Interprus,* his overall view of the angel has a slightly different function than what has been shown in the rest of the Bible. These angels are not fighting on behalf of Yahweh or Jerusalem, the angels are not arguing, they are not showing God’s presence, they are not redeeming people, naming people, physically guiding people to and from different locations, giving a sense of hope by their presence, not feeding someone, or predicting births; the primary function is to be an interpreter of a vision in a dream and the mediator between God and man. It is here in Zechariah though, that it becomes evident, that an angel is a separate figure from Yahweh. One may ask how this becomes apparent, the answer rests upon how the angels interact with man and God. But, the author keeps the common element that angels were always seen as a mediator, whether it was God’s manifested presence or that which is perceived here, as a separate being.

Zechariah goes one step further.

Zechariah shows that angels are a part of a hierarchy. Angels are no longer simply a hypostasis of the entity of Yahweh/God. Instead, they are now an entirely separate entity. This is demonstrated through the conversations that take place, mainly in Zechariah 1 and Zechariah 2.

At least two angels are seen conversing in these two chapters: the Angelus Interpus and a second angel that converses with him. This is another essential constituent to point out, nowhere else in the α-period is an angel seen conversing with another angel! Multiple angels do appear in the Bible, as in examples like Genesis 18 where there are three angels, these angels do not talk amongst each other. This example is also a strong piece of evidence to show that in the α-period angels are seen as the a hypostasis of God. In Genesis 18, Yahweh appears in front of Abraham. The audience and reader know that this is Yahweh and debatably two different angels. It was argued in chapter 1 (see pages XX) all three of these men are angels and by extension the embodiment of Yahweh. Abraham and later on Sarah, at first do not know that this is Yahweh, and this can be understood by looking at the Gen 18:2-9. What takes place in this chapter though is a conversation between Yahweh and Abraham about the destruction of a city, Sodom. The conversation becomes a banter between a man and God. Abraham talks to what seems to be all three men in front of him, addressing them as his lord, Yahweh, etc. The Hebrew shows Abraham mixing the singular with plural forms which can lead to the argument that the original author portrayed this as God and two angels, but as Friedman points out, "Abraham can face three angels and address 'my Lord.' And an angel can speak God's words in first person or can speak about God in third person."[123] This is just three hypostases of God. Friedman compares this to listening to an orchestra and hearing an orchestra on an electrical piece of equipment at home hearing all of the orchestra even though the entire orchestra is not housed in that electrical instrument, yet one is still hearing the orchestra. In comparing this story to Zech 2:5-9 while there are multiple angels in Genesis 18, they never turn to each other and speak. In fact, if it were as some have argued two angels and Yahweh, the two angels never address each other nor address Yahweh. Instead, they only speak with Abraham; it is uncertain whether one angel had

[123] Friedman, *Disappearance of God,* 13.

individual comments and others were by a separate angel. Contrasting with Zechariah 2, where there is one angel that speaks with the prophet Zechariah, and that angel speaks to a separate angel. These two angels even have a conversation with each other. In Zech. 2:5-9 one angel instructs another angel into doing something. This is worth pointing out, as it isn't just an acknowledgment that there is another angel. Instead, this shows that they are two separate thinking entities. If God had two or three separate emanations appear at once, why would they need to talk amongst each other? They should theoretically have one shared conscience, but even if they don't, they don't need to convince each other or update one another, because they are the same figure. In contemporary renditions of a hypostasis, it is meant to be comical when one emanation converses with another of the same entity.[124] If this isn't enough evidence that the angels are not the same as Yahweh (as was seen in earlier examples of angels), earlier in Zechariah, the angel that speaks with Zechariah also converses with God as is seen in Zech 1:7-17. God has to reveal the divine knowledge to the angel, who then, in turn, reveals the meaning to Zechariah (the protagonist/prophet). So now the angel is seen as being separate from Yahweh/God, and therefore more likely to be a new divine figure. The angel seeks the knowledge from God and then must pass on what it has learned to Zechariah. This figure and passage show that there is now a hierarchy among the divine and man. The hierarchy now goes God to the angel, angel to man. This hierarchy is seen more clearly by the angel asking Yahweh of Hosts for an answer to a question, [125] one the angel does not know. As can be seen with the example of two angels talking with each other, they do not have the evidence or the answers that

[124] An example of this is in a television show titled *Naruto*. Characters in *Naruto* are capable of making hypostasis or emanations of themselves called 'shadow clones.' There are many instances when multiple 'shadow clones' are made by the main character and they converse with each other, or fight with each other. Every instance it is meant to be comical as they represent and are the same being as the original. It is never seen as serious.

[125] This here could also represent that in this instance the author of Zechariah now perceives this Host as to relate to the angels. While it does not necessarily mean that this phrase used earlier in the Bible meant Yahweh with His host, being the angels, it could be understood that way here in Zechariah. Often the Yahweh of Hosts is paired with an angel right afterwards.

the other seeks, in the same way, the angel is not all-knowing as God is expected to be, and God has to fill in the blanks for the angel. This angel, is clearly not God, which means, the term and divine figure used to identify an angel, no longer has the same exact lexical definition as in the α-books. The argument is not because the author(s) of 1st Zechariah uses angels differently, that everybody who wrote in this period believed the same as he did, instead that at a minimum, one author had a different view of what an angel is.[126] This is profound because this allows the scholar to see a direct shift in the development of the angelic function and ideology; which explains the differences seen in other later related literature. Literature like: Enoch, Jubilees, Luke, Revelation, Jude, Tobit, and most importantly, the last book of the Hebrew Bible: Daniel.

Daniel's Angels:

Instead of comparing literature written during the same period as Daniel (since none of it is in the canonized Biblical literature) for now, using only the Hebrew Bible will suffice to deduce that Gabriel and Michael are angels.[127] This is also fruitful to explain that one doesn't need anything more than the Bible to know who these figures are. Secondly, in response to the rabbit hole of Daniel 7 and the *Son of Man* figure, this essay will not cover this rather controversial figure. This has been the topic of dozens of books, and hundreds of articles. While this is clearly a character on the mind of many, the focus here is to be directed to the named figures Michael and Gabriel. This is the only time named lower divine figures in the Hebrew Bible are referenced; it is imperative to ask whether or not these figures were understood in this

[126] Zechariah likely believed Ezekiel's figure to be an angel, as well as previous Biblical angels that resemble his new definition. It should be noted, that while the authors of Zechariah and Daniel may have believed Ezekiel's figure was an angel, one should not jump to the conclusion that the author of Ezekiel believed this.
[127] The next chapter will elaborate about texts written in the same period as Daniel but not contained in our canon. This chapter's focus is on the Hebrew Bible.

period as being angels and how this development took place. Who are Michael and Gabriel? And if they are angels, why aren't they termed as such?

Angels have been seen disappearing in the Biblical literature, and so it would be a logical question to ask because Gabriel and Michael are not branded as angels in the text, are angels found during the written material that is published during this period? Could the small 40 year period when Zechariah and other literature is written be an outlier in history? There are other texts in this period that don't have angels, and as Friedman also points out these texts contain a distancing factor from God.[128] For example, Ezra and Nehemiah do not have God intervening, instead only referenced.[129] Likely one of the most controversial books of the Bible and its canonicity is Esther because it does not even mention God a single time. This discussion of canonicity can even be reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls as this is the only book of the Bible which no fragment has been found.[130] But, Daniel, a text while younger than Esther, was found in multiple renditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Daniel, on the other hand, mentions God multiple times, between miracles and dream interpretations the book resembles much older literature. Related to this research though the text contains the necessary terminology identifying angels, albeit not in regards to Gabriel and Michael. While Daniel may resemble some older material, it is a product of its period. The context in which these angels appear also helps to show that angels do not have the same identity as that which is found in the oldest sources.

The discussion about how an angel is viewed in the broader middle/later 2nd temple Judaism will be further elaborated in the following chapter. By continuing to read through the Biblical Daniel corpus, one can see that even if the authors who wrote Daniel 8-12 did not write

[128] Friedman, *Disappearance of God,* 61-64.
[129] Friedman, *Disappearance of God,* 56-59.
[130] While Esther is a controversial book in some instances, it is uncertain whether or not the Essene community at Qumran even knew of the book. Only, that we have not uncovered any evidence to support they thought it was influential. On the other hand, at least for the Essene community, Daniel was incredibly important.

down the word for angel, the word is in use during this period. In other words, it would not be something that would surprise a listener/reader for this to sound similar to an angel, as they understood angels were a part of this religious tradition as can be shown in Daniel 3 and 6.

The word for angel occurs twice in the book of Daniel. In both instances, it is not in the apocalyptic portion of this book (from Daniel 7-12) which also happens to be the ***translated**** ***Hebrew***[131] segments of this book. Instead, the word for angel appears twice in Aramaic with both instances occurring within the conflict tales: Daniel 3 and 6. Scholars typically break up the *court tales* (Daniel 1-6) into two different categories of literature: Tales of Contest and the Tales of Conflict.[132] In Daniel, these chapters/short stories are seen as dream interpretation stories that greatly resemble that of the Joseph narrative in Genesis (38-49?). The "Tales of Conflict" instead resemble other literature such as the book of Esther, and Joseph/Potiphar's wife story, it is here in Daniel that we see the only two angels identified in the entire book. The angel with the most detail attributed to it appears in Daniel 3; interestingly this is also the only chapter that has nothing to do with the protagonist in the rest of the book, Daniel. It is focused on three characters and their loyalty to only bow to Yahweh and not **Nebuchadnezzar**.[133] According to Daniel 3,[134] Nebuchadnezzar commissions a golden statue to be built. After the completion of the statue

[131] The Hebrew in the book of Daniel is likely translated from an original Aramaic source. The author or translator's likely native tongue is most likely Aramaic. The overall chapters translated into Hebrew share a striking amount of Aramaisms along with the ability to put back into Aramaic fairly easily (according to the following scholars). Carol Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014) 6-12. Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, AB 23 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), 14-15. Frank Zimmermann, "The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8-12," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, v. 38. 1938. 255-272.
[132] John Collins *The Apocalyptic Vision of Daniel* (Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1977), 33-59 (49-50).
[133] John Collins *Daniel, 1-2 Maccabees: With an Excursus on the Apocalyptic Genre,* (Wilminton, DE: Michael Glazier Inc., 1981), 20-68. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of Daniel* 49-50. Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 12-21.
[134] The dating found here is to mainly show the term angel is being used during this period. The scholars have posited the idea that Daniel 3 is likely to be written in the early second century BCE. The main reason for this is the sfact that the oppressed Jews are being forced to do something under an oppressive government. The Persians were not oppressive, therefore it must be during the Hellenistic periods. Anything earlier the Hebrew would also not work. Hartman narrows it further down to what he believes to be 164 BCE. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of Daniel*, 58-59. Hartman and DiLella *The Book of Daniel*, 9-18 and 160-164. Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 100-102.

people are required to bow down and worship this statue, and if they refuse, they will be thrown into the fiery furnace.[135] Three Jews are known for not following this order: Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. When Nebuchadnezzar approaches them about this subject, and questions them, they explain with how they will not bow and worship the statue and this leads them to be thrown into the furnace. They even set up a challenge for Nebuchadnezzar in claiming that after they get thrown into the furnace, that their God will save them, whereas the false idol would do nothing to harm them. Nebuchadnezzar accepts the challenge heats the furnace hotter than it had ever been heated before and then has the men thrown into the fire. To the King's surprise, He looked into the furnace and saw all three men were fine, even though the people that threw them in were burned to a crisp. The king was in shock. As he looked closer he notices something even more interesting, a fourth figure was walking around casually in the furnace. He asks his fellow comrades, "did we not cast three men[136] into the fire?... I see four men walking in the midst of the fire, and the fourth is *like a son of the gods (*לבר אלהין*).*"[137] It should be noted, as referenced earlier in Chapter 1, that this phrase should not be confused as one that is synonymous with angel. This is **the only case** in the entire Biblical corpus where an angel is used synonymously with the figure in Hebrew מלאך(or here in the Aramaic equivalent מלאכה). It is also referenced not by a Jew, but by the Babylonian king. Take that for what it's worth, but at nothing else, it is safe to say, that it isn't until this period in history that angel/messenger (מלאך) and 'son of the gods' (בני אלוהים or in Aramaic לבר אלהין) can be identified as the theoretically equivalent figures. Now

[135] Angels often occur around fire, and there is plenty that someone could go off and delve into on this subject, but this would once again lead into a rabbit hole that is not the focus of this essay. This could be seen to help tie the figure here with angels in the past. Secondly the same could be same about the furnace and the imagery that this represents for the audience. It could have a relationship to Nebuchadnezzar etc. But not a topic for discussion here. For information concerning of fire with angels and Nebuchadnezzar see: Karin Schopflin, "Fire" *NIDB 2:454.*

[136] **Very important to note, the ARAMAIC IS גבר! This could also show a link to one of the reasons for why Daniel 8 is translated as גבר(man of God) instead of Strength of God in this instance!! Also rather important to note, that the term is much more common in Aramaic.**

[137] Dan 3:24-25

angels at least have one more new term that can be used to identify them. This shows a link to Newsom's definition, but do not confuse this with applying to every instance or for that matter any other instance before this period in which an angel is a 'son of the gods.'[138] It is unknown what the angel does in this story, in fact, the Jews do not even discuss the angel. The only account we have of the angel's existence is solely from Nebuchadnezzar point of view and how the author portrays Nebuchadnezzar's interpretation of the circumstance. After he sees the fourth man-like figure, he calls the three Jews out of the furnace and states, "Blessed be the God of Shadrach Meshach and Abednego, who has sent his angel[139] and delivered his servants, who trusted in him, and set at nought the king's command and yielded up their bodies rather than serve and worship any god except their own God." This angel according to Nebuchadnezzar delivered the servants, but the manner in which this is done is unknown, and the audience does not even know if Shadrach Meshach and Abednego saw the angel or was aware of its existence within the furnace. The audience is only given Nebuchadnezzar's view, and the protagonists don't even acknowledge it. What is known, is that the author of this passage included the terminology for an angel, and uses a new phrase to reference an angel. Finally, it would not be unlikely that any other author writing in the 300s BCE would have had a similar yet slightly different view of an angel in their heads.

The last direct reference to an angel found in the Bible occurs in Daniel 6. Many scholars even believe that this passage, because of its similarity to that of Daniel 3, was written with Daniel 3 in mind. An angel appears here once again; it is the story of Daniel being cast into the '*Lion's Den*.' The story does not contribute much to the angelic dialog. Daniel, like Shadrach

[138] On the contrary, something that can be deduced, is the statement that once this term becomes applied and becomes more inclusive, it is not a stretch that later people would also read earlier versions of this term to be equivalent to that in which this author portrays it. Now, anybody later will be liable to read earlier passages in the eyes that any time "sons of God" are mentioned, it could and possibly is an angel.
[139] This could be argued as being seen as Friedman's hypostasis.

Meshach and Abednego, refuses an order cast from the king of the time (in this case Darius *the Mede*).[140] Daniel, like his friends, was thrown into an impossible survival situation, being thrown into a den of hungry lions, but here Daniel states the angel of God saved him.

Friedman's argument is very powerful for this reason. Even in both of the scenarios in Daniel, it could be argued as the hypostasis of God. Therefore, in every instance in which an **angel** occurs in the Bible; it could be confused with God himself because it is God himself in his *hypostasis*-state. So technically speaking, Friedman isn't wrong if only using the Bible. Instead, as mentioned thus far, it is more likely that the evidence leads to these angels as being a likely separate figure from Yahweh, because of how Zechariah uses his angels in his prophecies along with the last bit of the argument which connects Gabriel and Michael. This makes more sense when looking at it in its Biblical Period, the oldest sources make the most sense with the hypostasis argument. Whereas the youngest sources show more evidence of being separate from Yahweh. This is the problem with misidentifying the understanding of the term and concept: angel.

Daniel 8-12 and the figures: Gabriel and Michael

If angels are a hypostasis of God, then who are Gabriel and Michael? As conveyed earlier, Zechariah opened the doors for a new expression of angelic involvement. Zechariah uses the only term (in his period and earlier) for angel, but he shows what seems to be a new perspective of what he understands an angel to be. While the earlier chapters of Daniel resemble their ancient counterpart, it also unlocks new terminology that can be applied to angels. This is shown both by the new synonym (בני אלוהיםor in Aramaic לבר אלהין) and as a result of the work being compiled

[140] Possibly also worth mentioning, as this seems to support a later dating then when the story takes place. The discussion about Darius being a Mede (who are the Medes?) versus a Persian.

in Aramaic, allowing for another term for man be applied to both men and a possible link to angels (גבר). Nowhere in Aramaic does the word איש appear. While the word אדם is used, it is not as common as גבר.[141] Daniel 3 allowed a more inclusive understanding of the figure (not the term). By continuing to only look at the Bible, it will now become more evident that angels encompass more than just the previous definition. Add this to the named divine figures in *Daniel* and it gives the scholar a clue into how the perspective of an angel developed historically in the Bible. If angels have names it is an important point. A name implies an identity, and a separate name implies separate identities. With separate names it will distance the angels further from God and by extension distance God further from man. Scholars should not nonchalantly identify Michael and Gabriel as angels;[142] they need to have evidence to support the notion that these authors who wrote the names believed them to be an angel. Remember, no angel beforehand had a name, so why should they now? The first step to approach this is to explore *Daniel's* understanding of what its authors believed these named figures to be.

In the later traditions of Judaism, Christianity and even Islam, Michael and Gabriel are well-known angels.[143] In the Hebrew Bible these names only appear in Daniel, more specifically only in the apocalyptic half of the book: Daniel 8-12. There is more evidence to support that Gabriel is an angel than Michael. Therefore this is where the focus of the argument will be. By concluding that Gabriel is an angel, then the idea that Michael is also an angel would not be a stretch. By only using the Bible, more evidence is necessary to conclude Michael's angelhood, but this will be continued in the following chapter with sources not included within the Biblical corpus.

---

[141] There will be an interesting parallel between גבר and אדם in Daniel.
[142] Newsom, "Angel" *ABD*, 252-253.
[143] Gabriel: Luke 1:11-38 Quran 96. Michael: Jude 1:9 Rev 12:7-9. All four of the archangels: Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael are all mentioned in the Jewish Midrash Bemidbar Rabbah 2:10. They are also referenced in the Jewish texts mentioned in chapter 3.

Daniel shares two languages in its canonical form: Aramaic (Dan 2:3-7) and Hebrew (Dan 1:1-2:2; 8-12). The book of Daniel returns to using the Hebrew language starting in Daniel 8, where the first occurrence of Gabriel appears. The first question that arises in any scholars' head when reading Daniel in the original languages is, "Why is Daniel written in two separate languages: Aramaic and Hebrew?" Scholars have been debating this for quite some time. The consensus leads to an understanding that the book of Daniel is a collection of many stories that likely were written in the same community over a brief span of time.[144] The same author did not necessarily write the entire book, but it is probable that each passage/chapter was originally written in Aramaic, and not in Hebrew.[145] The original editor/author/translator's intentions for translating certain passages into Hebrew are still unknown. Too much speculation goes into these arguments. The language factor is interesting for a number of reasons including, why is this particular chapter chosen as being the first/next portion in Hebrew, why is it in Hebrew at all (especially since the Hebrew provided is not great Hebrew) and not Aramaic, why translate only some of the book and not have the entire work translated into Hebrew? The list can go on, but it is not entirely relevant to understanding the angelology of the book. To understand Gabriel's role, one must be aware that while this passage remains in our Bibles in Hebrew, it has Aramaic undertones. Some of the vocabulary that is used works better with the Aramaic portions to help understand the translation and use of cognates within the language. Fortunately, for the sake of this paper 2:3-7:28 is in the original language Aramaic, and this allows for the scholar to reference the lexicon used in this period and community. This will explain how this author understood Gabriel, why his name is what it is, and as to how the figure is meant to be viewed.

[144] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 9-18.
[145] See Note 131.

In Gabriel's first appearance, Daniel is seen as having a vision. Keep in mind, Daniel in the preceding stories is seen as a character of immeasurable faith; and seemingly as the smartest person on the planet at the time, especially when it comes to dream interpretations. Daniel 8 though, paints a different picture. Daniel is given a vision that has very odd imagery, that many people in the past had difficulty understanding. Today, as it falls into the category of apocalyptic literature, most people assume that it is discussing the empire in which it is written, mocking it, with a sense of hope to the community that they will soon be saved.[146] These visions resemble 1st Zechariah; there are horned animals (here goats) that represent kingdoms and power, etc. All of a sudden in verse 13,[147] Daniel hears *a holy one speaking, and it was speaking with another holy one* (אחד-קדוש). Once again, recalling imagery used by the author of Zechariah 1, Zechariah's holy ones are angels.[148] In Daniel 8, one of the "holy ones' asks a question to the other, "for how long is the vision." The second "holy one" responds, "2300 evenings and mornings."[149] Daniel had no idea what this meant and wished to understand the vision. Once again, strikingly similar to Zechariah, as one looking like a man appears in front of him to elaborate about a vision. In Daniel's version, one of the *holy ones* tells this man to explain the vision to Daniel, the holy one's name: Gabriel.

Comparisons and summary: These similarities already have significance. So far both Zechariah and Daniel are in a dream/vision state described as in the night, by looking up etc.

---

[146] To know and learn more about Apocalyptic Literature see: John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 1-42. Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979), 402-413.

[147] Hartwell in his commentary does believe this to be actually an addition in the story, and his reasoning falls under the guise of Daniel 9 was introducing a character. This still doesn't change the argument nor exaplain why Gabriel is supposed to be significant. But, I find that as the redactor fetish that many people fall into when trying to parse authors out of the Bible. The narrative does not break up at all when reading this passage with or without verse 13, and so, the necessity for the redactor to add this seems unlikely. Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 230-232 and 246-249.

[148] One should also be aware that this implies in the same way as Zechariah that there are more than one, and therefore separate from each other and by extension they will also be separate from God.

[149] Dan 8:14

(**Zech** 1:8; 2:1, 5; 4:1; 5:1, 5; 6:1; **Dan** 8:2-3, 15, 18; 10:5, 7-9, 16). Neither can interpret the dreams' mysterious meaning alone (**Zech** 1:9, **Dan** 8:13-17; 9:22-23, 25 10:12; 11:2), and neither in the end can understand it (**Zech** 4:13-14, **Dan** 8:27). Both divine figures are referenced as to resemble a man (**Zech** 1:8, 10; 2:5, **Dan** 8:15; 9:21; 10:5, 16, 18) and called a holy one. There is more than one "holy one" character at play (Zechariah's angels: **Zech** 1:10-11; 2:2; 3:6; 4:1; 5:5; 6:4; **Dan** 8:13-17; 10:13, 20-21) and in each instance, one is instructed to explain the meaning to the protagonist (**Zech** 2:2-4, 8-9; **Dan** 8:16; 9:22). There is a time period included to explain on the previous prophecy to elaborate on its meaning, that only the divine figure can interpret the meaning (**Zech** 2:8-9; 4:13-14, **Dan** 9:22). These holy ones are conversing with each other and do not share the same knowledge as they are asking questions to each other (**Zech** 2:5-9, **Dan** 8:13-15). This is important because it once again explains that if these are angels, then the γ-time period has a different understanding of the angel than the earlier α-period. Since, these "holy ones" very closely resemble the figures in Zechariah, and those figures in Zechariah are identified as being angels, it would seem logical to identify these figures as being angels as well. Hartman disagrees. Hartman believes these figures are originally meant to be seen as *pious Jews*.[150] He bases this off of the understanding of the *people of the Holy Ones of the Most High* in Dan 7:18, 27 as being Jews. Hartman goes on to state that the item which the *holy ones* wish for Daniel to understand has nothing to do with the vision with the preceding 12 verses.[151] He believes that verse 13 is an insertion, and that is one reason they become identified as being angels in this verse. He also believes that the verse containing Gabriel is an insertion to flow well with Daniel 9.[152] The question that one should ask themselves is "does this change who Gabriel is?" Whether or not Gabriel and verse 13 was added later and not a part of the original might not

[150] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel,* 225-226.
[151] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel,* 230.
[152] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel,* 245-246, 249.

affect the perception of how the community would have perceived Gabriel. Instead, while it is doubtful that these figures were originally meant to be seen as *pious Jews* as Hartman proposes, from his perspective, the later (only briefly later) editor added this in with an expectation that nobody is to be confused. So whether or not it was the original author's intention, people would still have come to this conclusion after the redaction. Remember the question is what the author, who wrote down the name, believed it to represent. He draws a natural tie to Zechariah, one that is not subtle as is shown. Instead it is quite evident. Hartman though is also wrong in the sense with his analysis of these figures representing *pious Jews*. Because it makes no sense. As mentioned earlier, Daniel is portrayed as having divine insight when it comes to interpreting dreams. Why would unknown Jews be better at dissecting a vision than Daniel, the most famous and most intelligent man in the area, of which dream interpretation is his specialty? Is he also not considered to be one of the pious Jews that Hartman references? The author gains absolutely nothing from this and only sets up for a weaker version of the story if Hartman is correct. The resemblance to the angels in Zechariah along with identifying them as *holy ones* allows for the audience to give Daniel a pass. It is okay that Daniel couldn't understand, why? It takes someone even more knowledgeable than he to understand this encrypted message. Other than God the only other beings that would be capable of doing so are angels. How do we know this? Refer back to Zechariah. It seems likely that Hartman may be correct with the tie to Daniel 9, and naming the angel Gabriel, but as already elaborated it does not discredit that this figure is an angel. At least what can and should be understood, is that these *holy ones* are for all purposes meant to be seen as angels, and not pious Jews. This also means, that if verse 15, and by extension the name Gabriel, is inserted by the author of the following chapter, then it reveals that the following author had the understanding that this should be seen as a being he would later

identify in his chapter as Gabriel. Not a previously mysterious figure named Gabriel. This name would have no authority. We can still assume that these figures here speaking are angels. If it connects smoothly to Daniel 9, then Gabriel was a name given to an angel during the period in which it was written, which means angels can and do have names.

The Gabriel-figure in Daniel 9 contains more evidence to support that this is an angel that resembles the angels in Zechariah. Daniel is seen praying to Yahweh, and a *manlike* figure 'flying like a bird'[153] appears, here identified as "Gabriel, whom I had seen before." As Hartman points out, this shows a direct connection to the figure that was in Chapter 8, therefore showing some evidence this figure's name may have been added.[154] Also important to note, this is the first time a possible angel-like figure is portrayed as flying like a bird.[155] This gives yet again another clue, the people in this period already started drawing connections that angels could share characteristics of other divine figures like cherubim and seraphim. This manlike figure was sent to give Daniel a prophecy and help him understand its meaning.

As it could be argued that the terminology in Daniel is not the same words as used in Zechariah, this should be elaborated so as not to leave open loop holes. Often in the Bible, when a prophet or writer of the Bible wishes to recall or gather authority from the text, they might directly quote the text. In Daniel's case, the same words are not shared in Daniel and in Zechariah. This may cause some to question and put into doubt whether these are angels. The first logical question is: Why is the word for angel consciously avoided? If the author meant for the audience to see this as an angel, like in Zechariah, he could have very easily just written the

[153] Many have noted that this also shows that this was meant to be seen as an angel. Angels never before had wings or are compared to birds, but instead other divine figures are seen this way. Cherubs come to mind. The statement 'flying like a bird' is interesting because once again, we are seeing a new perspective of how an angel is portrayed to the community. For more information see: Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 243, 249.
[154] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel,* 230-231.
[155] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel,* 243, 249.

word angel, and here he doesn't. C*learly he doesn't mean it is an angel right?* By consciously avoiding a word like angel, it could tell scholars about the theology of the period as what is seen in the β-period. Here in Daniel though it does not represent the same as the meaning in the previous β-period, instead this is answered by the genre of literature it is written within and less to do with theology. Apocalyptic Literature, in general, is intentionally vague.[156] Who is to say that by mentioning Gabriel's name would not allow for the *in crowd* to know who the figure is? The name Gabriel is nowhere else used in the Bible, and so this does not provide authority to the character at hand by mentioning its name. By stating the name, it must have some form of authority to the people at hand for whom the text is written.[157] Anybody who has researched any apocalyptic literature, immediately knows that this genre of literature is written in a cryptic language on purpose. It is not meant to spell things out in a visible manner.[158] Apocalyptic literature most believe is an attack on the oppressive government of the period.[159] Symbols, analogies, and metaphors, taking place in the past are all elements that traditionally are applied to this genre. It is also very common for angels to appear in the literature often seen as a hero and a guide.[160] Indirect references are an important tool in Apocalyptic Literature. By merely mentioning the names of the figures, it is enough for the audience to know who they are and what they represent. When attacking and disrespecting the government, it would be logical for the more cryptic, the better. By following Zechariah's lead in how he uses angels, the term *holy ones* is enough, or the title Gabriel could also be sufficient. This book already has shown other terms can now be applied to angels that were previously not used. When someone says Moses'

[156] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination,*,5-9.
[157] This will be elaborated in the next chapter when discussing the names of Gabriel and Michael in the communities that write in the same period which Daniel is written.
[158] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination,* 9-19.
[159] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination,* 37-42.
[160] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination,* 5-9.

name in the Bible, there is no confusion as to who that person is, the inside community knows, even if a Babylonian might not, the Jew would. In the period in which Daniel 8 and 9 are written Gabriel must have some weight in its name much like Moses. When hearing the name people know who is referenced.[161]

In addition to this, some of the terminologies like the word for man is different. Why would this author choose the word (גבר) instead of the more common words, resembling what is seen in Zechariah? It might be expected that if he is referencing Zechariah, the terminology may be quoted, or at least use the same words. Instead, only look at how these words are used, and in translation, it still has the same meaning. These terms are within the same lexical range, and they bring with it the same idea. One could just state that the author intended to have an etiology for the term Gabriel (instead of portraying *strength of God*, it meant *man of God*).[162] It is rather plausible, that this is the author's understanding of the name, versus the more common Hebrew understanding "strength of God." Hebrew is not his native language, and therefore the more common 'man' versus 'strength' is likely to make more sense to him and the audience. That alone is a good enough reason, but let us not forget that our author's native language was not likely to be Hebrew, and instead was more likely to be Aramaic. This is significant as quoting another document naturally can get skewed between two languages.[163] In the two scenarios, whether the author wrote it in Hebrew (and his native tongue was Aramaic) or he translated it into Hebrew from Aramaic the conclusion is the same. גברis a cognate and more common in

[161] This is only speculation, but can be supported later by reading the final chapter.
[162] A very common and understandable conclusion, Scholars like: Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 227, 249. Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 268-270.
[163] Now remember this is likely a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic. And while, one might expect אדם or איש to be the word used for man, the author very well could be translating (or be thinking) about גבר being the word that would have made the most sense here. גברallows for an etymological definition for Gabriel, and it also is the same word used in Daniel 3 to describe this angel. When Nebuchadnezzar mentions 4 men. At least in this passage, gaber is more common than the other two terms.

Aramaic. The book of Daniel, as already earlier pointed out, shows that this cognate is used for man in Aramaic, and it is certainly the more common word. When looking back to Daniel 3, *written in Aramaic*, Nebuchadnezzar refers to the angel as looking like a man. He calls the four men who were cast into the fire, גברין(an Aramaic plural form of גבר). This could imply that גברין might have been the more common word in Aramaic, whereas it also works in Hebrew, while Hebrew's more common term is איש , אישis not an Aramaic word, and אדם will be used comparatively in Daniel. While he apparently could write in Hebrew, and therefore read it, it is more likely his thought for man was the cognate he used גבר, made even more plausible when including the earlier point, the angel's name is Gabriel.[164] Also, what follows in verse 17, when the angel is speaking to Daniel, he calls him a son of man **ADAM** (אדם). This shows there is a difference between these figures, one comes from Adam [aka humanity], and the other does not. Therefore simply by looking at the various words for *man*, it become less likely for the author of Daniel to directly quote Zechariah. To go even further, nobody knows exactly what version of Zechariah this author was reading. Was he reading the original Hebrew, or could it have been a translation into Aramaic he was referencing? This translation into Aramaic might contain גבר who knows? This is not to say scholars should jump to the conclusion and state that apparently he was reading an Aramaic version of the text, but merely propose scholars should not jump to the conclusion that it was not referencing Zechariah as the same exact words are not used. Each of these examples are completely viable options which should be seriously considered.

Michael?

If Gabriel is an angel, then it would not be far-fetched to state that Michael is as well. Both figures use similar terminology: A man in a vision (Gabriel – Dan 8:13-15; 9:21. Michael –

[164] Anybody who speaks a foreign language, knows that you are more likely to say the word that comes to mind that has the meaning you wish to get across, maybe not necessarily the most exact term that a local might use.

Dan 10:2-9) Greatly beloved (Gabriel – Dan 9:23 and Michael – Dan 10:11, 18). The figure Michael in Daniel 10-12 has much in common with other previously debated passages of angels, like in Josh 1:1-5. Michael is called the Prince of Israel and is seen as a figure that protects Israel in the heavenly realm. He battles with other figures like himself, which implies that these figures are no longer simply hypostases of God, and instead the representative of their nation in the heavenly realm. For now, at minimum Michael is a divine figure, possibly something else that shares characteristics with the new Biblical angel. While it may not be what a Jew would call a god, it resembles what other communities call gods and what a later Jewish community would certainly identify as an angel. This can be seen with its relationship to other passages like Deut 32, and Psalm 29, 82 among others. Instead of the religion having other gods, containing a lower divine status may have been the alternative and conclusion by these people. If they are angels, then we see once again angelic figures for other nations, like the Prince of Greece, and Prince of Persia. None of these are likely literal men, but instead more of a divine-like figure fighting in the cosmos representing their attributed nation/land.

Conclusion:

The question was not answered as to "how one gets from a specific divine figure that is called an angel to practically every divine figure that is in the heavenly court identified as being an angel in later traditions?" This is a fascinating and fruitful question that is sure to lead to exciting conclusions. I hope that other scholars, or maybe even myself might seek the answer to this issue. For now, at least the mysteries wrapped around how the lexical range of the term angel is expanded in the later 5th century BCE, explains as to whom the mysterious figures Gabriel and Michael were. Angels no longer represent emanations of Yahweh, and thanks to the

conscious decision to ignore the term angel, it gives rise to a new interpretation of both the word and concept by Zechariah's time. Even if they are not directly identified as an angel, the Bible provides enough evidence to support the authors who contributed to Daniel would have intended these figures to have been angels. The audience who would have read or heard their work would have logically deduced the same conclusion. It would not have been a mystery for them, as it is for a later audience such as ourselves. The next piece of evidence to support this conclusion derives in looking at how the surrounding literature written in the same community represents these figures. This will be tackled next to allow the conclusion to be even stronger. Michael and Gabriel were meant to be seen as angels and separate from Yahweh, and it is only because we are capable of looking at these figures in their period, that we can reach this conclusion and by extension see a development of angelology.

CHAPTER 3

GABRIEL AND MICHAEL PART 2 – THE OUTSIDE SOURCES

In Daniel 8-12, there are two named unknown figures: Gabriel and Michael. Nowhere in the Hebrew Bible are these two beings identified as angels, yet scholars consistently consider them as such.[165] Since both figures are only found in the book of Daniel, and it is the latest book in the Hebrew Bible, one should not immediately jump to the conclusion that these two *man-like* figures are angels. This instinct is not necessarily wrong, because later canonical religious texts in all three of the Abrahamic faiths refer to these beings and understand them to be angels. However if one were living in the 160s B.C.E. when the book of Daniel was most likely written, would the authors and readers have the same immediate conclusion? If they did, then what does this mean for the stage of the religion, at this point, when the book is written? The previous chapter analyzed how using solely the Hebrew Bible, one may be able to see these named figures in Daniel as angels. But, no other Biblical book was written late enough to verify the thoughts of this period. To answer these questions more accurately, one has to examine other works written around the same period in history, even if they are not canonical, to see if this conclusion is possible. The two books that lead most clearly to the answer are: Tobit and 1 Enoch. Both of

[165] Newsom, "Angels" *ABD*, 251-253. Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 227, 231, 245-246, 249, 264-265, 273, 275-315.

these texts are written in roughly the same period, and both discuss named celestial figures. Looking at what these texts say about *named celestial figure*s will explain who and what the reader is expected to know about the *named figures* in Daniel. One must be aware of the texts and the ideas that predated this work so as to understand why the book is seemingly unclear about who these named figures are, and if they are meant to be seen as angels in Daniel.

Why do we need to question who these figures are?

Michael and Gabriel are not called angels in Daniel, and so scholars should not immediately assume that they are angels, unless they have reasonable proof that the community that produced the book of Daniel knew without a doubt who these figures are and that they are angels. Because Daniel 8-12 lacks the word angel scholars have based their conclusions solely off of later sources, all of which support this idea. This leads to uncertainty as to when the concept was adopted that angels had names and we knew what they were, implying Daniel might have a different idea of who Michael and Gabriel are. Were they angels? Daniel alone does not provide enough evidence to support this answer for the reader to know for certain, especially if the only work used is the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, it is foolish for a scholar to make that claim without anybody ever arguing for it. Only by questioning what the author of Daniel assumed his audience knew, will we begin to understand more precisely what he meant and what would be necessary for him to write in the book.

Authorship and its significance.

Scholars who research the book of Daniel have a general consensus that chapters 8-12 were written around the time of the Maccabean revolt.[166] Carol Newsom states that these chapters were likely written after Dec. 167 B.C.E. and before the end of 164 B.C.E., because it directly references events taking place during this period.[167] While the dates and the time period are not as highly debated, authorship is. Nobody really knows if these five chapters were written by one individual; or if one person wrote these apocalypses and almost immediately afterwards two or three people added to it;[168] or finally if there were initially two or three separate authors.[169] The scope of this paper is not to argue for or against multiple authors because as Newsom explains "there is insufficient evidence to make a conclusive judgement,"[170] instead authorship must be addressed so as to explore what the reader would have been expected to know during these years - whether or not the reader would have known who these *named figures* were.

Multiple Authors

If Daniel 8-12 were written by multiple authors or even originally written by one author and had material added to it by two or three people. The conclusion is the same, Gabriel and Michael have no introduction, and give the reader no reason to accept either figure as an authority, at least in the Bible. (In response to Gabriel, the audience is only given two pieces of information, one is his name, the second is that he is *a holy one* (Dan 8:13) in the likeness of a man (Dan 8:15). Louis Hartman takes the position in Daniel 8 to assume that *holy one* meant

[166] To understand the position of dating a text see the previous chapter and the discussion that is used for why it is not a hard science.
[167] Newsom, *Daniel: A Commentary,* 11.
[168] Ibid
[169] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 9-18, 29-42. His parsing of what he thinks the different authors is based upon terminology used differently in the different apocalypses, and also fluidity of the story.
[170] Newom, *Daniel: A Commentary,* 12.

simply a *pious Jew*, in other words just a man.[171] This figure identified as Gabriel is seen as interpreting a dream in Daniel 8, and the reason he should not be understood as being a pious Jewish man, is the fact that he can interpret a dream that the master dream interpreter cannot even interpret. Even by the end of the story, Daniel is still incapable of understanding the dream. Who is this mysterious figure that is more capable than Daniel? His name is Gabriel, and the audience is expected to assume that this is not surprising, a man named Gabriel is better at dream interpretation than the man who has been seen interpreting dreams throughout the rest of the book. The name is the only piece of evidence that identifies this character to the community, and clearly he is more capable than Daniel (the most capable man seen at this point). Somehow, the name Gabriel must carry weight. The only definitive thing given, is the name Gabriel in Daniel 8 and 9. This name must have represented a being more powerful than Daniel, and that being is an angel. If this were possibly edited by multiple people or had multiple contributors, the confusion would have been less likely to have stuck around. Hartman assumes that multiple authors are evident because of a seemingly break in flow from the story in Daniel 8.[172] Hartman assumes that the verses containing the title Gabriel were an addition to the original.[173] If this was the case, why not add the simple word for angel (**מלאך** or messenger) especially if you are going to make this character a key character in the story? Unless Gabriel is already a known figure, the reader will only become more confused by the name. This would be an unnecessary bit of confusion that doesn't add to the work. If Hartman was correct, by leaving the word angel out, it would imply that the people reading this would know who Gabriel was. The same argument would be applied if there are two separate authors writing separate texts and an editor combines the two. If

[171] Hartman, *The Book of Daniel*, 230.
[172] Obviously there is much more evidence, but the flow is important specifically for this argument.
[173] "…was an addition to the original," In Daniel 8 it seems to flow a little better without verse 15, but when verse 15 is added it then adds to a connection with the following chapter, which Hartman believes was the main author of chapter 9. Verse 15 in 8 implies an addition.

this were the case, the editor clearly has no problem meddling with the original meaning, and therefore if there would have been any confusion for the audience by combining two separate accounts, the editor would have cleared up the confusion with a simple word. By simply just looking at Gabriel in Daniel 8 and 9 the evidence is clear that the reader was expected to know who Gabriel was. If multiple authors contributed to Daniel 8-12, then leaving out the word angel is perfectly acceptable, because the audience here would have known who these figures were with just using the name of the figure. They must be getting this information from other sources.

One Author:

The argument is similar but a little different if it were written by only one author. Because both figures are introduced with only a brief description of their appearance and how Daniel reacts when seeing them, there suggest some other questions for a singular author. After Daniel's reaction is described, the name is then revealed to Daniel, in neither case by the particular being, but instead by another separate (*holy one*) figure. Once again one only needs to look at the example with Gabriel. Daniel overhears one of the "holy ones" (**אחד-קדוש**) calling the name of Gabriel, and then Gabriel is instructed to reveal the apocalypse's meaning to Daniel. This mimics Daniel ability to explain meanings of visions to figures who don't understand.[174] Daniel is just a man, and there is nothing to imply that another man couldn't also reveal visions to Daniel. Daniel's case is no different than the others who needed their visions explained, so why would he need an angel? While this revelation and explanation of visions can easily relate to how angels act in the book of Zechariah,[175] it could also be Daniel is just having another possible pious Jew (who just so happened to be called Gabriel) reveal this vision to him. In Zechariah, the

[174] This is his job, dream interpretation. He is identified as being the best, where no dream could not be understood by him in Dan 1:17. He interprets dreams nobody else can n Daniel 2, 4, and 5. Daniel is meant to be the one who can interpret all dreams. These are the reasons why it mimics the abilities of Daniel.
[175] **Zech** 1:9-19; 2:3; 3:1-6; 4:1-5; 5:5, 10; 6:4-5.

narrator tells the reader that this is an angel explaining the vision, the angel never calls itself an angel, and in fact, no angel in the Hebrew Bible ever once calls itself an angel; but then again, no angel in the Hebrew Bible has a name either. The complication grows when one adds the fact that this vision Daniel saw was just in a dream. While angels do appear in dreams, and this seems like an angel, there is nothing specifically stating that it isn't just a man in his dream. The book of Daniel has no such claim that this being is an angel, and consequently it would be necessary for the reader to be told this is an angel or even more confusion would arise. Therefore, with that evidence, it is doubtful that this being is an angel. If it were meant to be seen as an angel, then the reader would have to be already aware of the name Gabriel -which seems to be the implication by the author or why else provide a name? Once again the book of Daniel is not sufficient enough evidence to assume that Gabriel is an angel, without an external reason.

In either scenario, with sole authorship or multiple authors, the author(s) assume that the reader will know that Gabriel and Michael are angels. These names are already known, and carry authority with them, and so the community must have other clues as to whom these names belong. These other clues come from content, other texts written during the period, and also the genre. These leave the reader in the know.

Tobit: Tobit and Raphael

While Daniel may be the only text within the Hebrew Bible that contains a *named figure/Celestial Being*, there is another book that is canonical for some communities. This text is a part of the Septuagint and was also written around the same period as Daniel. The book's name is *Tobit*. Scholars date this text between 225-170 B.C.E.[176] With these dates; it is of course

[176] Robert J. Littman, *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008), XIX-XXIV. J. Fitzmyer *Tobit: Discoveries in the Judean Desert 19,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995), 51. David deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*, (Grand

slightly earlier than Daniel. While it may or may not have influenced Daniel, it can help shed light on some *named figures* during the Second Temple Period that the community would have immediately recognized. Even though the figure here in *Tobit* is Raphael, not one of the two in Daniel, it allows one see that by the time of Daniel that some figures were recognized, and it would not be a stretch for Michael and Gabriel to be known as well. Dating Tobit is difficult for a number of reasons, one of which is it does not discuss events in its period.[177] Tobit is unaware of the Hellenizing of Judea and issues that are taking place during the Maccabean revolt which was taking place during the 160s B.C.E., and there is no evidence that it was written before 400 B.C.E. where the author is reflecting the "same ethos as in Ben Sira and Judith with regard to dietary laws, burial of the dead, endogamy, and piety."[178] There were fragments discovered at Qumran, which at least supports that parts of the book were written before the fall of the Second Temple.[179]

Tobit is a story about a man named Tobias (the son of Tobit), who with the help of an angel named Raphael,[180] heals his father's blindness. Raphael also helps Tobias successfully marry a woman (Sarah) who was married multiple times before, and yet because of an evil demon named Asmodeus she was unable to consummate her marriages, as this demon would slay each man on their wedding night. Both Tobit (Tobias' blind father) and Sarah prayed to God for help, and their prayers were answered when "Raphael was sent to heal the two of them" (Tob 3:17a). According to the story, Raphael is sent to Tobit's community to help Tobias on a journey to Media. Raphael (called an angel) appears as a man and Tobias never once questions that this is

---

Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 68-69. Bruce Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*, (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1957), 30.

[177] deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 69.

[178] Ibid.

[179] There is evidence for the word Raphael appearing at Qumran (our oldest sections of *Tobit*). The word angel is also found in one of the scrolls as well. Raphael (4Q197.04.1.15, 4Q197.04.2.07, 4Q197.04.2.19). Angel only partially legible (4Q197.04.05)

[180] Called Raphael dozens of times by the narrator.

just a man who knows the way to Media. Raphael gives a name, Azarias,[181] to Tobit when he asked who Raphael was. From then on, Raphael portrays himself as a mere man. During the journey to Media, Tobias and Raphael end up acquiring some odd ingredients. Tobias remained clueless as to the purpose for which they hold on to these materials. Raphael secretly was planning to use the ingredients to both heal Tobit's blindness and save Sarah from the demon (Tobit 8). Tobias becomes amazed when he sees these medicinal remedies work. Once his father's eyes were healed, Tobias begged his father to pay Raphael for his time and fulfillment of his promises. It is at this point that Raphael reveals his true identity to Tobias. While this never happens in the Bible, there are places where a figure's divinity is not in question. Raphael tells Tobias, "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels[182] who present the prayers of the saints and enter into the presence of the glory of the Holy Ones. (12:11-16)." This verse is crucial because it explains much of the communities accepted understanding of angels and of angelology in this time period. Now it is certain; there ***are*** named angels because the character is calling himself an angel and the angel also states that there is not only just one but *seven holy angels*. So then, who are these other seven holy angels, and are Michael and Gabriel included in this number? Neither Michael nor Gabriel seem to have a similar story to Raphael in Tobit, and so this immediate conclusion would be unfair. Finally, because Michael and Gabriel never call themselves an angel in the texts so far, there is still some uncertainty as to whether they should be included in this number.

1 Enoch and Daniel

Raphael, in the book of Tobit, identifies himself as one of the seven holy angels when this is stated it implies that people already knew who Raphael was and it is reasonable to assume

[181] – RSV's translation and it also states this means *God helps*. A clear pun off of the name Raphael (God heals)
[182] The Greek confirms the term angel (aggelos).

that they would also know who the other 6 were. Because the Bible never mentions a single named holy angel, where would the community who would have read Tobit have gotten that information? 1 Enoch gives scholars the desired answer.

Enoch has a rather important issue regarding language that should be addressed before going any further. The word used here for angel, is not the word typically used for angel in the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew Bible, written mainly in Hebrew and the notable examples in Aramaic including Daniel 2:3 to chapter 7, most often uses the word **מלאך** (literal meaning *messenger* with the Aramaic source in the Bible stating מלאכה) when referencing an angel. With Enoch, it is worth noting that the word **מלאך** is not found to reference these *named figures*. Enoch's original language, much like Daniel, would have likely been in Aramaic, and the oldest fragments we have of Enoch are in Aramaic. These old fragments while few in number line up almost identically to the more complete and later Ethiopic translation of Enoch, leading scholars to trust the validity of the Ethiopic translation. The word here that is used in the Qumran fragments is **עיר** where the meaning can be: wake, waking, and most commonly a *Watcher*. When the word **עיר** gets translated into the Greek, the word is the same as in the Hebrew, άγγεδος (Angelos, also simply meaning messenger).[183] These Watchers are angels.[184]

George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam, two very prominent scholars of Second Temple Judaism state, "1 Enoch is a collection of apocalyptic (revelatory) texts that were composed between the late fourth century B.C.E. and the turn of the era."[185] This book can be broken up into five segments, and the two earliest layers. Nickelsburg and VanderKam propose that the earliest section of 1 Enoch is the *Book of Luminaries* (chapters 72-82) dated during the

[183] George Nicklesburg and James VanderKam *1 Enoch: A Hermeneia Translation* vol.1 (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2012), 36n.
[184] The Ethiopic word used is *mal'ak.*
[185] VanderKam and Nicklesburg, *1 Enoch,* vii.

3rd century B.C.E. and possibly even a little earlier; and the *Book of Watchers* (chapters 1-36) is written right afterwards with its final form finished at the end of the 3rd Century B.C.E. It is proposed that the *Book of Watchers* is building off of the *Book of Luminaries*, because it flows perfectly when read in this order, and both are entirely unaware of anything happening during the Maccabean times. Unlike books that were written during the Maccabean era, there is nothing to suggest these works are referencing problems in this period, a common theme shared by texts written during the Maccabean period. While Enoch is considered an apocalyptic text, just like Daniel, these two segments are not considered the apocalyptic portions of the work. Being from the same genre of literature though, it does however show that the books Enoch and Daniel are known for containing similar themes in their construction.

In response to looking for the other six named holy angels referenced in *Tobit*, the segment called *The Book of Luminaries* contains a second holy angel with a name, Uriel. Uriel is mentioned multiple times in here, and all but twice (75:4 and 78:10) he is referenced as Uriel the angel, Uriel the holy angel, or Uriel the great angel (79:6). Uriel, in 1 Enoch 72-82, shows Enoch the laws of the heavens and how the cosmos works. He guides Enoch around and shows him everything from the stars, the seasons, where the sun and moon go, and all of the secrets that are concerned with the sky. Uriel reveals this knowledge to Enoch because of fear that when people see the fallen watchers/angels, represented by the stars, they might take them to be gods. Instead, these Fallen Watchers/Angels will be later identified as the root of sin. Similar to how Raphael in *Tobit* called himself one of the seven holy angels, when Enoch is brought back from the sky, Enoch states that it was, “Those *seven holy ones* brought me and set me on the earth in front of the gate to my house.” (En 81:5) Unlike in *Tobit*, Uriel does not call himself an angel or a holy

one, but resembling the biblical fashion, Enoch, our narrator, tells us he is a holy angel and therefore a holy one.

Enoch's second latest segment is written supplementary to the oldest, and that is *The Book of Watchers*. Uriel revealed the knowledge of the heavens to Enoch knowing that mankind would eventually begin to worship the *Fallen Watchers*, and these *Fallen Watchers* are responsible for sin.[186] *The Book of Watchers* is the story of how the angels who become later known in the Judeo-Christian community as Fallen Angels, become kicked out of heaven and who must be locked up and bound by the *Holy Watchers/Angels*.[187] According to Enoch 6, the *Fallen Angels* looked down from heaven and had noticed that the daughters of men were very beautiful. They decided to come down to the earth and mate with these women and have children. These children would then become giants, grandchildren the Nephilim known in Gen 6:4, and the children of the Nephilim would be known as Elioud (1 En 7:2). This brought madness upon the earth. Mankind began to scream in terror because this combined with the knowledge taught to them by the *Fallen Angels* was causing war and destruction. The *Fallen Angels* taught mankind everything from the signs of the stars, lightning flashes, spells, how to make weaponry and fashion jewelry (1 Enoch 8). These were the sins of the *Fallen Angels* that brought calamity to man.

Mankind did not deserve this terror, and so four angels on their own initiative looked down upon the earth from heaven and decided it was their duty to save the people. Who were these four angels? Michael, Sariel,[188] Raphael, and Gabriel, the holy ones of heaven (9:3). This is the first time that we see Raphael, Michael and Gabriel connected together as if a part of one

[186] Stephen Reid, *Enoch and Daniel* (Berkeley, CA: BIBAL Press, 1989), 45.
[187] This story is explained in a version more closely aligned with Genesis in the Book of *Jubilees.*
[188] Possibly Uriel, but VanderKam makes a good argument that it is more likely an angel called Sariel. Aramaic states Sariel and the Ethiopic agrees. The Greek on the other hand has Uriel. Vanderkam attributes the Greek getting it wrong as a result of mistaking the sigma and omicron. (Nicholsburg and VanderKam *Enoch*, page 26n).

group, a group called *the holy ones*. These names are therefore a connected group. Each of these individuals gets commissioned by God to do a different task, but it boils down to because the earth was being destroyed, a result of the sins of the *Fallen Angels*, these four were ordered to save the earth before it was too late. Raphael and Michael are told to bind (seen as similar to sealing) two of the Fallen Angels (10:4, 11), and Gabriel with the other two are instructed to destroy as many of these *Watchers* as possible. Michael is given the most vital task; he is to cleanse the earth. This can be compared to what is seen in Dan 12:1, "And in that time, Michael the Great Prince that stands over the children of your people, and there shall be a time of distress that a great nation that has never been, but at that time your people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book." As in Daniel, Michael is the *named figure* who will save mankind, at least those that are found written in the book. In Enoch's story, Enoch becomes an ambassador between the two angelic parties, the *Holy Angels*, and *Fallen Angels*. Enoch is working beside the *Holy Angels*, and as a result, he gives the insider information to his readers, and some of this information included: there were a total of *Seven Holy Angels:* **Uriel**, **Raphael**, Reuel, **Michael**, Sariel, **Gabriel**, and finally Remiel. Each of these angels has their own job to uphold and how they are meant to handle the *Fallen Angels*.

This book shows to scholars that there is a highly developed and significantly more sophisticated understanding of angelology and angels to the community that would read Daniel. Michael and Gabriel barely scratch the surface. 1 Enoch has a group of angels that are both good/holy and bad/fallen, and within these two groups, a hierarchy of the angels was taken place. When discussing the fallen angels/watchers, there is a total of twenty names provided to the

reader[189] and one of these *named figures* is a chief to ten angels that we don't know if they have names or not. (En 6:7) The communities that are referencing these names have a good background to refer to who they are. When communities then mention names, it brings a position of authority into the heads of the authors and readers. Therefore, it is clear that when the readers of Daniel came across the names Michael and Gabriel, one immediately would have known who they were. Enoch was clearly around, and it carried enough authority that we see remnants of it in other works like *Jubilees*, *Tobit*, and here in *Daniel*.

So finally, why does the author leave it out for the reader to not specify these are angels?

In Daniel, these figures unlike in the other books are never identified with being called an angel, and they wouldn't need to have been because the audience is expected to know who they are. The names Michael and Gabriel alone carry an immediate authority as people had been aware for at least the last 75-100 years. It is also unlikely that the authors of Daniel were ignorant of all of these works that had been written during this period as well. The author does not need to explicitly state, "this is Gabriel the holy angel," for one to know that it is Gabriel, the holy angel. It would have been nice, but it isn't necessary. The intended audience would have known who these figures were. It is kept cryptic just as the entire apocalyptic segment of this book was kept cryptic, it is only written for those who understand the apocalyptic code, Jews in the know.

Angels appear in different passages in the Bible, while most often they are identified as being an angel by the narrator, there are notable exceptions when the word **מלאך** is not used anywhere in that passage. In Genesis 32, there is a famous story of when Jacob is alone in the wilderness at night, and a strange, mysterious figure appears to him. The response by Jacob is to

[189] The 20 Fallen angels names: Shemihazah (their leader), Arteqoph, Remashel, Kokabel, Armumahel, Ramel, Daniel, Ziqel, Baraqel, Asael, Hermani, Matarel, Ananel, Setawel, Samshiel, Sahriel, Tummiel, Turiel, Yamiel, and Yehadiel.

wrestle with the figure for the entire evening. At dawn, this mysterious figure tells Jacob he must leave, but Jacob refuses to let him leave without knowing the figure's name and being blessed. This figure refuses to give Jacob his name but agrees to bless him. Jacob's name becomes Israel, and he calls the place where he fought with this figure, Peniel (Face of God), because he strove with God and prevailed. Jacob was aware of the divine nature of the figure, even if he does not explicitly state it. Nowhere in this passage does it state that Jacob fought an angel. Instead, it isn't until Hos 12:4 that this figure is called God and an angel. In Genesis 32, Jacob may have assumed he saw an angel, the reader might be able to deduce this same conclusion, but nowhere in the passage does it tell you explicitly.

Genesis 18 is another notable exception. Three mysterious figures appear to Abraham, and it takes Abraham a while to figure out who they are. We the reader never know for certain whether or not he knows who all three of them are by the end of the story, and the narrator of the story does something brilliant as well, it keeps these three figures anonymous for its reader. It is much simpler to just in the narration tell the reader that these three are angels or God. Instead, it is left ambiguous. This ambiguity allows for the reader to be put in the same position as Abraham. We, like Abraham, can figure out at least one of the three figures is God, but the other two remain unknown both to Abraham and us. We are given a sense of the confusion that Abraham must have experienced. Never in this scene is the reader told who these figures are, it isn't until the next chapter that the opening lines tell us that at least the two figures who left were angels.[190] For the same reason that Genesis 18's author, the earliest main contributor to the Torah-the author of J, consciously chose not to write the word angel, Daniel 8-12's author(s) also did not write the word angel. It is going even one step further in Daniel, because the one

[190] In the original Hebrew there would have been no chapter numbers, but as mentioned it isn't the separation of the chapter that implies they are angels, instead it is the change of the scene.

providing narration in this book is also the main character in the text, Daniel. Never once in the entire Hebrew Bible, does the character when speaking to an angel state that this figure is an angel. The character in some of the stories may recognize that the figure is an angel, but when they are speaking to the angel, the word never leaves their mouth. It is only in Zechariah (a late book) that an angel is called an angel within the story by a divine figure (also an angel). Outside of quotation, the narrator will more often than not let the reader know when the angel is speaking but always using the term for an angel. So, therefore, the reader has direction with who is speaking and when. In the cases found in Daniel 8-12, the meta-narrator is doing something brilliant. Keeping up with the biblical method for allowing the main character to remain confused with whom they are speaking, he lets the audience know that angels are involved. The angels do not call themselves an angel, nor address their names. Instead, it is one of the other figures that Daniel either overhears his name,[191] or he is told the name of the third party by the figure he is talking to.[192] Daniel in the story gives the information needed for the audience to know who these figures are, without having to say the word angel, because while he is narrating his vision. Daniel here is still the actor in the story. There should be no ambiguity as to who these 2 named figures are because the audience would have known just by the name itself. Daniel is telling you that it is an angel with which he is talking, even if it isn't explicitly saying the word

Conclusion

Scholars take it for granted when they automatically call Michael and Gabriel in Daniel 8-12 angels. If only looking at the Hebrew Bible, there is very little evidence to support that these two *named figures* were meant to be seen as angels. The scholar must ask themselves

[191] In the case of Gabriel and Dan 8:16
[192] In the case with Michael and Daniel 10-12

whether or not the intended audience of this passage was intended to read these figures in this manner. The answer is yes, but we cannot base our conclusions off of how the later examples of these figures are seen in the different religious scriptures. Just because later Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all picture Michael and Gabriel to being angels does not mean that Daniel 8-12 would have. The book of Daniel alone doesn't provide the evidence to arrive at this conclusion. Instead, one has to put their mind in the same timeframe as the intended reader of the story. This is done by having to be aware of what this reader would have known so that the conclusion can be correctly derived. While yes, Gabriel and Michael were meant to be known as angels in these passages, knowing what influenced these passages is the only way one can correctly arrive at this conclusion.

CONCLUSION

This investigation shows that angels are far too often defined based upon preconceived notions, and scholars have unfortunately avoided exploring this very interesting divine being. The study of this divine creature shows that angels tell scholars more about the theology of the religion based upon different time periods than at face value. Merely defining a word based upon evidence of a later date is lazy scholarship, and scholars don't often do this anymore. Somehow, angels slipped through the cracks. This research shows that angels are not only deserving of a reexamination, but more importantly, all divine figures should be looked at more closely.

By looking at angels more closely, and attempting to define an angel, many questions arose. Precisely, how does one get from an angel as the manifestation of God/Yahweh to a separate divine figure with a name? Apparently, it was a gradual process that took place. An overlooked near two hundred year fragment in history that the literati did not discuss angels lead to the development of a new figure. Examining the Bible showed that later in the religion angels had unique personalities that were not seen in the earlier texts. In the older segments of the Bible, angels were the emanations of God, but if an angel is also Michael and Gabriel than it becomes more difficult to see them as Yahweh. The lack of identifying angels in the period in which they are written lead to most scholars identifying all supernatural beings as a class of angels.

While most scholars saw angels as nearly every divine figure in the divine court, this examination shows that by looking more closely at an angel, a more accurate portrayal of the figure can be identified. Not all divine figures in the Bible are angels, and more importantly, just like the category of angels has now been observed, so should other categories of divine figures

be examined. The “Sons of God” figures will explain more about the religion than is already understood if studied more closely, just as was shown with angels. Instead of piling all divine beings into one category, it is imperative to inspect each one individually. Only then, will a more clear picture of the divine pantheon and court be understood. Cherubim, Seraphim, Sons of God, men in linen, princes and holy ones are all creatures that deserved to be explored. This thesis is intended to be the first step necessary to examine these supernatural beings, and to provide the most complete picture of an angel as shown in the Hebrew Bible.

REFERENCES

Alt, Albrecht. "The God of the Fathers." in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, (1967), 1-100.

Anderson, Francis I. and Freedman, David N. *Hosea*. Anchor Bible 24. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980.

Bampflyde, Gillian. "The Prince of the Hosts in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 14, no. 2. (Dec 1983), 129-134.

Barr, James. "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 53, no.2 (1985) 201-235.

Black, Matthew. "The Twenty Angel Dekadarchs at I Enoch 6. 7 and 69.2." *Journal of Jewish Studies* XXXIII (1982), 227-235.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1-39.* Vol 1 of Isaiah. Anchor Bible 19. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

----*Isaiah 56-66*. Vol 3 of Isaiah. Anchor Bible 19B. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Boda, Mark J. *The Book of Zechariah*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2016.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Vision of Daniel*. Missoula, MO: Scholars Press. 1977.

----*Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: MI: William. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 1998.

----*Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* London: Routledge. 2002.

---- *Daniel, 1-2 Maccabees: With an Excursus on the Apocalyptic Genre*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc. 1981.

Collins, John J., Cross, Frank M. and Collins, Adela Y. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.

Cross, Frank M. “A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration,” in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94. (1975), 3-18.

----*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1973.

----*From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1998.

Cross, Frank M. and Freedman, David N. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Grand Rapids, MI: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 1997 2nd Edition.

Davies, Philip R. *Daniel*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1988. (1985 Reprint).

deSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. 2002.

Freedman, David N. ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

---- “The Chroniclers Purpose,” in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23, no 4. (1961), 436-442.

Friedman, Richard E. *The Bible with Sources Revealed.* San Francisco, CA: HarperOne, 2003.

----*The Disappearance of God*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company, 1995.

----*The Hidden Book of the Bible.* New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 1998.

---- *Who Wrote the Bible?* New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997.

Fitzmyer, J. A. “The Aramaic Fragments of Tobit from Cave 4.” In *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57, no. 4 (1995), 655-675.

----*Tobit: Discoveries in the Judean Desert 19.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1995

Gaster, Theordor. “Angels.” Pages 128-134 in vol. 1 of *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Ginsberg, H. L. “Studies in the Book of Job,” *Leshonenu* 21. (1956), 259-264.

Halpern, Baruch. “Brisker Pipes than Poetry: The Development of Israelite Monotheism,” in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press. (1987) 77-115.

----*David’s Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press. 1979.

Hartman, Louis F. and DiLella, Alexander A. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978.

Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi*. Anchor Bible 25D. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1998.

Kaufmann, Yezekel. *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile.* Translated and Abridged by Moshe Greenberg. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. 1960.

Kister, Manaheim. "Some Early Jewish Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 37, no. 4 (2006): 548-593.

Knoppers, Gary. *1 Chronicles 1-9*. Vol 1 of Chronicles. Anchor Bible 12. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Kuhn, Harold B. "The Angelology of the Non-Canonical Jewish Apocalypses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67, no. 3 (1948): 217-233.

Larrimore, Mark. *The Book of Job*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2013.

Lindenberger, James M.. "Daniel 12:1-4." *Interpretation* XXXIX, no. 2 (1985): 181-186.

Littman, Robert J. *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2008.

McKenzie, Steven L. *1-2 Chronicles*. Abington Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abington Press, 2004.

Meadowcroft, Tim. "Who Are The Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers Toward the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29 (2004): 99-113.

Metzger, Bruce M. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 1957.

Meyers, Carol L. and Meyers, Eric M. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*. Anchor Bible 25B. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.

----*Zechariah 9-14*. Anchor Bible 25C. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1993.

Michel, Walter L. *Job: In the Light of Northwest Semitic.* Rome, Italy: Biblical Institute Press 1987.

Miller, Geoffrey D.. "Raphael The Liar: Angelic Deceit and Testing In The Book of Tobit." *The Catholic Bible Quarterly* 74 (2012): 492-508.

Myers, Jacob. *1 Chronicles*. Anchor Bible 12. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

Newsom, Carol. "Angels." Pages 248-253 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

----*Daniel: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

----*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press. 1985.

Newsome, James D. *The Hebrew Prophets*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984.

Nicholsburg, George E. and Vanderkam, James C. *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* Vol. 1 of 1st Enoch. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 2012.

Noth, Martin. *Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957. Original Edition, 1943. Pp. 1-110 in English Translation as *The Deuteronomistic History.* JSOT Supplement Series. Sheffield, 1981.

Olyan, Saul. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*. Tubingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

Otzen, Benedikt . "Michael and Gabriel: Angelological Problems in the Book Of Daniel." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* XLIX (192): 114-124.

Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. Anchor Bible 15. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

Portier-Young, Anathea. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011.

Propp, William H.C. *Exodus 1-18*. Vol. 1 of Exodus. Anchor Bible 2. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.

Reid, Stephen B. *Enoch and Daniel.* Berkeley, CA: BIBAL Press, 1989.

Sasson, Jack M. *Judges 1-12.* Vol. 1 of Judges. Anchor Bible 6D. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.

Savron, George W. "Theophany as Type Scene," *Prooftexts* 23 no. 2 (2003), 119-149.

Schopflin, Karin. “Fire.” Page 454 in vol. 2 of *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by Katherine Doob Sakenfeld. 5 vols New York: Abingdon Press. (2006).

Schumer, Rep. Charles E. “*H.R.1308: Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993*.” 103rd Congress (1993). doi: https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/1308.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Creation of Angels And Natural Phenomena Intertwined in the Book of Jubilees (4QJUB)." *Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism* III (2006): 273-307.

Tiemeyer, Lena-Sophia. *Zechariah and His Visions: An Exegetical Study of Zechariah’s Vision Report*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.

----*Zechariah’s Vision Report and its Earliest Interpreters: A Redaction-Critical Study of Zechariah 1-8.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.

Vermes, Geza. "The Archangel Sariel." *Studies In Judaism In Late Antiquity* 12 (1975): 159-166.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel.* New York, NY: World Publishing Company, 1883.

Zimmerman, Frank. “The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8-12.” *JBL* 38 (1938), 255-272.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Angels in the Bible by Author or Segment

J	E	RJE
Gen 16: 7-11; 18; 19:1, 15 **Exod** 3:2	**Gen** 21:17; 28: 12; 31:11; 32:1, 25-31; 48:16 **Exod** 14:19, 23:20-23, 33:2, 20 **Num** 22:21-41	**Gen** 22:11-15 **Exod** 3:2-3

Former Prophets	Writings	Prophets
1Sam 29:9 **2Sam** 14:17-20; 19:27 **2Kgs** 1:3, 15; 19:35	**1Chr** 21:12-30 **2Chr** 32:21 **Job** 4:18, 33:23 **Eccl** 5:6 (not likely) **Dan** 3:28; 6:22 (Michael and Gabriel are in chapters 8-12)	**Hos** 12:4 **Isa** 14:32, 37:36, 63:9 **Zech** 1:9-19; 2:3; 3:1-6; 4:1-5; 5:5, 10; 6:4, 5; 12:8

APPENDIX II

Angelic Time Periods.

α-Period	β- Period	γ-Period
Early to 701 BCE	~701 – 538 BCE	Starting 538 BCE
Only books containing Angels	*No angels here in this Period, Only long books are listed.*	*Only books containing Angels*
J-source, E-source, Early Historical Material in the Former Prophets, Hosea 1st Isaiah	P-Source, D-Source, DtrH-historian, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, 2nd Isaiah	Zechariah, Chronicler Daniel Haggai (debatable) Malachi (debatable)