



Steven Fitchie · Nov 15, 2016 · 3 min read

Who Appeared in the Fiery Furnace in Daniel 3:25?



Many translations read, "The form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Daniel 3:25

THE PULPIT COMMENTARY says, "The phrase, 'the Son of God,' is clearly wrong; the correct translation is, 'The appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods'... As in most heathen mythologies, there were not only gods, but demi-gods, of several different classes... we ought to guard against ascribing to the Babylonian monarch the idea that this appearance was that of the Second Person of the Christian Trinity..."

Then the Pulpit commentary says, "... it was an angel who strengthened these servants of God in the furnace."

Daniel 3:28 proves that Nebuchadnezzar said that God has "sent His angel and delivered His servants..." out of the fiery furnace. Since it is hard to imagine that an angelic messenger who was "sent" by God could be an alleged Trinitarian God the Son Person. Hence, the context of Daniel chapter three proves that a literal angelic messenger had appeared in the fiery furnace to Deliver Daniel and his friends from being burnt in the fire.

Doug Kutilek is a scholarly Trinitarian researcher who wrote that Daniel 3:25 should be literally translated as "**A SON OF THE GODS**" rather than a Son of God.

"The precise, literal English equivalent of bar-elahin is "a son of the gods," as the ASV, NASB and NIV have it. It should not surprise us to find a pagan king who acknowledged and worshipped many gods speaking of the appearance of a supernatural person as "a son of the gods".

Mr. Kutilek continued, "Nebuchadnezzar was yet a pagan (he had just erected an idol of gold and compelled his subjects to worship it). In Daniel 3:28, the king refers once again to the fourth man in the furnace, this time by the designation "angel," which suggests that the two terms, "angel" and "a son of the gods," were synonymous designations. As for the appearance of the fourth man, which he asserts to be like that of a son of God, either we must take him to be an angel, as the Septuagint has rendered it, or indeed, as the majority think, the Lord our Savior. Yet I do not know how an ungodly king could have merited a vision of the Son of God."

Mr. Kutilek concludes, "It merits noting that Scripture itself refers to angels as sons of God in Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; and also, so I think, Genesis 6:2, 4." [Excerpts from Doug Kutilek's Article "The Son Of God, Or A Son Of The Gods (Daniel 3:25)?" www.kjvonly.org/doug/index_doug.html]

In conclusion, literal translations such as the NASB and ASV translate Daniel 3:25 as "a son of the gods" rather than "the Son of God" because the literal translation of the Hebrew text accurately says, "a son of the gods". Since the context of Daniel 3:28 proves that God has "sent His angel and delivered His servants", we know that it was a "sent" "angel" that God used to deliver His servants rather than another God the Son Person. Therefore, Jesus Christ the Son of God was clearly not the same individual who King Nebuchadnezzar called "a son of the gods" in Daniel 3:25 and who King Nebuchadnezzar identified as an angelic messenger in Daniel 3:28 who was sent by one of the gods to deliver his servants from being killed by the intense heat of the fiery furnace.

For More ARTICLES
For Free BOOKS
For Video Teachings, subscribe to our YOUTUBE CHANNEL

Recent Posts

See All



Christ Is The Spirit In Romans 8

154 views 0 comments 1 like



"God was manifest in the flesh" or "He was manifest..."

200 views 0 comments 1 like

Oneness vs Unitarianism, Part 5 'Gnosticism'

Unitarian Socinian author Tom Raddatz recently posted a scathing polemic attacking Oneness Theology and personally attacking Oneness Apologi



id="comp-tyw9v3k

hk