

DESOLATION OF THE TEMPLE AND MESSIANIC ENTHRONEMENT IN DANIEL 11:36–12:3

JASON THOMAS PARRY*

I. INTRODUCTION

Although there is a broad consensus that Dan 11:21–35 refers to the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, two mutually incompatible interpretations dominate the commentaries for the subsequent verses 11:36–12:3.¹ Most traditional commentators, following in the footsteps of Hippolytus and Jerome, argue that the passage describes a future Antichrist figure (11:36–39), his demise (11:40–45), and the tribulation and final resurrection (12:1–3).² The typical interpretation of critical scholarship, by contrast, argues that the passage accurately describes Antiochus IV (11:36–39), but erroneously predicts his demise (11:40–45) and a heavenly deliverance and resurrection (12:1–3).³ A third,

* Jason Thomas Parry is a Ph.D. student at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville, KY 40280.

¹ An earlier version of this paper was read in a prophetic literature seminar at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the fall semester of 2009. I would like to thank James M. Hamilton Jr., Cameron Jungels, and the other members of the seminar for their thoughtful and instructive feedback. I am also grateful for helpful corrections and suggestions provided by Peter J. Gentry, Stephen Kempf, Matt Hodge, and Matt Dickie.

² See, e.g., Andrew E. Steinmann, *Daniel* (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2008) 533–46; Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel* (NAC 18; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994) 304–20; Edward J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) 246–57. For the commentary of Hippolytus on Daniel 11:36–12:3, see Hippolytus *Commentarium in Daniele* 4.48–56, available in Hippolyte and Maurice Lefevre, *Commentaire sur Daniel* (SC 14; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947; repr. 2006) 362–77. For Jerome, the prediction of the Antichrist begins with Dan 11:21; for Jerome's commentary on 11:21–12:3, see *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (trans. Gleason L. Archer Jr.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958) 129–47.

³ See especially John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 386–98. Some scholars have suggested that the presence of an erroneous prediction in Scripture (Antiochus's demise in 11:40–45) can be justified on the basis of genre comparison of Daniel 11 with ANE literature, especially Akkadian prophecies: John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word, 1989) 39–40, 281–86, 304–6; Ernest Lucas, *Daniel* (Apollon OT Commentary 20; Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 2002) 269–72, 290–93, 300–302, 308–9. Even if similarities between Daniel 11 and the Akkadian prophecies indicate a shared genre, the claim that the author of Daniel 11 intended to signal by this choice of genre that his text was to be understood as merely a “quasi-prophecy” relating past events (11:2–39) and a hopeful expectation of future events (11:40–12:3) seems unsustainable unless it can be demonstrated that the form of the Akkadian prophecies was also intended to signal to their original audiences that their predictions were to be understood as mere quasi-prophecies and fallible predictions rather than actual prophecies. This seems unlikely since their pseudonymous claims of authority and their function as political

less common view, which can be traced at least as far back as John Calvin, argues that the passage describes events in the historical Roman Republic and early Empire (11:36–45), and summarily the church age and final resurrection (12:1–3).⁴ Although Calvin's exposition understands 11:36–45 as a rather general description of the rise of Roman power in the East, Gurney has argued more recently that the passage specifically describes Antiochus IV (11:36–39), the successful campaign of Pompey and Scaurus into Syria-Palestine in 65–62 BC and Rome's annexation of Egypt in 27 BC (11:40–43), and the fatal campaign of Crassus against the Parthians in 54–53 BC (11:44–45).⁵ Although commentators have given convincing reasons to reject Gurney's view,⁶ Calvin's contention that this passage somehow refers to historical Rome, rather than to Antiochus or the Antichrist, need not be dismissed.

The following argument seeks to demonstrate that Dan 11:36–45 accurately predicts the events of the Jewish revolt against Rome which culminated in the destruction of the temple in AD 70, while Dan 12:1–3 describes the enthronement of the Messiah which accomplishes the new exodus and the resurrection.⁷ Daniel's five-kingdom schema, the nature of the transition between

propaganda would have been undermined if the audience could readily recognize by the genre that the prophecies were likely to be false. A similar objection is raised by Tremper Longman III, *Daniel* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999) 281; cf. idem, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1991) 187–89, 204–8.

⁴ John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel* (trans. Thomas Myers; vol. 13 of *Calvin's Commentaries*; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1846; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) 332–80.

⁵ Robert M. Gurney, *God in Control: An Exposition of the Prophecies of Daniel* (Worthing, UK: H. E. Walter, 1980) 144–55. A revised edition of this work (2006) is currently available online through Biblical Studies.org.uk (http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/book_god-in-control_gurney.html).

⁶ See especially Lucas, *Daniel* 292. The most serious objection to Gurney's view is that there is little exegetical warrant for arguing that Dan 11:44–45 predicts events which were to occur chronologically before the submission of Egypt to the king of the north (11:43). The sequence of the narrative of 11:43–45 appears to describe the response of the king of the north to reports which he hears while he is ruling in Egypt, with the Holy Mountain to the northeast. Philip Mauro's analysis, in which he identifies 11:36–39 and 11:44–45 as describing Herod, and 11:40–43 as describing the Battle of Actium and Augustus's subsequent conquest, is subject to a similar critique, since there is little exegetical warrant for understanding 11:40–43 as parenthetical. See Philip Mauro, *The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation: A Study of the Last Two Visions of Daniel, and of the Olivet Discourse of the Lord Jesus Christ* (rev. ed.; Swengel, PA: Bible Truth Depot, 1944; repr. Swengel, PA: Reiner Publications, 1970) 135–62.

⁷ In Calvin's commentary on Dan 11:36, he notes that some rabbis apply this passage to Vespasian and Titus but simply dismisses their view as unreasonable foolish chatter (*Commentaries on Daniel* 338). In any case, Calvin's comment may be evidence of some precedent for understanding Dan 11:36ff as describing the events of AD 67–70. I have not yet discovered whether any extant rabbinical commentators explain the text in this way, however. Rashi understands 11:21 to describe the rise of the Roman kingdom and applies 11:36–39 to the "kingdom of Rome" in general, without mention of Vespasian or Titus. Ibn Ezra and Ralbag identify Titus specifically in their comments on 11:32, but not in 11:36ff. Ibn Ezra, Abarbanel, Isaiah da Trani, and Malbim maintain that 11:36 describes the Roman emperor Constantine I, and the latter three also see references to the pope in 11:37–39. For further details, see A. J. Rosenberg, *Mikra ot gedolot: Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, A New English Translation* (New York: Judaica, 1991) 103–10; Hersch Goldwurm, *Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources*, ArtScroll Tanach Series (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah Publications, 1998) 305–19. For Ralbag (Gersonides), see

the fourth and fifth kingdoms as described in Daniel 2 and 7, and allusions to Dan 9:26–27 in 11:36–45 provide the exegetical grounds for seeking the fulfillment of 11:36–45 in the events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the Romans. A careful exegetical analysis of 11:36–45 shows that the text indeed describes the events of AD 67–70. The explanatory power of this interpretation of 11:36–12:3 is demonstrated by its ability to clarify the ambiguous descriptions of the fourth kingdom in Daniel 2 and 7, which in turn brings a coherent unity to the prophetic outlook of Daniel.

II. DANIEL'S SCHEMA OF FIVE KINGDOMS

The chiastic structure of the Aramaic portion of Daniel is now widely accepted, but the implications of this chiasm for the interpretation of the visions are too often neglected.⁸ The chiasm of Daniel 2–7 may be described thematically as follows:

- A – Daniel 2: Four temporal kingdoms precede the eternal kingdom of God
- B – Daniel 3: God's law and judgment trumps Nebuchadnezzar's decree and judgment
- C – Daniel 4: God rules over the kingdom of man and gives it to whom he wishes
- C' – Daniel 5: God rules over the kingdom of man and gives it to whom he wishes
- B' – Daniel 6: God's law and judgment trump the law of the Medes and Persians
- A' – Daniel 7: Four temporal kingdoms precede the eternal kingdom of God

The center of the chiasm (Daniel 4–5) highlights the central message of the first half of the book (Daniel 1–7) which provides a key to the interpretation of the five kingdoms in Daniel 2 and 7, and in turn to the interpretation of the second half of the book which provides increasingly more detail about those kingdoms (Daniel 8–12).

Both Nebuchadnezzar's dream vision and Daniel's interpretation indicate that the intended message of Daniel 4 is that the Most High rules over the kingdom of man and sets over it whomever he wishes (4:17, 25–26 [MT 4:14, 22–23]). Nebuchadnezzar's opening and closing statements report that he has indeed learned this lesson (4:1–3; 4:34–37 [MT 3:31–33; 4:31–34]). The intended message of Daniel 5 is the same: God brought an end to Belshazzar's kingdom because he failed to learn this very lesson from Nebuchadnezzar's experience (5:17–23), so that God gave the kingdom of man to Darius the Mede instead (6:1). The stories of deliverance in Daniel 3 and 6 demonstrate that God's law is higher than the laws of the kingdom of man, and that God's judgment,

his *Perush Daniel* (Italy, c. 1480; Venice, 1517–18; Amsterdam, 1524–27; Tel Aviv: Pardes, 1970 [*Otsar ha-Perushim*, vol. 2]).

⁸ Lenglet is usually credited with first describing the concentric symmetry of Daniel 2–7 in Ad. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2–7," *Bib* 53 (1972) 169–90.

which vindicates those faithful to him, overrides the judgment imposed by the laws of the kingdom of man. The stories in Daniel 3 and 6 function to illustrate the message which is made explicit in the stories of Daniel 4 and 5, namely, that God is sovereign over the kingdom of man and gives it to whom he wishes.

The five kingdoms of Daniel 2 and 7 should be interpreted in light of this central theme of the chiasm of Daniel 2–7. The Most High will give the kingdom of man to four sequential, temporary kingdoms before he gives the kingdom of man to “one like a son of man” forever. Since Daniel 2 and 7 are a pair in the chiasm, the five kingdoms in Daniel 2 correspond to the five kingdoms in Daniel 7. The first kingdom is explicitly identified as the Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadnezzar, and by implication his successors (2:37). The second kingdom is best understood as “Medo-Persia” rather than strictly Media, because the book of Daniel consistently refers to the Medes and Persians as co-temporal (5:28; 6:9, 13, 16; 8:3, 20), and because the Median kingdom had already been subsumed into the Persian Empire (550 BC) by the time that the Babylonian Empire fell to Cyrus II (539 BC). The claim that Media alone is the second kingdom is based primarily on the observation that the kingdom of Belshazzar falls to Darius the Mede (Daniel 5–6), but Darius the Mede is most plausibly identified as Cyrus II, who was both a Mede and a Persian by descent.⁹ The two references to the kingdom of Persia without the Medes in the later visions (Dan 10:13; 11:2) can be explained easily by the fact that the Persians dominated the rule of this empire. If Medo-Persia corresponds to the second kingdom, then Greece, mentioned explicitly as one of the kingdoms (Dan 8:21), would correspond to the third kingdom. The fourth kingdom is not named in the book of Daniel, but is most plausibly identified with *at least* the Roman Empire, since the visions describe no gap between the end of the third (Greek) kingdom and the beginning of the fourth kingdom, and since it is “in the days of those kings” of the fourth kingdom that the kingdom of God is inaugurated (Dan 2:44; cf. Mark 1:15). Early Jewish literature also identified Daniel’s fourth beast as Rome.¹⁰ The fifth kingdom is an eternal kingdom over which the Ancient of Days enthrones “one like a son of man” (2:34–35, 44–45; 7:9–14, 18, 22, 26–27).

The visions of Daniel 2 and 7, informed by the central message of the chiasm of Daniel 2–7, thus foresee a five-fold sequence of human rulers enthroned by God over the kingdom of man: Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, and the kingdom of the Son of Man. The transition between the fourth and fifth

⁹ Steinmann, *Daniel* 290–96; Brian E. Colless, “Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel,” *JSOT* 56 (1992) 113–26; William H. Shea, “Darius the Mede in his Persian-Babylonian Setting,” *AUSS* 29 (1991) 235–57; David W. Baker, “Further Examples of the *Waw Explicativum*,” *VT* 30 (1980) 134; James M. Bulman, “The Identification of Darius the Mede,” *WTJ* 35 (1973) 247–67; D. J. Wiseman, “Some Historical Problems in the Book of Daniel,” in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale, 1965) 9–16. Shea, however, has returned to the position that Darius the Mede refers to Cyrus’s general Ugbaru in William H. Shea, “The Search for Darius the Mede (Concluded), or, The Time of the Answer to Daniel’s Prayer and the Date of the Death of Darius the Mede,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 12/1 (2001) 97–105.

¹⁰ For a list of references see G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 684–85.

kingdoms presents some difficulty, because the inauguration of the kingdom of God at the first advent of Christ did not bring an end to the historical Roman Empire, and at least some of the description of the fifth-kingdom appears to refer to what is now known as the second coming of Christ in light of NT revelation. These observations lead many interpreters to conclude that Daniel's unnamed fourth kingdom extends beyond the historical Roman Empire until the return of Christ. However, it is difficult to reconcile an extended fourth kingdom with the testimony of the NT that the fifth kingdom was inaugurated already in the first century. An examination of the time and nature of the transition between the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel is therefore in order, since a proper understanding of Daniel's five-kingdom schema can clarify the proper place of Dan 11:36–12:3 in Daniel's prophetic outlook. Specifically, the "Writing of Truth" (Dan 11:2–12:3) can be mapped to Daniel's five-kingdom schema according to the following table.

Daniel's Five-Kingdom Schema

	Identification	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8	Dan 9	Dan 10–12
1	Babylon	gold	lion			
2	Medo-Persia	silver	bear	ram		11:2
3	Greece	bronze	leopard	goat		11:3–35
?	(Greece or Rome?)					11:36–39
4	Rome (historical or extended?)	iron/clay	beast		70th week	11:40–45
5	Messianic kingdom of God	stone	Son of Man		70th week	12:1–3

The assignment of Dan 11:36–39 to either the third kingdom (as a continuation of the description of Antiochus IV) or to the fourth kingdom (as a historical figure during the Roman Empire or as a future Antichrist figure) is an exegetical problem which will be discussed below. First, however, Daniel 2, 7, and 9 need to be examined in order to determine the relationship between the end of the fourth kingdom and the beginning of the fifth kingdom, which should then inform a proper understanding of the place of 11:36–12:3 in Daniel's five-kingdom schema.

III. THE FOURTH AND FIFTH KINGDOMS IN DANIEL

A careful examination of Daniel 2, 7, and 9 demonstrates that the fourth kingdom is best understood as limited to the first-century Roman Empire, while the fifth kingdom is best understood as beginning with the first advent of Christ.

1. *The fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 2.* Daniel provides a description of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (2:31–35) as well as an interpretation of the dream (2:36–45). The sections of the dream and its interpretation which describe the fourth and fifth kingdoms can be aligned as follows:

Fourth and Fifth Kingdoms in Daniel 2

Dream	Interpretation	Summary	Kingdom
2:33a	2:40	Iron legs represent a fourth kingdom crushing all others.	Fourth kingdom: Roman Empire
2:33b	2:41–43	Iron-clay feet and toes indicate that at the end of the fourth kingdom, it will be divided into strong and weak parts, and the weak part will be broken.	
2:34	2:44a	A stone shatters the iron-clay feet (34) to indicate that God will set up an eternal kingdom in place of the fourth kingdom (44a).	Fifth kingdom: Kingdom of God
2:35a	2:44b	The rest of the statue shatters and is blown away (35a) to indicate that the fifth kingdom will shatter all the other kingdoms as well (44b).	
2:35b	2:44c	The stone became a great mountain and filled all the earth (35b) to indicate that the fifth kingdom will stand forever unchallenged (44c).	
	2:45	The dream is a trustworthy account of events to come after Nebuchadnezzar’s reign.	

The fourth kingdom is described as a mighty kingdom which initially crushes all other kingdoms, but which is divided and weakened toward the end of the kingdom. Nothing in the description of the fourth kingdom (2:33, 40–43) definitively answers the question of whether the referent was fulfilled in the historical Roman Empire or remains to be fulfilled in a still-future extension of the Roman Empire.¹¹ The question must be answered with respect to the time of the inauguration of the fifth kingdom as described in 2:34, 44a. Since the end of the fourth kingdom is represented by the shattering of the iron-clay feet by the stone (2:34), and since the corresponding interpretation of the feet-shattering stone is that God will set up an eternal kingdom (2:44a), the end of the fourth kingdom occurs when God sets up the eternal kingdom represented by the stone.¹²

¹¹ The argument that the fourth kingdom is extended or paradigmatic because Rome is the only kingdom not mentioned by name in the book of Daniel is an argument from silence which only carries weight if we *expect* Rome to be named. There are good reasons *not* to expect Rome to be named. First, Rome is never mentioned by name elsewhere in the OT (unlike the Medes, Persians, and Greece). Second, we have reason to doubt that Daniel would have known the name of Rome, since Rome was a small and distant monarchy at the time of Daniel’s visions.

¹² The fact that 2:44b interprets the stone which *shatters* the statue in 2:34–35 as a kingdom which *shatters* all other kingdoms indicates that the stone represents the kingdom established by God in 2:44a.

As recorded in Matt 21:44 and Luke 20:18, Jesus alludes to Dan 2:34–35a with the understanding that Daniel’s fifth-kingdom stone represents himself. Israel’s apostate religious leaders would be among those whom the stone would crush, so that the kingdom of God could be given to another people instead (Matt 21:41, 43; Luke 20:16). Jesus therefore understands Dan 2:34–35a to refer to his first coming.¹³ This fact should not be surprising, since the inspired interpretation of the stone (Dan 2:44a–b; cf. 2:34–35a) is that God will inaugurate an eternal fifth kingdom. The NT claims that Jesus Christ inaugurated the kingdom of God at his first coming and now sits enthroned over the world at the right hand of the God (Acts 2:32–36). Therefore, Daniel’s fifth kingdom as described in Daniel 2 is the kingdom of God inaugurated by Jesus Christ during the historical Roman Empire.¹⁴

Since the dream indicates that the fourth kingdom is shattered at the inauguration of the fifth kingdom (2:34, 44a), and since the NT identifies the inauguration of the fifth kingdom with the inauguration of the kingdom of God by Jesus Christ at his first advent, the description of the fourth kingdom (2:33, 40–43) must refer strictly to the *historical* Roman Empire in which the kingdom of God was inaugurated through Christ. The dream sequence simply does not permit any significant overlap of the fourth and fifth kingdoms. The interpretation which maintains that Daniel’s fourth kingdom extends to the second advent will have to place the inauguration of Daniel’s fifth kingdom at the second advent, despite the evidence that Jesus and the NT authors understood the fifth kingdom to correspond to the kingdom of God inaugurated at the first advent.

An obvious objection to this understanding of the fulfillment of Daniel 2 is that the inauguration of the kingdom of God by Jesus Christ in the first century did not bring an end to the Roman Empire. This objection, however, misunderstands the complexity of the symbolism. A “kingdom” by definition consists of at least four essential components: a king, his subjects, his land, and apparently in the worldview of Daniel, a patron angel (10:13, 20, 21; 12:1). To “shatter” a kingdom does not necessarily involve the destruction of all of these components. The removal of any one of these components would bring an end to a kingdom. Furthermore, in the five-kingdom schema of Daniel, each one of the five kingdoms corresponds to the God-ordained manifestation of the universal “kingdom of man” over which God rules and which God gives to whom he pleases, as is made clear by the central theme of the chiasm of

¹³ Additionally, Jesus may have alluded to the “stone cut without hands” (Dan 2:34, 45) in reference to his resurrection. The witnesses against Jesus reported that he had said that he would build a temple “made without hands” (Mark 14:58). Mark may call their testimony false only in the sense that they were also claiming that Jesus had said that he would destroy the actual temple “made with hands” (cf. John 2:19).

¹⁴ Revelation 20:11 also alludes to Dan 2:35a in a description of the fleeing of heaven and earth from the great white throne at the final judgment. This allusion no doubt indicates that Dan 2:35a and 2:44b find an ultimate fulfillment at the final judgment, but the allusion does not require that Dan 2:34 and 2:44a also find fulfillment at the final judgment, since the latter verses describe the inauguration, not the consummation, of the kingdom. Furthermore, John’s application of the language of Dan 2:35a to the dragon and his angels at the inauguration of the messianic kingdom in Rev 12:8 indicates that Dan 2:35a begins to find its fulfillment already in Christ’s resurrection, so that 2:35a need not refer *strictly* to the final judgment. See Beale, *Book of Revelation* 654–55.

Daniel 2–7. To shatter one of these five kingdoms in Daniel's schema can simply involve God removing the sovereignty of that king over the universal "kingdom of man" and giving it to another.

For example, God removed the universal sovereignty of Babylon and gave universal sovereignty instead to Medo-Persia when the kingdom of man passed from Belshazzar to Darius the Mede (Dan 5:30–31; 9:1).¹⁵ Yet the realm of Babylon continued to exist within the second kingdom in the form of a Persian satrapy. Historically speaking, Babylon (the first kingdom) was not so much destroyed as it was subordinated to Medo-Persia (the second kingdom); yet as a manifestation of the universal "kingdom of man" in Daniel's schema, the first-kingdom Babylon *was* destroyed and replaced by the second-kingdom Medo-Persia. In the same way, the fourth-kingdom Roman Empire in Daniel's five-kingdom schema can be said to have been destroyed as *the universal kingdom of man* and replaced with the kingdom of God inaugurated by Christ. Historically, however, the fourth-kingdom Roman Empire continued to exist as a subordinate realm within the messianic fifth-kingdom, just as first-kingdom Babylon continued to exist as a subordinate realm within the second-kingdom Medo-Persian Empire. In fact, Dan 2:44 reflects this understanding of kingdom "destruction" in Daniel's schema since the phrase "the kingdom *will not be left to another people*" explains what is meant by the phrase "a kingdom which *will not be destroyed* forever." Consequently, "destruction" or "shattering" of a kingdom in Daniel's schema entails subordinating that kingdom to another people who have been divinely appointed as the new rulers of the kingdom of man.

If the above analysis is correct, then the fourth kingdom in Daniel 2 refers strictly to the historical Roman Empire, and the fulfillment of Dan 2:33, 40–43 should be sought no later than the first-century context in which the fifth kingdom was inaugurated. Since the Writing of Truth (Dan 11:2–12:3) provides details on the fulfillment of Daniel's five-kingdom schema, the fulfillment of the fourth-kingdom segment of Daniel 11 should also be sought no later than the first century.

2. *The fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 7.* On the flip side of the chiasm of Daniel 2–7, Daniel describes a dream which first gives a broad overview (7:2–14) and interpretation (7:15–18) of the same five-kingdom schema as Daniel 2, but then focuses on a more detailed description (7:19–22) and interpretation (7:23–27) of the fourth and fifth kingdoms. The sections of the vision and interpretation which describe the fourth and fifth kingdoms can be aligned as shown on the following page.

Nothing in the description of the fourth kingdom (7:7–8, 19–21, 23–25) precludes its identification with historical Rome, nor is there any indication in this description that the fourth kingdom extends beyond the inauguration

¹⁵ Daniel portrays Nebuchadnezzar as having universal sovereignty in 2:37–38; 3:4–11, 29; 4:1, 10–12, 17, 20–22, 25, 32, 36 [MT 3:31, 4:7–9, 14, 17–19, 22, 29, 33]; 5:18–21. This universal sovereignty is then transferred to Darius the Mede / Cyrus II when Belshazzar is found deficient (5:22–31). Darius the Mede is described as having universal sovereignty in 6:25 [MT 6:26].

The Fourth and Fifth Kingdoms in Daniel 7

Vision Description		Vision Interpretation	Summary of the Vision and Its Interpretation	Kingdom
Broad Overview	Focus on Kingdoms 4 and 5			
7:7a	7:19	7:23	A fourth beast eats, shatters, and tramples the other beasts (7, 19) to indicate that a fourth kingdom will eat and trample and shatter all the earth (23). Ten horns on the fourth beast's head represent ten kings of the fourth kingdom.	Fourth kingdom: Roman Empire
7:7b	7:20a	7:24a		
7:8	7:20b	7:24b	Another little horn uproots three of the ten horns (8, 20b) to indicate that an eleventh king will bring down three of the ten kings (24b).	
	7:21	7:25	The little horn makes war on and prevails against the holy ones (21) to indicate that the eleventh king will speak words against the Most High, wear out the holy ones, intend to change the times and law, and subjugate the holy ones for a time, times, and half a time (25).	
7:9–10	7:22a	7:26a	The Ancient of Days and the court sit on their thrones and open the books.	Fifth kingdom: Kingdom of God
7:11		7:26b	The fourth beast is slain, its body destroyed and burned (11) to indicate that the court will take away the dominion of the eleventh king forever (26b).	
7:12			The court also removes the dominion of the rest of the beasts (kingdoms), but grants them a prolongation of life for a time.	
7:13			One like a son of man coming with the clouds approaches the Ancient of Days.	
7:14a	7:22b	7:27a	The court gives the kingdom to the one like a son of man (14a) and to the holy ones (22b) to indicate that the fifth kingdom will be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High forever (27a).	
7:14b		7:27b	All nations serve the one like a son of man in his eternal kingdom (14b) which indicates that all dominions will serve and obey the Most High (27b).	

of the fifth kingdom. In fact, the beast which represents the fourth kingdom is destroyed (7:11, 26b) *before* the Ancient of Days gives the kingdom to the Son of Man (7:13–14a, 22b, 27a). The fourth kingdom ends before the fifth kingdom begins, and no significant overlap exists between the fourth and fifth kingdoms. The fulfillment of the predicted end of the fourth kingdom must again be sought in the context of the inauguration of the fifth kingdom.

The NT confirms that Jesus Christ inaugurated the fifth kingdom of Daniel 7 in the first century. Jesus quoted Dan 7:13 (conflated with Psalm 110:1) in his response to the high priest Caiaphas, who had asked for a plain answer as to whether Jesus was the Christ: “From now on (ἀπ’ ἄρτι) you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven” (Matt 26:64; cf. Mark 14:62, Luke 22:69). The prepositional phrase ἀπ’ ἄρτι indicates that Jesus understood the imagery of Dan 7:13–14 and Ps 110:1 to refer to his enthronement at his first coming, not to his second coming as is often assumed (cf. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν in Luke 22:69).¹⁶ Since Jesus’ trial before Caiaphas was the beginning of the “cutting off” of the Messiah which had been predicted to occur at the inauguration of the Messianic fifth kingdom (Dan 9:26), there is no reason to interpret ἀπ’ ἄρτι in any way other than its usual meaning (cf. Matt 23:39; 26:29; John 13:19; 14:7; Rev 14:13).¹⁷ The events which were seen “from then on” by Caiaphas and the other witnesses accomplished the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom envisioned by Daniel.

Furthermore, Jesus’ blending of Dan 7:13 with Ps 110:1 indicates that he understood these two passages to have the same referent: the enthronement of Christ at his first coming. Peter quoted Ps 110:1 at Pentecost to refer to the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God after his resurrection (Acts 2:32–35). Christ’s seat at the right hand of the Father signifies his co-regency with the Father over the entire earth, including the Roman Empire, and is a repeated image throughout the NT in reference to the universal sovereignty of Christ.¹⁸ Christ himself claimed that he had been granted “all authority in heaven and on earth” after his resurrection (Matt 28:18).

A cloud carried Jesus up to the Father at his ascension as a visual sign of the fulfillment of Dan 7:13–14 in which the Son of Man comes before the

¹⁶ Similarly, R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 1027–28; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 524–26; Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term “Son of Man” and Its Use in St Mark’s Gospel* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967) 163–73; John A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957; repr. 1979) 43–52; T. F. Glasson, “The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark XIV.62),” *NTS* 7 (1960) 88–93.

¹⁷ See below for clarification on this understanding of Dan 9:26.

¹⁸ Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62; 16:19; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:32–35; 5:31; 7:55–56; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:21–22. The imagery of a king seated at the right hand of his god as a co-ruler is also found in Egyptian iconography. Othmar Keel draws attention to a limestone statue of Pharaoh Horemheb seated at the right hand of his god, Horus. See Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (trans. Timothy J. Hallett; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997) 263. J. de Savignac similarly notes the parallel, citing as an example the dyadic statue of Thutmose III and Amun discovered in the cachette at Karnak. See J. de Savignac, “Théologie pharaonique et messianisme d’Israël,” *VT* 7 (1957) 83.

Ancient of Days to receive the kingdom (Acts 1:9; cf. Luke 24:51; Acts 1:2; Mark 16:19). Although Jesus is also described as returning with clouds at his second coming (Acts 1:11; 1 Thess 4:15–17; Rev 14:14–16), these verses describe Christ's *coming down to earth* at the consummation of his kingdom, not his *coming before the throne of God in heaven* to receive a universal, eternal kingdom as in Daniel 7.¹⁹ Even Jesus' allusion to Dan 7:13 in the Olivet Discourse can be understood not as a reference to his return, but rather as a way of saying that the destruction of the temple and the gathering of the elect from the ends of the earth beginning within the living generation would be an earthly manifestation of his heavenly enthronement (Matt 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27).²⁰ John recognized Jesus Christ as already being "the ruler of the kings of earth" when he composed the book of Revelation (Rev 1:5).²¹

Since Jesus and the NT authors apply Dan 7:13 to the enthronement of Christ at his first coming, and since there is no significant overlap between the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel's vision, the fulfillment of the end of the fourth kingdom as signified by the destruction of the fourth beast (7:11) should again be sought in connection with the inauguration of the fifth kingdom by Christ in the first century. The objection that historical Rome did not come to an end in the first century has already been addressed above. The central theme of Daniel 2–7 indicates that the end of a kingdom in the vision corresponds to the end of that kingdom's God-given universal dominion over the kingdom of man.

Furthermore, the significance of the slaying of the fourth beast in the vision (Dan 7:11) is provided explicitly by the inspired interpretation (7:26b): "and his dominion will be taken away." In the symbolic world of the vision, the beast is destroyed (7:11); in the interpretation of this symbolism, the dominion or sovereignty of the fourth kingdom is taken away (7:26b). In Daniel's schema, this dominion (7:26b) is the universal dominion of the "kingdom of man" which is taken from the fourth kingdom (7:11, 26b) and given to the fifth kingdom (7:14a, 22b, 27a). The inspired interpretation of the vision confirms that the removal of universal dominion from the fourth kingdom need not entail its physical destruction in history.²² Therefore, the destruction of the fourth beast before the inauguration of the fifth kingdom in the symbolic

¹⁹ Furthermore, the timing of the appearance of Jesus in the clouds is a secondary issue, because the imagery of Dan 7:13 belongs to a vision of symbols of future reality, not a vision of future reality itself. The fifth kingdom could have been inaugurated without the Son of Man ever flying on the clouds, just as the other four kingdoms were not actually beasts coming out of a sea (Dan 7:3).

²⁰ For exegesis supporting this last point, see especially R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971; repr. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998) 140, 227–239; idem, *Divine Government: God's Kingship in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SPCK, 1990) 64–84; idem, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 530–35; idem, *Gospel of Matthew* 889–928; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* 360–64.

²¹ The non-parousia view of Dan 7:13–14 is also attested in the early church. Cyprian understands Dan 7:13–14 to describe the eternal power Jesus received at his resurrection (*Test.* 2.26; AD 248), and Lactantius applies Dan 7:13 to the cloud at Jesus' ascension (*Div. Inst.* 4.21; early fourth century), as pointed out by France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* 211.

²² This understanding is further confirmed by the observation that the rest of the beasts are eaten, shattered, and trampled by the fourth beast when it replaces the third beast in the symbolic

world of the vision is consistent with the understanding that universal dominion over the kingdom of man was taken away from the Roman Empire and given to Christ in the first century.

An objection to this understanding of Daniel 7 might be raised on the basis of John's adoption of Daniel's imagery of the fourth beast to describe a beast which will ultimately be thrown alive into the lake of fire at the return of Christ (Rev 13:1; 19:19–20). Since John's beast borrows imagery from Daniel's fourth beast, and since John's beast lives until the return of Christ, it could be argued that Daniel's fourth beast must also live until the return of Christ. It would follow that the destruction of the fourth beast (Dan 7:11, 26b) and the enthronement of the Son of Man (Dan 7:13–14a) are fulfilled at the return of Christ rather than at his first coming. The NT evidence which indicates that the enthronement of the Son of Man occurred already at Christ's first coming could then be explained by appeal to an "already/not-yet" fulfillment of the prophecy. The enthronement of Christ would be fulfilled in a preliminary sense at Christ's first coming (the "already"), and in a final sense at Christ's second coming (the "not-yet").

The interpreter who adopts this double-fulfillment approach must decide whether the eleven kings of Daniel's fourth kingdom precede the initial enthronement at Christ's first coming or the final enthronement at Christ's second coming, since the eleven kings (Dan 7:7–8) precede the enthronement of the Son of Man (Dan 7:13–14a) in the narrative sequence of the prophecy. If the eleven kings are understood to precede the *initial* enthronement at Christ's first coming, then the eleven kings correspond to the historical Roman Empire, and there is little difference from the interpretation adopted below. If the eleven kings are understood to precede the *final* enthronement at Christ's second coming, the interpreter will have to decide whether the eleven kings rule only in a future period just before the return of Christ or rule during the whole period from the end of Greece until the return of Christ. Those who maintain that the eleven kings rule in a future period must insert a large gap between Daniel's third and fourth kingdoms without exegetical warrant, especially since the fourth kingdom conquers the third kingdom (Greece) in the vision (Dan 7:7, 19, 23). Those who claim that the eleven kings span the period from the end of Greece until the return of Christ have the burden of explaining why the NT authors present Jesus as having been enthroned and granted universal dominion over heaven and earth at his first coming when in fact Daniel's fourth kingdom still has God-given universal dominion according to this interpretation of Daniel's schema. Since Daniel's vision admits of no overlap between the fourth and fifth kingdoms, it is special pleading to contend that the NT authors understood both Daniel's fourth kingdom and the exalted Son of Man to have been granted universal dominion. Consequently, even if the destruction of the fourth beast and the enthronement of the Son of Man (Dan 7:9–14) are understood in terms of already/not-yet fulfillment, the simplest solution would still be to maintain that the eleven kings of Daniel's

world of the vision (7:7a, 19, 23), yet these other beasts are still assumed to exist when they are brought before the throne of the Ancient of Days (7:12).

fourth kingdom precede the *initial* enthronement of the Son of Man at his first coming.

In any case, John's use of Daniel's fourth-kingdom imagery (e.g. Rev 13:1) does not actually require Daniel's fourth kingdom to extend until the return of Christ. John is not simply describing Daniel's fourth kingdom by adopting some of Daniel's imagery. The complexity of John's imagery demands a more nuanced explanation. In fact, John describes his beast by borrowing imagery from Daniel's three other beasts as well (Rev 13:2), and these three beasts represent the undisputedly *historical* kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece within Daniel's five-kingdom schema. The real question, then, is: why does John employ the imagery of these historical kingdoms to describe his beast? Since John blends all of Daniel's beasts into a single beast which thrives even after Jesus has inaugurated his kingdom at his first coming, John most probably based his beast imagery upon Daniel's statement that the three previously dethroned beasts (Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece) are granted an extension of life at the inauguration of the kingdom of the Son of Man (Dan 7:12). Since John's beast incorporates imagery from Daniel's fourth beast as well (Rev 13:1), John apparently assumed that the fourth beast must be revived after its foreseen destruction (Dan 7:11, 26b) and granted an extension of life during the kingdom of the Son of Man along with the three other dethroned beasts.²³ John's assumption would be reasonable in his time since the Roman Empire had survived the inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah.

John's beast, then, represents the Satan-empowered kingdoms which continue to exist *after* the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom (Dan 7:12), but which no longer exercise God-given universal dominion over the kingdom of man as in Daniel's five-kingdom schema, since this dominion now belongs to the Messiah (Dan 7:14a; Rev 1:5). These evil kingdoms correspond to the enemies who must be subdued *during* the Messianic kingdom as described in other passages (Ps 110:1–2; 1 Cor 15:25; Heb 10:12–13).

By contrast, Daniel's fourth beast represents a *single* kingdom with God-given universal dominion (Dan 7:7a, 19, 23) which is revoked (Dan 7:11, 26b) *before* the inauguration of the messianic kingdom (Dan 7:13–14a, 22b, 27a).²⁴ Consequently, Daniel's fourth beast can be both fulfilled entirely by the historical Roman Empire and be legitimately incorporated into John's beast as representative of the dethroned evil kingdoms which have been granted an extension of life until the consummation of the kingdom of the Son of Man, when all nations will bow to the Messiah (Dan 7:14b, 27b). In other words, the universal sovereignty of Daniel's fourth kingdom with its eleven kings has *already* been revoked (Dan 7:9–11), the Son of Man has *already* been granted universal dominion over the kingdom of man instead (Dan 7:13–14a),

²³ John's comment that one of the heads of the beast had been fatally wounded but was then healed (Rev 13:3, 12, 14) may represent this revival of the dethroned fourth beast, but the complexity of the imagery hinders certainty.

²⁴ John indicates a distinction between Daniel's fourth beast and his own beast in other ways. For example, Daniel's fourth beast is slain and *destroyed* (Dan 7:11), whereas John's beast is slain and *revived* (Rev 13:3, 12, 14). Daniel's fourth beast is ultimately *slain* and given to the fire (Dan 7:11), whereas John's beast is ultimately thrown *alive* into the fire (Rev 19:20).

but the dethroned nations which have been granted an extension of life during the messianic kingdom (7:12) are *not yet* serving him (7:14b, 27b). This understanding of the already / not-yet fulfillment of the messianic kingdom accounts more fully for both the NT evidence and the prophetic narrative sequence of Daniel 7.

The transition between the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 7 is therefore best understood as fulfilled in the inauguration of the messianic kingdom during the first-century Roman Empire, just as in Daniel 2. Consequently, the fulfillment of the description of the fourth kingdom (Dan 7:7–8, 19–21, 23–25) should be sought in the historical Roman Empire, and may include the destruction of the temple in AD 70 on the basis of Jesus' use of Dan 7:13 in the section of the Olivet Discourse which describes events to occur in his generation (Matt 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27). There is no warrant in the description of the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 7 for interpreting the end of Daniel 11 as a description of events at the second coming.

3. The fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 9. Although the meaning of the seventy weeks prophecy in Dan 9:24–27 has long been a matter of debate, the interpretation adopted here depends largely on the excellent analysis presented recently by Peter J. Gentry.²⁵ The seventy heptads (9:24) refer to the seventy consecutive sabbatical cycles beginning in 457 BC with Artaxerxes's renewal of Cyrus's decree (Ezra 1:1–4; 6:14; 7:11–26) and ending in AD 34, with the crucifixion of Christ occurring halfway through the seventieth sabbatical cycle in about AD 31.²⁶ The six infinitives in 9:24 which describe the outcome of the seventy sabbatical cycles thus began to be fulfilled in the inauguration of the messianic kingdom by Christ (i.e. Daniel's fifth kingdom) which accomplishes a new exodus. The "anointed ruler" (מְשִׁיחַ הַמֶּלֶךְ) in Dan 9:25 refers to Christ. Verses 9:26–27 follow an A-B-A-B pattern in which the A-A lines describe the vicarious death of the Messiah and the confirmation of the new covenant, while the B-B lines describe the desecration of Jerusalem by Jews and the resulting destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in AD 67–70:

- | | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 9:26a | A | And after the sixty-two sabbatical cycles (AD 27), the Messiah will be cut off, but not for himself (<i>vicarious death of the Messiah c. AD 31</i>). |
| 9:26b | B | And the people (<i>Jews</i>) of the coming ruler (<i>the Messiah</i>) will ruin the city (<i>Jerusalem</i>) and the sanctuary (<i>temple</i>), and its end (<i>destruction of Jerusalem and temple</i>) will come with a flood (<i>Vespasian's armies</i>), and until the end (<i>of Jerusalem and the temple</i>) there will be war (AD 67–70); desolations (<i>of Jerusalem and temple</i>) are what is decided. |

²⁵ Peter J. Gentry, "Daniel's Seventy Weeks and the New Exodus," *SBJT* 14/1 (2010) 26–44.

²⁶ Thus in Mark 1:15 when Jesus announces that "the time has been fulfilled and the kingdom of God has come," he may be announcing the arrival of Daniel's seventieth sabbatical cycle. The date of the crucifixion is usually calculated from the Gospels to be either AD 30 or 33, but in either case the prophecy is accurate to within half of a sabbatical cycle.

- 9:27a A And he will confirm a covenant (*the new covenant*) for the many in one sabbatical cycle (*in the seventieth cycle, AD 27–34*), and after half of the sabbatical cycle (c. AD 31), He will put an end to sacrifice and offering (*by his once-for-all sacrifice*).
- 9:27b B And at the height of abominations (*committed by the Jews against Jerusalem and temple in 9:26b*) will come a desolator (*Vespasian*), even until a complete destruction and that which is decided (*the “desolations” in 9:26b*) is poured out upon the one being desolated (*Jerusalem and temple*).

The warrant for understanding the “flood” imagery in 9:26b as a reference to overflowing armies arises from the use of the same root (שטף) in Dan 11:10, 22, 26, 40. The “desolator” in 9:27b is identified specifically as Vespasian rather than Titus on the basis of the analysis of Dan 11:40–45 below, although the difference is not significant in the context of 9:26–27.²⁷

The atoning death of the Messiah described in the A-A lines is explicitly predicted to occur in the seventieth sabbatical cycle (AD 27–34), whereas the timing of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is not explicitly stated in the B-B lines, so that the destruction may occur later (AD 70) without deviation from the prophecy.²⁸ Nevertheless, the A-B-A-B structure links these two events together as two stages of the inauguration of Daniel’s fifth kingdom in which the goals of 9:24 are to be fulfilled.²⁹ It is therefore reasonable to expect that the descriptions of the transition between the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 2, 7, and 11 may also involve the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in AD 70.

4. *Summary of the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 2, 7, and 9.* The fifth kingdom begins with the “destruction” of the universal sovereignty of the fourth kingdom and enthronement of “one like a son of man” over the kingdom of man (Daniel 2, 7). This transfer of dominion, ironically, will involve the Christ being “cut off” and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (Daniel 9). The NT understands Daniel’s fifth kingdom to have been inaugurated in the context of the fourth-kingdom Roman Empire, with the universal

²⁷ Young, *Prophecy of Daniel* 218–19 identifies the “desolator” as Titus and “that which is being desolated” as the city and temple, but his identification of the “wing of abominations” as a reference to the pinnacle of the temple seems forced. The parallelism suggests that the “abominations” (9:27b) refer not to the temple itself (or figuratively to worship therein), but rather to that ruination which is brought upon the temple and city by the people of the Messiah (9:26b).

²⁸ The phrase “the people of the coming ruler” (9:26b) refers collectively to the Jews, and probably implies a reference to the same generation of Jews who see the Messiah cut off (9:26a). The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (the B-B lines) are thus predicted to occur in the same generation as the cutting off of the Messiah (the A-A lines). Not surprisingly, then, Jesus indicates that the temple will be destroyed in his generation (Matt 24:34; Mark 13:30; Luke 21:32).

²⁹ The NT likewise links the crucifixion of Christ and the destruction of the temple through the tearing of the veil which foreshadows the impending judgment on the temple (Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45). Jesus’ saying that he would rebuild the temple in three days also implies a link between the destruction of the temple and his crucifixion and resurrection (John 2:18–22; cf. Matt 26:61; Mark 15:29; Acts 6:14).

sovereignty of the exalted Christ superseding the power of Rome. The broader context of the book of Daniel therefore suggests that the fulfillment of the fourth-kingdom segment of Daniel 11 should be sought in historical Rome rather than at the second coming.

IV. PLACEMENT OF 11:36–39 IN THE FIVE-KINGDOM SCHEMA

The question of whether the description of the king (11:36–39) continues the description of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (11:21–35) or belongs with the description of the “time of the end” (11:40–12:3) should be answered on exegetical rather than historical grounds, since there is notable disagreement among interpreters as to whether or not the description of the king matches what is known about Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

The subject of the narrative switches from the persecution of the *maskilim* in 11:33–35 to “the king” in 11:36–39. This shift in subject raises the question of whether or not there is a corresponding shift in time from the third kingdom to the fourth kingdom. The final phrase of 11:35 (עֲדָתָהּ קִין כִּי־עוֹר לְמוֹעֵד) does not necessarily push the focus of 11:36 to the “time of the end,” because nearly the same phrase is used at the end of 11:27 (כִּי־עוֹר קִין לְמוֹעֵד) without shifting the focus of 11:28 to the “time of the end.” Nevertheless, the phrase at the end of 11:35 does allow for the possibility that 11:36–39 describes events in the “time of the end.”

The subject of the narrative again switches in 11:40–45 to the “king of the south” and the “king of the north” at the “time of the end.” The phrase “in the time of the end” (וּבְעֵת קִין) in 11:40 appears to mark off 11:40–12:3 as a description of the “time of the end” involving the fourth and fifth kingdoms. However, the introductory phrase קִין וּבְעֵת קִין may or may not indicate a gap in time or a shift from the third kingdom to the fourth kingdom between 11:39 and 11:40. In other words, although the phrase קִין וּבְעֵת קִין functions to identify 11:40–12:3 as a description of the “time of the end,” the phrase does not necessarily indicate that 11:36–39 should be grouped instead with the preceding material in terms of the five-kingdom schema. It is still possible that 11:36–39 describes fourth-kingdom events which lead up to the “time of the end” in 11:40–12:3. There is an indication in 11:40 that this latter option is indeed the case. The antecedent of the 3ms pronominal suffix on עָמֹ in 11:40 is most plausibly “the king” of 11:36–39 in terms of a straightforward reading of the narrative, a fact which nearly requires 11:36–39 to be grouped with the fourth-kingdom events of 11:40–45.

The suggestion that the description of the king (11:36–39) belongs to the fourth kingdom rather than the third kingdom is also confirmed by the allusion in 11:36 to the description of the fourth- and fifth-kingdom events described in the seventy weeks prophecy (9:26–27). The phrase “until the indignation is complete, for what has been decided will be done” (עַד־כָּלָה זַעַם כִּי נִחְרָצָה נִעְשְׂתָהּ) in 11:36 alludes to phrases in 9:26b and 9:27b (the B-B lines in the A-B-A-B structure of 9:26–27):

and until the end will be war;
desolations are *what is decided*

וְעַד קִין מִלְחָמָה נִחְרָצָה שְׁמֹמֹת 9:26b

and until a complete destruction and *what is decided*

וְעַד-כָּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה תִּתֵּן עַל-שָׁמַיִם 9:27b

is poured out upon the one being desolated

until the indignation is complete,

עַד-כָּלָה זַעַם כִּי נִחְרָצָה נִעֲשֶׂתָהּ 11:36b

for *what has been decided* will be done

The clearest indication that an allusion to 9:26–27 is intended in 11:36 is the use of the verb *חרץ*, which occurs only eleven times in the MT and only these three times in the book of Daniel.³⁰ Given the rarity of the verb *חרץ* and the availability of more common synonyms, the most probable explanation for the use of *חרץ* in 11:36 is that an allusion is intended to the two prior instances of the same verb in 9:26–27. The three instances of *חרץ* are even of the same morphological form: feminine singular Niphal participles. The allusion suggests that the king (11:36–39) is somehow connected with the events described in the B-B lines of 9:26–27, rather than Antiochus IV.

V. THE FULFILLMENT OF DANIEL 11:36–12:3

If the above exegetical analysis has merit, then the text of 11:36–45 should align with events relating to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the fourth-kingdom Roman Empire, while 12:1–3 would be understood as a description of the fifth-kingdom. The following verse-by-verse exposition demonstrates such an alignment between the prophecy and known history.³¹ A fresh translation, exegetical considerations, and historical fulfillment will be presented for each verse.

1. *Daniel 11:36–37: The self-exalting king.*

a. *Translation.* “³⁶And the king will act according to his will, so that he will exalt himself and magnify himself over every god, and against the God of gods he will speak extraordinary things, and he will show prosperity until indignation is finished, for what has been decided will be done. ³⁷And he will not give heed to the God of his fathers, and he will not give heed to the desire of women nor to any god, for he will magnify himself over all.”

b. *Exegetical considerations.* This king is not the first to be described as acting “according to his will” in the Writing of Truth (11:3, Alexander the Great; 11:16, Antiochus III). The phrase is also used of the ram which represents Medo-Persia in Dan 8:4, 20. The little horn of Dan 8:11 (Antiochus IV) also “magnified himself” against the Prince of the host. The only other king in Daniel who is said to “show prosperity” (Hiphil of *צלה*) is likewise the third-kingdom little horn (8:12, 24). These various verbal similarities to

³⁰ Exod 11:7; Josh 10:21; 2 Sam 5:24; 1 Kgs 20:40; Job 14:5; Isa 10:22; 10:23; 28:22; Dan 9:26; 9:27; 11:36.

³¹ Useful summaries of this war between the Jews and the Romans include Anson F. Rainey and R. Steven Notley, *The Sacred Bridge: Carta's Atlas of the Biblical World* (Jerusalem: Carta, 2006) 383–95; E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden: Brill, 1976; repr. 2001) 293–330; Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; rev. ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973) 1:484–513.

Daniel 8 suggest that the king described in 11:36–39 may be a fourth-kingdom antitype of the third-kingdom little horn in Daniel 8.

The noun used for “indignation” (זַעַם) in Dan 11:36 almost always refers to the indignation of God rather than men in the OT, and here the “indignation” may refer specifically to the desolation brought upon the city and the temple by means of the war (i.e. “what has been decided”) as predicted in 9:26b. However, the noun זַעַם also occurs in Dan 8:19 when Gabriel tells Daniel that he is making known to him what will occur “in the latter part of the indignation, for it pertains to the appointed time of the end” (בְּאַחֲרִית הַזַּעַם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ). Since “the indignation” of God involves both the third-kingdom ruler Antiochus IV and the fourth-kingdom king of 11:36–39, a broader referent is probably in view for “the indignation” than just the desolation predicted in 9:26b.

Gentry has helpfully pointed out that the time of God’s indignation mentioned in Dan 8:19 refers to an extended period of subjugation of God’s people by foreign overlords to occur before the new exodus, a view which can be supported by the use of the same root (זַעַם) in Zech 1:12 to describe the seventy years under Babylonian rule.³² Thus Dan 8:19 and 11:36 are indicating that the foreign rulers predicted in Daniel 8 and 11 are manifestations of God’s wrath associated with the time between the physical return from exile accomplished through Cyrus (Isa 44:24–48:22; cf. Deut 30:4–5) and the spiritual return from exile accomplished through the Suffering Servant (Isa 49:1–53:12; cf. Deut 30:6–8). The six purposes of the seventy sabbatical cycles in Dan 9:24 correspond to the spiritual return from exile, as do the events predicted in connection with the seventieth sabbatical cycle in 9:26–27: the vicarious death of the Messiah and the complete destruction of the city and sanctuary.³³ Consequently, the use of זַעַם in Dan 11:36 indicates that the king will prosper until the end of the spiritual exile and foreign subjugation, and that he is probably involved in the events described in Dan 9:26–27 which bring an end to the spiritual exile according to 9:24.

It has already been shown above that the next phrase, “what has been decided will be done,” alludes to the B-B lines of Dan 9:26–27 through the rare verb חָרַץ (“decide”). Since חָרַץ (“decide”) occurs twice in Isa 10:22–23, in the same context in which זַעַם (“be indignant”) is used of God’s indignation upon Israel mediated through Assyria (Isa 10:5, 25), it is likely that all three instances of חָרַץ (“decide”) in Daniel (9:26–27; 11:36) are in fact alluding to Isaiah 10:20–23, which speaks of the return of the remnant of Israel which is left after an annihilation which has been decided (חָרַץ) and after a complete destruction which is decided (בְּכֻלָּהּ וּבְנִחְרָצָה). Thus Dan 9:26–27 and 11:36ff reveal the details of the complete, determined destruction mentioned already by Isaiah 10:22–23, from which only a remnant of Israel will return to Yahweh. The subjugation of Israel to the Assyrians in Isaiah 10 can be viewed

³² Gentry, “Daniel’s Seventy Weeks and the New Exodus” 32, 42. See also זַעַם used in Isa 10:5, 25 of God’s indignation against his people to be mediated through Assyria, and in Isa 13:5 of God’s indignation against Babylon to be mediated through the Medes.

³³ For the two-staged return from exile in Isaiah and its development in Daniel 9, see further Gentry, “Daniel’s Seventy Weeks and the New Exodus” 31–34.

as a forerunner of the complete destruction of Israel (save a remnant) to be brought about by Daniel's fourth kingdom (cf. Dan 12:7).

The king of 11:36–39 is not presented as one of the fourth-kingdom foreign rulers who mediates God's indignation upon Israel, however. The phrase "God of (one's) father(s)" occurs sixty times in the MT and always refers to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.³⁴ The expression is essentially synonymous with Yahweh, and when the expression involves a plural "fathers," the "fathers" envisioned are specifically Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 3:15). Since the king of 11:36–37 is said not to give heed to the "God of his fathers," he should be a descendent of Abraham whose God is Yahweh.³⁵ Therefore, 11:36–37 predicts that a Jewish king will exalt himself over every god and will prosper until God's indignation has been completely poured out upon Jerusalem and the temple through a war, assuming the allusion to 9:26b is valid.

The statement that the king will not give heed to the "desire of women," or perhaps "one desired by women" (חֲמֻדַּת נָשִׁים), is ambiguous. Since the context suggests a reference to a pagan deity, modern commentators often follow the suggestion of G. H. A. von Ewald that the phrase refers to Tammuz (cf. Ezek 8:14), although other deities have been proposed as well.³⁶ Other commentators understand the phrase in terms of the nature of the king's desire for women, although the ambiguity of the wording allows for two different interpretations of the nature of the king's desire for women, a fact recognized already in the time of Jerome.³⁷ The statement could mean either that the king will lust for women, or that the king will have no desire for women, since in either case the king would be disregarding a proper desire for women.

c. Historical fulfillment. The Jewish king who prospered right down to the end of the city and temple in AD 70 was the tyrant John of Gischala, the leader of one of three insurgent factions who were at war with each other for control of Jerusalem, and who forced the Romans to subdue the entire region by military force. Josephus portrays John as breaking from the coalition of Zealots in order to set himself up as a sovereign king, at which he succeeds to a measurable degree:

But now John, aspiring to despotic power, began to disdain the position of mere equality in honours with his peers, and, gradually gathering round him a group of the more depraved, broke away from the coalition. Invariably disregarding the decisions of the rest, and issuing imperious orders of his own, he was evidently laying claim to absolute sovereignty [μοναρχία]. Some yielded to him

³⁴ Gen 31:5, 29, 42, 53; 32:10; 43:23; 46:1, 3; 50:17; Exod 3:6, 13, 15f; 4:5; 15:2; 18:4; Deut 1:11, 21; 4:1; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7; 27:3; 29:24; Josh 18:3; Judg 2:12; 2 Kgs 21:22; 1 Chr 5:25; 12:18; 28:9; 29:20; 2 Chr 7:22; 11:16; 13:12, 18; 14:3; 15:12; 17:4; 19:4; 20:6, 33; 21:10; 24:18, 24; 28:6, 9, 25; 29:5; 30:7, 19, 22; 33:12; 34:32–33; 36:15; Ezra 7:27; 8:28; 10:11; Dan 11:37.

³⁵ Similarly Young, although he applies the passage to the Antichrist (*Prophecy of Daniel* 249). Steinmann rightly recognizes that the phrase refers to Yahweh, but denies that the king will necessarily be Jewish because "this phrase is not an ethnic identification, but a religious one" (*Daniel* 541–42). This distinction is questionable within the OT context, and Daniel would have understood the phrase to be used with respect to a descendent of the fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

³⁶ Georg Heinrich August von Ewald, *Commentary on the Books of Haggai, Zakharya, Mal'aki, Yona, Barukh, Daniel*, vol. 5 of Ewald's *Prophets of the Old Testament*; vol. 26 of *Theological Translation Fund Library* (trans. J. Frederick Smith; London: Williams and Norgate, 1881) 303.

³⁷ Jerome, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* 138.

through fear, others from devotion (for he was an expert in gaining supporters by fraud and rhetoric); a large number thought that it would conduce to their own safety that the blame for their daring crimes should henceforth rest upon one individual rather than upon many; while his energy both of body and mind procured him not a few retainers. On the other hand, he was abandoned by a large section of antagonists, partly influenced by envy—they scorned subjection to a former equal—but mainly deterred by dread of monarchical rule; for they could not expect easily to depose him when once in power, and thought that they would have an excuse for themselves if they opposed him at the outset. Anyhow, each man preferred war, whatever sufferings it might entail, to voluntary servitude and being killed off like slaves.³⁸

Even the presence of antagonists shows that John was indeed setting up monarchical rule, since dread of monarchical rule was the main reason for some rejecting John's leadership.

John exalted himself over every god and spoke extraordinary things against the God of gods in his treatment of the temple. One example of his sacrilege can be seen in the following excerpt from Josephus:

John, when the plunder from the people failed him, had recourse to sacrilege, melting down many of the temple-offerings and many of the vessels required for public worship, bowls and salvers and tables; nor did he abstain from the vessels for pure wine sent by Augustus and his consort. For the Roman sovereigns ever honoured and added embellishment to the temple, whereas this Jew now pulled down even the donations of foreigners, remarking to his companions that they should not scruple to employ divine things on the Divinity's behalf, and that those who fought for the temple should be supported by it. He accordingly drew every drop of the sacred wine and of the oil, which the priests kept for pouring upon the burnt-offerings and which stood in the inner temple, and distributed these to his horde, who without horror anointed themselves and drank therefrom. Nor can I here refrain from uttering what my emotion bids me say. I believe that, had the Romans delayed to punish these reprobates, either the earth would have opened and swallowed up the city, or it would have been swept away by a flood, or have tasted anew the thunderbolts of the land of Sodom.³⁹

John's blatant misuse of the sacred utensils demonstrates his prideful self-exaltation against the God of gods. Daniel interpreted Belshazzar's similar misuse of the sacred vessels as a self-exaltation "against the Lord of heaven" (Dan 5:23), and Belshazzar's punishment was the end of his kingdom (5:24–30).

John of Gischala can also be understood to be a king who did "not give heed to the desire of women," regardless of which interpretation of the phrase is adopted. With all of Josephus's negative commentary on John (e.g. *J.W.* 2.585–89; 7.263–64), one would expect Josephus to have mentioned idolatry if John had been a worshipper of a recognized pagan deity such as Tammuz.

³⁸ Josephus *The Jewish War* 4.389–94 (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, under the title *The Jewish War*, Books III–IV, LCL 487; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927; repr. 2006) 270–71. Interestingly, in the passage immediately preceding this quotation, Josephus claims that the Zealots, with whom John aligns himself before setting himself up as a king (*J.W.* 4.208–16), are fulfilling an inspired prophecy which may refer to Dan 9:26–27 (or 11:36–45; *J.W.* 4.381–88).

³⁹ Josephus *The Jewish War* 5.562–66a (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, under the title *The Jewish War*, Books V–VII, LCL 210; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928; repr. 2006) 174–77.

John's lack of an appropriate desire for women can be seen in his abandonment of the women and children in the middle of his flight from Titus to Jerusalem (*J.W.* 4.103–11), and also in his allowing his Galilean contingent in Jerusalem to rape women for sport, to indulge in effeminate practices, and to imitate the passions of women (*J.W.* 4.558–63).⁴⁰

2. *Daniel 11:38: The king's god of fortresses.*

a. *Translation.* "And he will honor instead a god of fortresses, and he will honor a god whom his fathers did not know with gold and with silver and with precious stone, and with desirable things."

b. *Exegetical considerations.* The tension between the statement that the king would not give heed to any god (11:37) and the statement that the king would honor a god of fortresses (11:38) suggests that the god of fortresses is not a conventionally recognized deity but rather an innovation on the part of the king. The king's god of fortresses could represent the king's worship of military power and war (cf. *Hab* 1:11).⁴¹ The king's offerings of gold, silver, and precious stones to the god of fortresses (*Dan* 11:38) could be figurative for the resources which the king invests in building his military power.

Another possibility is that the Jewish king's "god of fortresses" refers to his distorted conception of Yahweh which has become the king's idol. The king has

⁴⁰ An objection might be raised against the identification of the king of *Dan* 11:36 as John of Gischala on the basis of Paul's probable allusion to *Dan* 11:36–37 in his description of the "man of lawlessness" (2 *Thess* 2:3–4), whom the Lord "will destroy with the breath of his mouth and will abolish by the appearance of his coming" (2 *Thess* 2:8). Although the Lord's *parousia* did not occur in the time of John of Gischala, this objection is not decisive. One possibility could be that Paul adopts the language of the prediction of John of Gischala in *Dan* 11:36–37 in order to describe the man of lawlessness as a second, greater fulfillment who will be revealed just before Christ's return. Such a typology would be consistent with the broader NT theme in which the destruction of apostate Jerusalem in AD 70 prefigures end-time judgment. A second possibility could be that Paul's prediction of a man of lawlessness was fulfilled by John of Gischala. Paul warns that "the mystery of lawlessness is already at work," which may mean that Paul understood the "man of lawlessness" to be living in his generation, though not yet revealed at the time of his epistle (2 *Thess* 2:7a). That which "restrained" John of Gischala was the Roman Empire, which was "taken out of the way" with the deaths of Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius in AD 68–69 (2 *Thess* 2:7b; cf. *Dan* 2:33b, 41–43; 7:8, 20b, 24b), at which point John of Gischala was "revealed" as he rose to power in Jerusalem (2 *Thess* 2:8a). The destruction of the man of lawlessness at the Lord's *parousia* (2 *Thess* 2:8b) could refer to John's final judgment at Christ's return, since the relative clause simply functions to describe "the lawless one" and does not necessarily imply that the Lord will return *immediately* upon the revelation of the man of lawlessness. Josephus records how the tyrants (such as John) used false prophets to delude the people, who ignored or misread real signs of the coming destruction (2 *Thess* 2:9–10; Josephus *J.W.* 1.28; 2.650; 6.285–301; cf. *Mark* 13:21–22; *Matt* 24:23–24). This interpretation of the passage would still be consistent with Paul's claim that it was fallacious for the Thessalonians in AD 50–51 to believe that the *parousia* of the Lord had already come since *Dan* 11:36–37 had not yet been fulfilled (2 *Thess* 2:1–4), since John was not revealed until AD 67–70. A third possibility would be to understand the man of lawlessness along these same lines, but to interpret his destruction as John's downfall in history and the "appearance of His coming" as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 as a prefigurative manifestation of Christ's final *parousia*. Several reasonable interpretations of 2 *Thess* 2:1–12 are therefore compatible with the view that *Dan* 11:36–37 predicts John of Gischala.

⁴¹ Young (*Prophecy of Daniel* 249), Miller (*Daniel* 308), and others commentators argue similarly, but apply the verse to the Antichrist.

invented an idolatrous version of Yahweh who is concerned with fortresses, and especially with the preservation of the temple in Jerusalem.⁴² Thus the king honors Yahweh in name but not in truth, since the real Yahweh has in fact determined to destroy the temple (Dan 9:26–27).⁴³

c. Historical fulfillment. John's actions are consistent with both of these interpretations of the god of fortresses, which are not mutually exclusive explanations. John worshipped military power and invested all of his resources in war with Simon and Eleazar and the Romans, even to the point of plundering the temple. John pillaged the sacred instruments in the temple which were used to serve Yahweh in order to serve his war instead. He exploited the temple offerings of both Jews and foreigners (*J.W.* 5.562–66, quoted above). Thus John quite literally served his god of military power with precious metals and stones and desirable things from Yahweh's temple.

John's ruthless use of the temple as a fortress also demonstrates that he had transformed Yahweh into a "god of fortresses," since converting Yahweh's sanctuary into a fortress is tantamount to saying that Yahweh is a "god of fortresses." John's conception of Yahweh was distorted, idolatrous, and ignorant of the fact that God had already determined to destroy the city and sanctuary (Dan 9:26–27; cf. *J.W.* 4.381–88; 6.98, 109–10).

3. Daniel 11:39: The king's action against the strongest fortress.

a. Translation. "And he [the king] will take action against the strongest fortress with a foreign god; whoever will acknowledge him [the foreign god] will increase honor, and he [the foreign god] will cause them to rule over the many, and he [the foreign god] will apportion land for a price."

b. Exegetical considerations. The adversarial use of the verb עָשָׂה elsewhere in the Writing of Truth (11:7, 28, 30, 32) suggests that the *lamed* in the expression מְבַצְרֵי מַעְזִים should be understood as a *lamed dativus incommodi*. The construct package מְבַצְרֵי מַעְזִים contains two nearly synonymous nouns which are found throughout the Writing of Truth (מְבַצֵּר, "fortification" and מַעְזוֹ, "fortress") so that a superlative genitive seems to be intended, with the referent standing in contrast to all of the previously mentioned fortresses.⁴⁴ However, the construct noun in a standard superlative genitive construction would normally be singular (e.g. קִדְשׁ הַקִּדְשִׁים), so that the plural form מְבַצְרֵי is unexpected and ambiguous. What is proposed here is that the plural form of מְבַצְרֵי is either a plural of extension (signifying a large or complex fortification) or an intensive plural (signifying the great strength of the fortification), so that the bound phrase מְבַצְרֵי מַעְזִים refers to the single most-fortified fortress in the same way that אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱלֹהִים refers to the single highest God (Deut 10:17) or שְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם refers to the highest heaven (1 Kgs 8:27). This "strongest fortress" has already been mentioned in Dan 11:31 as the "sanctuary fortress" (הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז) attacked by forces from the king of the north (Antiochus IV); in other

⁴² For the king's conception of the temple as a fortress, see the discussion of Daniel 11:39 below.

⁴³ Compare Jeroboam's innovation in 1 Kgs 12:28.

⁴⁴ The noun מְבַצֵּר ("fortification") occurs in 11:15, 24, and מַעְזוֹ ("fortress") occurs in 11:1 (figuratively), 7, 10, 19, 31, 38.

words, this phrase is a reference to the temple (cf. Ezek 24:25).⁴⁵ Paul also locates the man of lawlessness in the temple (2 Thess 2:3–4), and Jesus locates the “abomination of desolation” in the temple (Matt 24:15; cf. Dan 9:27 OG, Theod.), so it should not be surprising to find a reference to the temple in Dan 11:36–39.⁴⁶

The “foreign god” is most probably the “god of fortresses whom his father did not know” from the previous verse. The phrase “foreign god” always refers to idols.⁴⁷ Given the wordplay between “foreign” (נֹכְרִי) and the verb “acknowledge” (נִכְרַח), the implicit object of the verb “acknowledge” is probably the foreign god, not the king.⁴⁸ The subject of “cause them to rule over” (וְהִקְשִׁילָם) is more probably the foreign god than the king for several reasons. First, the nearest explicit antecedent is “foreign god.” Second, the clause “he will cause them to rule” is expounding upon what is meant by “they will increase honor,” and they will increase honor by acknowledging the foreign god. Third, the Hiphil of מִשַּׁל is used in the OT of Yahweh’s granting authority to rule (Ps 8:7), and Yahweh’s granting authority to rule over the kingdom of man is a major theme in Daniel 1–7; here this motif is contrasted with a foreign god granting authority to this king and his followers. The same kinds of arguments can be made for the subject of the next clause, “he will apportion land for a price” (e.g. Neh 9:22; Mic 2:4).

The objection could be raised that a mere idol cannot truly help a king to attack fortresses, grant authority to rule over the many, and apportion land. If the “foreign god” represents the king’s quest for military power, however, this objection loses force. Military power can grant to those who wield it the ability to attack fortresses, to rule over others, and to attain land. Furthermore, the Scriptures are clear that those who serve idols are in fact serving demons (Lev 17:7; Deut 32:17; Ps 106:37–38; 1 Cor 10:19–20), so that the king’s “foreign god” could be understood to manifest demonic power. Indeed, Paul asserts that the coming of the man of lawlessness is “in accord with the activity of Satan” (2 Thess 2:9). Daniel 10:13, 20, 21, and 12:1 also portray supernatural forces behind the rule of kings and kingdoms. The attack of Antiochus IV on the temple likewise involves supernatural conflicts (Dan 8:10–11; Rev 12:4). The

⁴⁵ Similarly, Lacocque translates the phrase as “fortifications of citadels” and identifies its referent as the Acra in Jerusalem without concern for the grammatical plural. However, he applies the passage to Antiochus IV. See André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979) 232.

⁴⁶ When Jesus refers to the “abomination of desolation” which precedes the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt 24:15; Mark 13:14), he is referring to the abomination in the phrase “at the height of abominations will come a desolator” in Dan 9:27b via the popular Greek versions of this text. Both the Old Greek and Theodotion interpretively translate this phrase as “upon the temple will be an abomination of desolation.” The other references to “abomination of desolation” in Daniel relate to Antiochus IV in the third kingdom (Dan 11:31; 12:11). Luke opts to use the arrival of the “desolator” (Roman armies) in Dan 9:27b rather than the “height of abominations” (Jews ruining the city and sanctuary) as the warning to flee Jerusalem (Luke 21:20).

⁴⁷ Gen 35:2, 4; Deut 31:16; 32:12; Josh 24:20, 23; Judg 10:16; 1 Sam 7:3; Jer 5:19; Mal 2:11; Ps 81:10; Dan 11:39; 2 Chr 33:15.

⁴⁸ The paronomasia is pointed out by Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: Tome 3. Ézéchiél, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO 50/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992) 491.

point of the verse, then, could be that the king will attack the temple with supernatural help, and those who acknowledge the king's so-called god will be supernaturally granted authority to rule over the many and will receive land, but at a price.

Alternatively, it is at least grammatically *possible* that the king himself is the subject of the clauses "he will cause them to rule over the many, and he will apportion land for a price." If so, those who acknowledge the king's "foreign god" and rule over the many would be those to whom the king grants leadership positions, while the "many" would refer to the king's subjects in general.

c. *Historical fulfillment.* John took action against the temple throughout AD 68–70, and was ultimately responsible for its destruction. John joined the Zealots who had "converted the temple of God into their fortress and refuge from any outbreak of popular violence, and made the Holy Place the headquarters of their tyranny" (*J.W.* 4.151; see also 4.172, 208–16).⁴⁹ John and the Zealots continued to use the temple as their fortress when Simon entered the city to oppose John (*J.W.* 4.572–84). Although Eleazar eventually took control of the inner court of the temple while John continued to hold the outer court (*J.W.* 5.5–11), John soon recovered control of the inner court at Passover in AD 70 by sending in armed men who trampled, beat, and slew the visiting worshippers while granting Eleazar's men a truce (*J.W.* 5.98–105). After Titus breached the outer walls of Jerusalem, John's resources had dwindled, so he sacrilegiously melted down the sacred vessels of the temple and gave the sacred wine to his men, who anointed themselves with the sacred oil (*J.W.* 5.562–66).

John then allowed the continual sacrifices to cease due either to lack of men (ἀνδρῶν) or lambs (ἀρνῶν), depending on whether one emends the text (*J.W.* 6.94). On behalf of Titus, Josephus extended a promise to John as a fellow Jew that upon surrender, Titus would permit the continual sacrifices to be restored and would spare John and the temple (*J.W.* 6.95–110). In Josephus's plea to John that he allow the restoration of the continual sacrifices, Josephus warned John that his tyranny was in fact fulfilling an ancient prophecy in which a Jew would slaughter his own people just before Jerusalem would be taken by a foreign power, a prophecy which likely refers to Dan 9:26–27, if not also to 11:36–45:

Once again are you indignant and shout your abuse at me; and indeed I deserve even harsher treatment for offering advice in fate's despite and for struggling to save those whom God has condemned. Who knows not the records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city and is even now coming true? For they foretold that it would then be taken whensoever one should begin to slaughter his own countrymen. And is not the city, aye and the

⁴⁹ Josephus *The Jewish War* 4.151 (trans. Thackeray 203). The temple is also described as a fortress in *J.W.* 5.245; 6.121, 240. The temple rebuilt by Herod included a tower called Antonia on the north side of the temple area which made the complex the strategic key to the city (*J.W.* 5.238–47; 6.45; *Ant.* 15.292; cf. Neh 2:8), and thus the "strongest fortress." Tacitus observes that the temple "was built like a citadel" with its strong walls, defensive colonnades, internal water supply, and subterranean passages (*Hist.* 5.12). In another context, Tacitus refers to the temple simply as "the mountain-citadel" (*Hist.* 2.4).

whole temple, filled with your corpses? God it is then, God Himself, who with the Romans is bringing the fire to purge His temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions.⁵⁰

Josephus blames the destruction of the temple ultimately on John's refusal to allow the continual sacrifices to be restored, and seems to recognize John as the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy.⁵¹ The removal of the continual sacrifices was also a characteristic of the desecration of the temple committed by Antiochus IV (Dan 8:11–14; 11:31; 1 Macc 1:45, 54, 59; 4:52–53).

When the Romans resumed their attack on the rebels, first the Jews and then the Romans engaged in burning the temple porticoes (*J.W.* 6.164–68, 177–86, 190–92, 232–33). The Jews were eventually blockaded in the inner temple, and the Romans were forced to destroy the temple in order to bring an end to the war (*J.W.* 6.248–87). John of Gischala, then, can be understood as a king who “took action against the strongest fortress” throughout AD 68–70, while the Romans were God's agents of its final destruction.

The “foreign god” which empowered John and his Zealots can be understood as their ruthless pursuit of political power and their false conception of Yahweh and his intentions for the city and sanctuary, probably driven by a demonic influence. John had a false hope that God would deliver them (*J.W.* 6.98). The “many” over whom the Zealots ruled were the general populace of Jerusalem, and the land within Jerusalem which they captured was that which the demonic “foreign god” was permitted to apportion to them. John and the Zealots had control of the whole city of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 4.135–50, 326–33, 389–97, 558–73). Then they lost much of Jerusalem to Simon, but

⁵⁰ Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.108–10 (trans. Thackeray 209). Josephus blames John for the ruin of Jerusalem also in an earlier context, which anticipates John's refusal to restore the continual sacrifices (*J.W.* 4.104). Josephus describes this oracle more fully in an earlier account, where he applies it against the Zealots in general (*J.W.* 4.386–88), and then proceeds to narrate that John broke from the Zealot coalition only to set himself up as a king (*J.W.* 4.389–94).

⁵¹ Although Josephus does not cite Daniel explicitly when he describes this oracle (*J.W.* 4.386–88; 6.108–10), in another context he says that Daniel predicted that the Roman government would make his country desolate (*Ant.* 10.276), which makes the identification of the oracle as Daniel 9 all the more probable. I would suggest that Josephus probably read Dan 9:26–27 as follows, based upon indications in the cited passages: “And after the sixty-two heptads, a messiah will be cut off (murder of Ananus in AD 67/68, *J.W.* 4.318, 323–25), but not for himself. And the people (Zealots, *J.W.* 4.386–88) of the coming ruler (John, *J.W.* 4.389–90) will ruin the city and the sanctuary, and its end will come with a flood (Romans/fire), and until the end there will be war; desolations are what is decided (*J.W.* 1.10; 3.293; 3.351–54; 3.399–408; 4.323; 4.88; 5.19; 5.257; 5.366–67; 5.412; 6.109–10; 6.250; 6.310–13). And he (Vespasian/Titus) will enforce a covenant/treaty for the many for one heptad (subjugation of Judea to Rome, AD 66–73; *J.W.* 1.21), and after half of the heptad, he will put an end to sacrifice and offering (*J.W.* 6.93–94; July/August AD 70). And at the height of abominations (John's refusal to restore the continual sacrifice, *J.W.* 4.104; 6.108–10) will come a desolator (Titus), even until a complete destruction and that which is decided is poured out upon the one being desolated (city and sanctuary).” John and the Zealots no doubt understood “the coming ruler” as Vespasian or Titus and the “abominations” as those caused by the Romans (*J.W.* 4.388). F. F. Bruce hesitantly suggests that the oracle which Josephus mentions in *J.W.* 4.386–88 and 6.108–10 could correspond to Jer 7:14; 26:6, Ezek 9:6–7, or Dan 11:30–32; 12:7, but none of these passages clearly make the fall of the city and sanctuary to a foreign power contingent upon Jewish abominations, as does Dan 9:26–27. See F. F. Bruce, “Josephus and Daniel,” in *A Mind for What Matters: Collected Essays of F. F. Bruce* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) 26.

still held the temple (*J.W.* 4.577). After the defeat of Eleazar's faction, John held the temple and its environs, Ophla, and the valley Kedron, while Simon held the upper city and part of the lower city (*J.W.* 5.252–54). John and Simon eventually joined forces when the Romans arrived at the city walls, and from then on they gradually lost their control of the city to the Romans (*J.W.* 5.275–79). The “price” of controlling the land within Jerusalem's walls was their eventual downfall at the hands of the Roman armies, as suggested by the logical connection between 11:39 and 11:40.

Alternatively, if the king, rather than the foreign god, is the one who grants some the authority to rule over the many (a grammatical possibility), then John's twenty officers and army of six thousand men can be understood as those whom the king causes to rule over the citizens of Jerusalem (*J.W.* 5.250–51). Although it is not clear whether John apportioned land for a price, it is reasonable to assume that John would have accepted bribes to fund his war in exchange for promises of land to be granted once John's kingdom was fully established.

4. *Daniel 11:40: Summary of the time of the end.*

a. *Translation.* “And in the time of the end, the king of the South will engage in thrusting with him [‘the king’ of 11:36], and the king of the North will storm against him [‘the king’ of 11:36] with chariotry and with horsemen, and with many ships, and he [the king of the North] will come into the lands and overflow and pass through.”⁵²

b. *Exegetical considerations.* Although the phrase וּבִעֵת קֵץ in 11:40 introduces the entire section of 11:40–12:3 as the “time of the end,” the phrase וּבִעֵת הַיָּהִי in 12:1 marks off 12:1–3 from 11:40–45, so that 11:40–45 can be viewed as a literary subunit of the description of the “time of the end.” The phrase “in the time of the end” in 11:40 indicates that 11:40–12:3 describes the appointed end-time events anticipated by 11:27 and 11:35.

The “end” (קֵץ) in view is most probably the “end” which had been predicted to occur sometime after the sixty-ninth week of Daniel 9: “and [Jerusalem's] end will come with a flood, and until the end will be war” (וְקֵצוֹ בַּשָּׁטָף וְעַד קֵץ 9:26). The allusion to 9:26 is strengthened by the use of the verb שָׁטַף (“to overflow”) to describe the armies of the king of the north who flood the lands (11:40). Although שָׁטַף is used earlier in the Writing of Truth to describe overflowing armies, only the instance in 11:40 occurs at the “time of the end” (11:10, 22, 26). These allusions continue to confirm that fulfillment should be sought in the destruction of the city and sanctuary predicted by Dan 9:26–27.

Earlier in the Writing of Truth, a statement is made which implies that the king of the South and the king of the North will cooperate in the “time of

⁵² The pronouns in this verse are handled in various ways by commentators. The bracketed identification of the pronouns presented here follows the general rule of nearest antecedent, with the exception of the 3ms pronoun on עָלָיו which should have the same referent as the 3ms pronoun on עָמּוֹ since the phrase “the king of the South will engage in thrusting with him (עָמּוֹ)” appears to be parallel to “the king of the North will storm against him (עָלָיו),” with the overall point being that the king of 11:36 will be attacked from both directions. Further justification of this identification of the pronouns can be found below.

the end": "And as for the two kings: their hearts will be for wickedness, and at one table they will speak a lie, and it will not prosper, for the end is still to come at the appointed time" (11:27). The reason given for the failure of the alliance between the two kings is that "the end is still to come at the appointed time" (כִּי-עוֹד קֶץ לְמוֹעֵד). The narrative marker וּבִרְעֻתָּהֶם in 11:40 followed by the mention of the king of the South and the king of the North indicates that the reader should now understand the two kings to be in a successful alliance at this point in the narrative. Therefore, the 3ms pronominal suffixes in עָמּוֹ and עָלָיו should refer to a third individual who is to be attacked by the two allied kings, and most plausibly refers to "the king" of 11:36–39. The previous identification of "the king" of 11:36–39 as a descendent of Abraham who rejects the God of his fathers precludes identification of "the king" of 11:36–39 with either the "king of the north" or the "king of the south" in 11:40, since these kings must be fourth-kingdom counterparts to the third-kingdom kings of the south and north in Daniel's five-kingdom schema.

The attack on the king (11:40) appears to be a proleptic summary statement of 11:41–45.⁵³ The final clause of 11:40 ("and he will come into the lands and overflow and pass through") is a general description in that the "lands" are not specified through which the king of the north will "overflow and pass through." By contrast, the "lands" involved in the conquest are named specifically in the subsequent narrative (11:41–45): the Beautiful Land, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia. Since 11:40b appears to be a summary statement of the subsequent narrative of the conquest of the king of the north (11:41–45), it is reasonable to assume that 11:40a is also a summary statement of that conquest. Furthermore, the preceding characterization of the king (11:36–39) is also summary, so that the king and his demise are first summarized (11:36–40), and then the subsequent narrative (11:41–45) provides the details of his demise "in the time of the end" as introduced proleptically by 11:40.

c. *Historical fulfillment.* Daniel 11:40 describes in summary fashion the invasion of Vespasian, Titus, and Tiberius Julius Alexander into Judaea to attack "the king" of 11:36–39, John of Gischala, during the years of AD 67–70. The "king of the south" refers to Tiberius Julius Alexander, while the "king

⁵³ The rhetorical device of prolepsis occurs frequently in Biblical Hebrew narrative. For example, Gen 22:1 announces that God tested Abraham before detailing the story of the test (Gen 22:1–19). Prolepsis also occurs in the Marduk Prophecy (to which Daniel 11 is sometimes compared), with 1:18'–21' providing a brief overview of the details given in 1:21'–III:30', as noted by Tremper Longman III, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography* 134. For prolepsis in Biblical narrative, see further Jean Marcus, "Prolepsis in the Story of Rahab and the Spies (Joshua 2)," in *Bringing the Hidden to Light: The Process of Interpretation, Studies in Honor of Stephen A. Geller* (ed. Kathryn F. Kravitz and Diane M. Sharon; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007) 149–62; Jerome T. Walsh, *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001) 124, 139, 184; David Louis Ska, "Our Fathers Have Told Us": *Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives* (Subsidia Biblica 13; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990) 8; Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, Indiana Literary Biblical Series (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985) 264–83, 321–41; Marten H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 13–14; W. J. Martin, "'Dischronologized' Narrative in the Old Testament," in *Congress Volume: Rome, 1968* (VTSup 17; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969) 179–86.

of the north” refers to Vespasian (and his son Titus acting on behalf of Vespasian). Tiberius Julius Alexander had been appointed as Prefect of Egypt by Nero in May AD 66.⁵⁴ He therefore functioned as a fourth-kingdom (Roman) counterpart to the third-kingdom “kings of the south” (the Ptolemies) described earlier in the Writing of Truth.⁵⁵ Vespasian was appointed by Nero as Proprætorian Legate of the Army of Judæa, charged with the task of suppressing the Jewish rebellion upon the defeat of the governor of Syria, Gaius Cestius Gallus, in November AD 66.⁵⁶ Vespasian was later declared Emperor by the soldiers in Caesarea and Alexandria in July AD 69, and was recognized as Emperor by the senate on December 21, AD 69.⁵⁷ Vespasian therefore functioned as a fourth-kingdom counterpart to the third-kingdom “kings of the north” (the Seleucids) in two possible senses: (1) Vespasian was the commander of the Syrian legion X Fretensis (among others) when he invaded Judæa from the north in AD 67 (although Nero replaced Cestius Gallus with Licinius Mucianus as governor of Syria),⁵⁸ and (2) Vespasian became the Emperor or “king” of the Roman Empire which was centered on Rome, to the north of the Beautiful Land.

Tiberius Julius Alexander, the proposed king of the south, does not seem to have played a direct role in the invasion of Judæa beginning in AD 67 alongside Vespasian, but he did serve as second-in-command under Titus (as prefect of the armies) after Vespasian had been declared Emperor in July AD 69 and had left the task of suppressing the Jewish rebellion to Titus.⁵⁹ Therefore it was Tiberius Julius Alexander (a king of the south) and Titus acting on behalf of Vespasian (a king of the north) who captured Jerusalem and destroyed the temple in AD 70, resulting in the downfall of John of Gischala (the king of 11:36–39; *J.W.* 5.510; 6.237; 6.242). Since Dan 11:40 can be read as a prophetic summary of 11:41–45, the delay in Tiberius Julius Alexander’s direct involvement in Judæa is not problematic. Although it was ultimately Tiberius Julius Alexander and Titus who attacked John of Gischala in Jerusalem, the demands of 11:43 require that the “king of the north” be a reference to Vespasian rather than Titus, as will be shown.

⁵⁴ E. G. Turner, “Tiberivs Ivliivs Alexander,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 44 (1954) 59; Barbara Levick, *Vespasian* (New York: Routledge, 2005) 28; Josephus *J.W.* 2.309.

⁵⁵ Tiberius Julius Alexander issued an edict in AD 68 which nicely illustrates his authority to function essentially as a king in Egypt who governed his prefecture and who brought only the most important matters to the Emperor. The edict was inscribed on the gateway to the temple of Hibis in El-Khargeh, Egypt and is available in Robert K. Sherk, ed., *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian* (Translated Documents of Greece & Rome 6; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988; repr. 1994) 118–23.

⁵⁶ Levick, *Vespasian*, 27–29; H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68* (5th ed.; London: Routledge, 1982; repr. 2007) 317; Josephus *J.W.* 1.21; 3.1–7; Tacitus *Hist.* 1.10; Suetonius *Vesp.* 4.

⁵⁷ Levick, *Vespasian* 43, 47; 79.

⁵⁸ Levick, *Vespasian* 29; Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero* 317. Levick suggests that Vespasian may have served as governor of Syria in the short gap between the defeat of Cestius Gallus and the arrival of his replacement Licinius Mucianus, which would strengthen the case if true.

⁵⁹ Levick, *Vespasian* 47. Josephus *J.W.* 4.658; 5.45–46.

Although the invasion of Judaea by the Romans in AD 67–70 was primarily a land battle, there were occasions on which the Romans employed ships.⁶⁰ Vespasian employed fleets as well as auxiliary infantry and cavalry as he subdued the Jews around Jerusalem (Tacitus *Hist.* 2.4).

5. *Daniel 11:41–42: The campaign of the king of the north.*

a. *Translation.* ⁴¹“And he [king of the north] will come into the Land of Beauty, and myriads will stumble, but these will escape from his hand: Edom and Moab and the main part of the sons of Ammon, ⁴²so that he will send his hand into the lands, and the land of Egypt will not escape.”

b. *Exegetical considerations.* The form וַיִּרְבוּ (“and many [lands]”) in the MT is probably best emended to וַיִּרְבוּ (“and myriads [of individuals]”).⁶¹ If this reading is adopted, the ones who “stumble” are the inhabitants of the “Land of Beauty.” Even if the reading of the MT is retained, the immediate context would limit the “many [lands]” (רַבּוֹת) to territories in and around Palestine, so the difference in meaning is minor.

The last clause in 11:42 (וְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא תִהְיֶה לְפָלִיטָה) is open to two possible interpretations. The noun פְּלִיטָה usually refers to an “escaped remnant” or “survivor,” and in the expression הָיָה לְפָלִיטָה in Gen 32:9 the subject of the verb “escapes,” apparently with a *lamed revaluationis*.⁶² On analogy with Gen 32:9, the similar phrase in Dan 11:42b can be rendered as “and the land of Egypt will not be an escaped remnant [i.e. escape].” In this interpretation, the land of Egypt is among the lands conquered by the king of the north as he “overflows and passes through.” However, the noun פְּלִיטָה can also refer to “an escape, deliverance.”⁶³ The clause could then be rendered as “and the land of Egypt will not be for deliverance [i.e. a place to escape].” Theodotion seems to understand the phrase in this way: καὶ ἡ Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἔσται εἰς σωτηρίαν. In this interpretation, the land of Egypt is not a place to which those being attacked by the king of the north in the Land of Beauty can escape.

c. *Historical fulfillment.* Daniel 11:41–42 describes Vespasian’s successful campaign into Galilee and Judaea from AD 67–69 to subdue Jewish insurgents. Vespasian marched into Galilee in the spring of AD 67 and eventually surrounded Jerusalem by the summer of AD 69.⁶⁴ Myriads were indeed slaughtered in the process, although John fled from Gischala to Jerusalem in late AD 67 or early AD 68 (*J.W.* 4.97–121).

The lands of Edom, Moab, and part of Ammon belonged at this time to the Nabataean kingdom of Malichus II, who allied with Vespasian and Titus in AD 67 and contributed a thousand cavalry and five thousand infantry to the

⁶⁰ *J.W.* 3.503–31 (naval battle on the lake Gennesar near Tarichaeae in AD 67); 4.437–39 (naval battle on Lake Asphaltitis, i.e. the Dead Sea, in AD 68); 4.658–60 (embarkation of Titus’s army onto Nile en route from Alexandria to Jerusalem in winter AD 69/70).

⁶¹ Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l’Ancien Testament: Tome 3* 492.

⁶² BDB, s.v. “פְּלִיטָה”; *HALOT*, s.v. “פְּלִיטָה.”

⁶³ Gen 45:7; 2 Sam 15:14; Jer 25:35; 50:29; Joel 2:3; 3:5; Obad 17; 2 Chr 12:7; 20:24.

⁶⁴ Josephus *J.W.* 3.115–42; 4.486–90; 4.550–55; Levick, *Vespasian* 40–41.

cause of the Romans.⁶⁵ The Nabataean kingdom was not annexed by the Roman Empire until AD 106 under the emperor Trajan, well after the purview of Dan 11:41–42.⁶⁶ Thus the lands of Edom, Moab and most of Ammon escaped the hand of the king of the north, Vespasian.⁶⁷ The part of Ammon which Vespasian did subdue was Gadara, the capital of Perea, and some of the nearby towns and villages (*J.W.* 4.413–39). The main part of ancient Ammon was spared, however, just as predicted.

The last clause of Dan 11:42 regarding Egypt was fulfilled regardless of which of the two possible interpretations is adopted. The fact that Egypt was not a safe refuge for Jews is illustrated by the incident in which the prefect Tiberius Julius Alexander unleashed two Roman legions on the rebellious Jewish community in Alexandria in AD 66, with permission to kill, plunder, and burn houses.⁶⁸ The land of Egypt was therefore not a place of deliverance from Vespasian's campaign in the Holy Land. The fact that Egypt did not escape from Vespasian is illustrated by the fact that he paused the war against the Holy Land to travel to Alexandria to secure the empire's grain supply, as will be explained below.

6. *Daniel 11:43: The king of the north rules Egypt and its neighbors.*

a. *Translation.* "And he [the king of the north] will rule over the hidden stores of gold and silver, and over all the desirable things of Egypt, and the Libyans and Cushites will be in his footsteps."

b. *Exegetical considerations.* The imagery of the clause "the Libyans and Cushites will be in his footsteps" signifies that the Libyans and Cushites will submit to the king of the north. The imagery could reflect either the bowing down of subordinates to the king's feet, the following of subordinates behind the king who is leading the way, or the conquering of the king's enemies (cf. Ps 110:1).

c. *Historical fulfillment.* About the time that Vespasian had finished subduing the regions of Galilee and Judaea (except for Jerusalem) in AD 67–69, Vespasian learned that Vitellius had replaced Otho as Emperor in April AD 69 (*J.W.* 4.588). Vespasian's commanders and soldiers declared him Emperor instead at Caesarea in July AD 69, and Tiberius Julius Alexander likewise instructed his legions and the populace to swear allegiance to Vespasian as Emperor in Egypt (*J.W.* 4.592–617; Tacitus *Hist.* 2.79–81). Vespasian dispatched forces to attack Vitellius in Rome, while Vespasian traveled to Alexandria, Egypt to take control of the empire's grain supply and to annex two legions; while in Alexandria, Vespasian learned that Vitellius had been defeated (*J.W.* 4.605–07; 630–56; Suetonius *Vesp.* 7; Tacitus *Hist.* 2.82; 3.48; 4.38; 4.51). Upon the death of Vitellius, the senate recognized Vespasian as

⁶⁵ Josephus *J.W.* 3.68; Jean Starcky, "The Nabataeans: A Historical Sketch," *BA* 18/4 (1955) 100–1; Levick, *Vespasian* 29, 31.

⁶⁶ Starcky, "Nabataeans: A Historical Sketch" 103.

⁶⁷ Gurney likewise identifies Edom, Moab, and Ammon in 11:41 with the Nabataeans, who were spared from the campaign of Pompey in 63 BC (*God in Control* 148).

⁶⁸ Josephus *J.W.* 2.487–99; Levick, *Vespasian* 27.

Emperor in December AD 69 (Tacitus *Hist.* 4.3).⁶⁹ Vespasian remained in Alexandria, however, until early summer AD 70, at which time he departed for Rome (*J.W.* 4.658; 7.21–22; Tacitus *Hist.* 4.81). As the Emperor, Vespasian indeed ruled over the riches of Egypt, especially while stationed in Alexandria.

The ancient Libyans lived in the region to the west of Alexandria known as Cyrenaica, which had been annexed by the Roman senate in 74 BC.⁷⁰ The Cushites lived to the south of Egypt and were called Nubians by the Egyptians.⁷¹ The Nubian kingdom, whose capital was Meroe, thrived from 650 BC to AD 350, and was declared a Roman protectorate subject to annual tribute in 29 BC. This arrangement led to various conflicts between the Romans and the Nubians, but in 20 BC the Meroites and Romans signed a treaty in which the tribute requirement was removed, and peace was maintained by a garrison of three cohorts until AD 297.⁷² Since both Libya and Nubia were subject to the authority of the Roman Empire, they would have submitted to the leadership of the new Emperor Vespasian.

Josephus records the reaction of the Empire to Vitellius's defeat and Vespasian's new status as Emperor:

On reaching Alexandria Vespasian was greeted by the good news from Rome and by embassies of congratulation from every quarter of the world, now his own; and that city, though second only to Rome in magnitude, proved too confined for the throng.⁷³

Tacitus adds that even the Parthian King Vologaesius sent envoys to Alexandria with an offer of forty thousand horses (*Hist.* 4.51). Certainly the Libyans and Nubians, geographical neighbors of Egypt and subjects of Rome, can be included among those “from every quarter of the world” who submitted to Vespasian as the Emperor in AD 69 and who were “in his footsteps.”

7. *Daniel 11:44–45: The king of the north attacks Jerusalem and the temple.*

a. *Translation.* “⁴⁴And reports will disturb him [the king of the north] from the east and from the north, and he will go out with great rage to annihilate and to exterminate many, ⁴⁵so that he will plant his palatial tents between the seas and the beautiful Holy Mountain, and he will invade until its end, and there will not be anyone who helps it [the Holy Mountain].”

b. *Exegetical considerations.* The “east” and the “north” should be understood from the perspective of the previous verse, in which the king of the north is situated in Egypt (11:43), especially since the Holy Mountain (11:45) lies to the northeast of Egypt. The “many” (רַבִּים) in 11:44 is masculine plural and therefore refers to individuals rather than lands, and the lack of article

⁶⁹ The law passed by the Assembly of the People to grant Vespasian imperial powers is preserved on a bronze tablet from Rome and is available in Sherk, ed., *Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian* 124–25.

⁷⁰ Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Africa and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004) 41, 183, 191.

⁷¹ Ibid. 43–44.

⁷² Ibid. 149, 158–60.

⁷³ Josephus *The Jewish War* 4.656 (trans. Thackeray 350–51). A fragmentary papyrus from Egypt (P. Fouad 8) also attests to the grandiose acclamation of Vespasian upon his arrival in Alexandria, and is available in Sherk, ed., *Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian* 123–24.

suggests that it does not necessarily echo “the many” who were persecuted under Antiochus Epiphanes IV (11:33), nor need it refer to “the many” (11:39) persecuted under “the king” of 11:36–39. The *wəyiqtol* form וַיִּטַּע (“so that he will plant”) indicates that the encampment against the Holy Mountain (11:45) is the result of the disturbing reports heard while in Egypt (11:44). The plural form יָמִים (“seas”) is normally a plural of extension and does not usually specify multiple bodies of water. Consequently, the *lamed* of לְהִרְצִיב־קִדְשׁ is probably the second member of the *y-l-x* בֵּין-ל- construction which was in the process of replacing the older *y-w-x* וּבֵין-בֵּין construction in late Biblical Hebrew and the DSS (cf. Neh 3:32).⁷⁴ Thus the phrase can be rendered “between the seas and the beautiful Holy Mountain.”

The “beautiful Holy Mountain” (הִרְצִיב־קִדְשׁ) is an allusion to Daniel 9:16 and 9:20. In 9:16, Daniel prays for God to turn his wrath away “from Your city Jerusalem, Your Holy Mountain” (מֵעִירְךָ יְרוּשָׁלַם הִרְצִיב־קִדְשֶׁךָ). In 9:20, Daniel summarizes his prayer (9:4–19) as a confession of individual and corporate sins, and as a supplication “concerning the Holy Mountain of my God” (עַל הִרְצִיב־קִדְשִׁי). The “beautiful Holy Mountain” in 11:45 is therefore Jerusalem, with “beautiful” echoing the “Land of Beauty” (אֶרֶץ הַצְּבִי) in 11:41. Furthermore, the answer to Daniel’s prayer is the seventy weeks prophecy of 9:24–27, which predicts the destruction of the city and the sanctuary in a war. The use of the label הִרְצִיב־קִדְשׁ for Jerusalem, then, is another indication that 11:40–45 describes the fulfillment of the seventy weeks prophecy.

The 3ms pronominal suffixes in 11:45b קָצוֹ and לוֹ are usually understood as referring to the king of the north. The nearest masculine singular antecedent, however, is the construct chain הִרְצִיב־קִדְשׁ, which is more likely the intended referent. The context strongly suggests that the enraged king of the north has come to desolate the Holy Mountain (11:44–45a), so the “end” (קֵץ) which is anticipated by the near context is that of the Holy Mountain, not that of the king of the north. Furthermore, the phrase עַד־קָצוֹ (“until its end”) in 11:45 suggests an allusion to the similar wording in Daniel 9:26: “and its end (וְקֵצוֹ) [Jerusalem’s end] will come with a flood [cf. שֹׁטף in 11:40], and until the end [cf. עַד עֵת קֵץ in 11:40] will be war.” Since the 3ms pronominal suffix in 9:26 refers to the city and sanctuary, so also should the 3ms pronominal suffixes in 11:45 refer to the Holy Mountain. In Daniel 12:6–7, the “end of these wonders” (קֵץ הַפְּלִאוֹת) described in the Writing of Truth corresponds to the complete shattering of the “power” of the holy people, so that the “end” in 11:45 more probably refers to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple than merely the death of a king (cf. Ezek 24:21). The use of the noun קֵץ for the “end” of apostate Israel and Jerusalem occurs elsewhere in Scripture (Lam 4:18; Ezek 7:2–3, 6; Amos 8:2).

Alternatively, it could be argued on the basis of the prolepsis of 11:40 that the Jewish king of 11:36–39 is the referent of the pronominal suffixes in 11:45, rather than the Holy Mountain. The distance between the pronominal suffixes in 11:45 and the antecedent in 11:40 makes this explanation less probable

⁷⁴ Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986; repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008) 83.

than the alternative, however. Since the Jewish king (11:36–39) is located at the Holy Mountain when he is attacked by the kings of the north and south (11:39–40), the destruction of the Holy Mountain (11:45) implies the downfall of the Jewish king (11:40) even though he is probably not the intended referent of the pronominal suffixes in 11:45. In any case, both the temple and the Jewish king meet their demise at the hands of the king of the north and the king of the south in the invasion described by 11:45. The verb בָּרָא (“come, enter”) here has the same sense of “invade” as it does in 11:40–41, and should not be confused with the English idiom “to come to an end.”

c. *Historical fulfillment.* Daniel 11:44–45 refers to the desolation which Vespasian brought upon Jerusalem and the temple in AD 70 by means of his son Titus (acting on behalf of the king of the north) and Tiberius Julius Alexander (the king of the south). While settling affairs in Alexandria, Vespasian sent Titus to finish up the war against Jerusalem, and he himself went to Rome as the new Emperor (*J.W.* 4.657–58). Josephus does not mention reports which disturb Vespasian, but Jerusalem is to the east and north of Alexandria, and no doubt word of the continuing civil war within Jerusalem among the various factions would have come to Alexandria along with all those who were coming to congratulate the new Emperor (*J.W.* 4.656–57; 5.1–20). Tacitus, furthermore, mentions a disturbing report from the north in connection with the resumption of the war against the Jews:

While Vespasian was absorbed with thoughts of Italy and conditions in Rome, he heard an unfavorable report concerning Domitian, to the effect that he was transgressing the bounds set by his youth and what might be permissible in a son: accordingly he turned over to Titus the main force of his army to complete the war with the Jews.⁷⁵

By no later than April AD 70, Titus, acting on behalf of Vespasian, had established two encampments at Mount Scopus and one encampment at the Mount of Olives against Jerusalem (*J.W.* 5.67–70). These encampments correspond to the “palatial tents” which are planted outside the Holy Mountain, and the “seas” are the Mediterranean Sea, the Dead Sea, or both collectively.⁷⁶ The temple burned in August AD 70, and the city of Jerusalem fell about a month later.⁷⁷ Jerusalem had no allies to help her due to Vespasian’s successful campaign throughout Galilee and Judaea in AD 67–69. In Josephus’s account of Titus’s address to John and Simon when they finally ask for a parley, Titus quips: “Did you rely on numbers? Nay, a mere fraction of the Roman soldiery has proved your match. On the fidelity of allies? Pray, what nation beyond the limits of our empire would prefer Jews to Romans?”⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Tacitus *The Histories* 4.51 (trans. Clifford H. Moore, under the title *The Histories, Books IV–V, The Annals, Books I–III*, LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931; repr. 1962) 96–99.

⁷⁶ Roman encampments were usually arranged with the general’s tent (the *praetorium*) in the center of a square grid of soldiers’ tents; evidence for such an encampment exists at the foot of Masada. See further Michael M. Homan, *To Your Tents, O Israel! The Terminology, Function, Form, and Symbolism of Tents in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 73–74.

⁷⁷ Levick, *Vespasian* 41–42.

⁷⁸ Josephus *The Jewish War* 6.330 (trans. Thackeray 274–75).

8. *Summary narrative of AD 67–70 aligned with Daniel 11:36–45.* Before examining Dan 12:1–3, it may prove useful to summarize the results of the preceding analysis by aligning the relevant events of AD 67–70 with Dan 11:36–45 in chronological order, especially since part of the passage is summary description (11:36–40) and part is sequential narrative (11:41–45). The italicized sentences relate directly to the verses with which they are aligned, while the other details are important to the storyline, especially with respect to John of Gischala.

- 11:36–39 *Characterization and summary of John of Gischala from AD 67–70.*
- 11:40 *Proleptic summary of AD 67–70: Tiberius Julius Alexander [king of the south] and Vespasian [king of the north] attack John of Gischala.*
- 11:41–42 *Vespasian subdues the Jewish rebellion in all of Galilee (J.W. 4.120) and Judaea (except Jerusalem, Herodion, Masada, and Machaerus) (J.W. 4.555, 588) from spring AD 67 to summer AD 69, while leaving the lands of Edom, Moab, and most of Ammon alone. During this invasion of the Beautiful Land, John of Gischala is routed from Gischala to Jerusalem (J.W. 4.97–121). The Zealots invade Jerusalem and convert the temple into their fortress and refuge (J.W. 4.135–37, 151, 172) and wage war with the deposed high priest Ananus (J.W. 4.162–325). During this internal conflict John sides with the Zealots (J.W. 4.208–16), and then sets himself up as a king after the murder of Ananus (4.389–94). Simon is brought into the city in order to subdue John and the Zealots, but he seizes control of Jerusalem for himself, with John and the Zealots blockaded in the temple, which they fortify with four towers (J.W. 4.566–84). In July 69, Vespasian is proclaimed the new Emperor by the legions in Alexandria (Egypt) (J.W. 4.617), Caesarea (J.W. 4.601), Moesia, and Pannonia (J.W. 4.619), and elsewhere (Tacitus Hist. 2.79–81). Vespasian then sends forces to attack Vitellius in Rome (J.W. 4.632), whom the senate had recently recognized as the new Emperor in April 69.*
- 11:43 *Then, having subdued all of Galilee and most of Judaea, Vespasian travels to Alexandria, Egypt in the last half of AD 69 to take control of the empire's grain supply and to annex two legions (J.W. 4.605–07; 4.656). Meanwhile, Vespasian's forces defeat Vitellius in Rome (J.W. 4.651–52), and the senate immediately recognizes Vespasian as Emperor in December 69 (Tacitus Hist. 4.3). Vespasian remains in Alexandria, however, until early summer AD 70, at which time he departs for Rome (J.W. 4.658; 7.21–22; Tacitus Hist. 4.81). Vespasian rules over the treasures of Egypt while stationed in Alexandria as the new Emperor.*

- 11:44 *Vespasian, while still in Alexandria, having secured his position as Emperor, resumes his campaign against revolting Judaea, to the northeast of Egypt, by sending out his son Titus in early AD 70 to crush Jerusalem (J.W. 4.657–58). While Vespasian has been away in Alexandria, the civil strife in Jerusalem has escalated (J.W. 5.2). Eleazar has seceded from the Zealots and now holds the inner court of the temple, John and the Zealots still hold the outer court of the temple, and Simon still holds most of Jerusalem (J.W. 5.5–11). Fighting between John and Simon results in a famine and reduces the environs of the temple to ashes (J.W. 5.22–26).*
- 11:45 *On behalf of Vespasian, Titus begins to besiege Jerusalem in early AD 70 (J.W. 5.39–40; Tacitus Hist. 5.1). Tiberius Julius Alexander serves as prefect of all the forces in the attack (J.W. 5.43–46; 5.510; 6.237; cf. Dan 11:40). Titus establishes two encampments at Mount Scopus and one encampment at the Mount of Olives (J.W. 5.67–70). John takes possession of the inner court of the temple from Eleazar at Passover (J.W. 5.98–105). Titus moves the encampments at Mount Scopus to two furlongs from Jerusalem's walls (J.W. 5.130–35). The factions of John and Simon unite when Titus's battering-rams strike Jerusalem's walls (J.W. 5.275–79). Titus breaches Jerusalem's first and second walls (J.W. 5.302, 331, 347). In desperation, John plunders the temple (5.562–66). Daily sacrifices cease (6.94–112). Both the insurgent Jews and the Romans burn the temple porticoes (J.W. 6.164–68, 177–86, 190–92, 232–33). The insurgent Jews seek refuge in the inner court of the temple (J.W. 6.248). The Romans destroy the temple (J.W. 6.250–87). Titus denies the request of John and Simon to be permitted to leave the city, which the Romans begin to sack and burn (6.323–55, 363). The insurgent Jews take refuge in Herod's palace in the upper city (J.W. 6.358–62). Titus captures the upper city and the rebels are driven into underground passages (J.W. 6.374–77, 392–408). John and Simon surrender; the former is imprisoned for life and the latter is to be executed at the triumph due to the manner of his surrender (J.W. 6.433–34; 7.25–36, 118, 153–57). The rest of Jerusalem is destroyed (J.W. 6.434–7.4). The city and sanctuary are thus desolated and completely destroyed (cf. Dan 9:26–27), and John's tyranny ceases to prosper (cf. Dan 11:36).*

9. *Daniel 12:1: Inauguration of the fifth kingdom.*

a. *Translation.* “And in that time, Michael, the great prince who stands over the sons of your people, will take a stand, and it will be a time of distress, which has not occurred from the existing of a nation until that time, and in that time your people will escape—all who are found written in the book.”

b. *Exegetical considerations.* The phrase *וּבָעֵת הַהִיא* marks off 12:1–3 from 11:40–45 as a literary unit, while referring back to the “time of the end” (*קֵץ וּבָעֵת*) in 11:40. Consequently, 12:1–3 also refers to the “time of the end,” so that chronological overlap between 11:40–45 and 12:1–3 is possible, but any suggestion of a gap in time between 11:45 and 12:1 is unwarranted. Furthermore, in the Olivet Discourse Jesus alludes to the “time of distress” in Dan 12:1 as occurring during the time of the destruction of the temple within his generation (Mark 13:19; Matt 24:21; Luke 21:23). Jesus’ use of Dan 12:1 suggests that he likewise understood the events of Dan 11:36–45 to describe the destruction of the temple.

The significance of Michael, the prince of Israel, “taking a stand” is probably the same as the significance of the clause “behold, the prince of Greece is coming” (*וְהִנֵּה שָׂרִי־יָוֶן בָּא*) in Dan 10:20. The arrival of the prince of Greece (Dan 10:20) in the heavenly scene corresponds to the rise of the Greek king Alexander the Great in the earthly scene (Dan 11:3). In other words, this language indicates that when the angelic prince of a kingdom comes onto the heavenly scene, a new king receives the kingdom of man in the earthly scene. The same concept is probably also behind Dan 11:1, in which the divine speaker tells Daniel that he “stood” to confirm Darius the Mede (Cyrus II) in the first year of his reign, presumably because Darius the Mede had received the kingdom of man (Dan 6:1 [5:31 Eng]; cf. Ezra 1:1). Just as the angelic prince of Greece came onto the heavenly scene in correspondence with the rise of the universal dominion of Alexander the Great (10:20, 11:3), and just as the divine speaker “stood” to confirm the universal dominion of Cyrus II (11:1), Michael’s coming onto the scene to take a stand in Dan 12:1 would correspond to the rise of a king of Israel with universal dominion. John similarly interprets the rise of Michael in Rev 12:7–12, a passage which describes the heavenly scene corresponding to the victorious first coming of Christ on earth as described in Rev 12:1–6.⁷⁹ Daniel 12:1, therefore, describes the inauguration of the fifth kingdom.

Additional evidence of the inauguration of the fifth kingdom in Dan 12:1 can be found in 11:36. The king of 11:36, who “prosper[s] until indignation is finished,” ceases to prosper at the destruction of the temple in 11:45. Consequently, the indignation (*זַעַם*) of God, which is mediated by foreign rulers during the extended spiritual exile (see above on 11:36), is also finished in 11:45. In terms of Daniel’s five-kingdom schema, the end of God’s indignation in 11:45 corresponds to the end of the God-given dominion of Daniel’s fourth kingdom as an agent of God’s indignation upon his people during the extended spiritual exile before the new exodus. If 11:45 corresponds to the end of Daniel’s fourth kingdom and the end of the spiritual exile, then 12:1 corresponds to the inauguration of the fifth kingdom, as well as the beginning of the return from spiritual exile.

The context suggests that the unprecedented “time of distress” involves both the conflict in heaven resulting from Michael taking a stand, and the conflict on earth from which those written in the book will escape. The un-

⁷⁹ Beale, *Book of Revelation* 650.

precedented nature of the “time of distress” is indicated by the relative clause “which has not occurred from the existing of a nation until that time.” This language echoes the description of the plague of hail sent by Yahweh upon Egypt so that Pharaoh would release the people of God (Exod 9:18, 24). More importantly, in the context of the Babylonian exile, Jeremiah speaks of an unprecedented “time of distress” (עֵת־צָרָה) for Jacob from which Yahweh would deliver a remnant to serve God and the Messiah (Jer 30:7–11). Since Israel did not serve the Messiah at the *physical* return from exile in Babylon initiated by Cyrus, the fulfillment of Jer 30:7–11 naturally occurs at the *spiritual* return from exile accomplished by the vicarious death of the Messiah after seventy sabbatical cycles and the destruction of the temple (Dan 9:24–27). The unprecedented “time of distress” in Dan 12:1 is therefore probably an allusion to Jer 30:1–11, and another indication that the spiritual return from exile and the new exodus are in view.

The clause “and in that time your people will escape” in Dan 12:1 must also be associated with the time around the destruction of the temple in light of the repetition of the phrase וּבְעֵת הַהִיא (“and in that time”). Although not a clear allusion, this clause is likely the basis for Jesus’ statement in the Olivet Discourse that the Lord had shortened the days of this distress so that the elect would be saved (Mark 13:20; Matt 24:22), since Jesus makes this statement immediately following the clear allusion to the time of distress. Jesus’ warning to his followers to flee to the hills in the Olivet Discourse provides another means by which those written in the book could escape from the distress of AD 70 (Mark 13:14–18; Matt 24:15–20; Luke 21:20–22). In terms of the larger biblical storyline, however, the elect who physically escape from the distress of AD 70 are representative of a larger category of people: the predicted remnant of Israel who would escape the “determined destruction” and return to the Lord from spiritual exile (Isa 10:20–23). In other words, the escape from the time of distress (Dan 12:1) is part of the new exodus which is accomplished by the enthronement of the Messiah.

c. *Historical fulfillment.* The lack of exegetical warrant for a gap in time between 11:45 and 12:1 suggests that the fulfillment of this verse should be sought in connection with the destruction of the temple in AD 70. Since Michael’s involvement occurs in the heavenly scene which is normally hidden from view, one need not find historical evidence of its fulfillment in AD 70. Nevertheless, it is interesting that both Josephus (*J.W.* 6.296–99) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5.13) report that celestial armies were seen in the heavens engaged in combat, much like John describes the heavenly battle between Michael and Satan in Rev 12:7–12. Since the “time of distress” involves both heavenly and earthly conflict, it is futile to tally up the earthly casualties of AD 70 in order to attempt to demonstrate that the magnitude of the distress was unprecedented. Nevertheless, it is interesting that Josephus uses language which is reminiscent of Dan 12:1 to describe the atrocities of this period (*J.W.* 1.1, 4, 11–12; 5.442; 6.429).⁸⁰ Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3) and Epiphanius (*De mens.*

⁸⁰ See also the inscription on an arch from AD 80–81 that originally stood in the Circus Maximus which speaks of Titus: “following the directions and plans and under the auspices of his father, he

15; *Adv. haer.* 29.7) record a tradition that the Christian church of Jerusalem fled to the city of Pella in Perea, thus escaping the time of distress.⁸¹

10. *Daniel 12:2–3: Summary of the fifth kingdom.*

a. *Translation.* “And many from those who are asleep in the dusty ground will awaken—some to eternal life, and some to the reproaches of eternal abhorrence. And the *maskilim* will shine like the shining of the sky, and those who make the many righteous will shine like the stars forever and ever.”

b. *Exegetical considerations.* While Dan 12:1 twice specifies that the events described in 12:1 would occur “in that time,” 12:2–3 has no such restriction. Therefore, the events of 12:2–3 can extend to more future realities. However, there is no indication of a gap in time between 12:1 and 12:2. The inauguration of Daniel’s fifth kingdom (12:1) is thus followed by a summary description of kingdom realities, with a focus on resurrection and the vindication of the fallen *maskilim* who had taught the community and were martyred (12:2–3; cf. 11:33–35).

The ׀ preposition (12:2) is usually considered to be partitive, so that the phrase “many from” appears to limit the resurrection to a subset of those who are dead.⁸² The reason that the resurrection is described as partial is probably due to the narrative context, which describes God’s judgment on unfaithful Israel in an unprecedented time of distress, and God’s deliverance of a faithful remnant of Israel from that time of distress (12:1). Consequently, the context suggests that the phrase “many from those who are asleep” is intended to focus attention upon all of the deceased members of ethnic Israel, while leaving the question of the resurrection of the Gentiles unanswered and irrelevant to the narrative context. The resurrection unto eternal life will accomplish the ultimate deliverance of the faithful remnant of Israel, not only for those who live through the time of distress (Dan 12:1), but also for those who have died throughout ages past. The ultimate judgment on the unfaithful portion of Israel from throughout the ages will be resurrection unto eternal abhorrence.

The *maskilim* are probably described as “those who make the many righteous” because through their teaching and through their example of martyrdom they refine and purify the community “until the time of the end” (Dan 11:33–35). The *maskilim* who were martyred under the persecution of Antiochus IV (11:33–35) were thus to serve as examples of faithfulness to those

tamed the race of the Jews and destroyed the city of Jerusalem, a thing either sought in vain by all commanders, kings, and races before him or never even attempted.” See Sherk, ed., *Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*, 126. The Romans also recognized the unprecedented nature of the distress that they imposed upon the Jewish nation in AD 70. This inscription is also significant because it confirms that Titus was acting on behalf of Vespasian, the king of the north.

⁸¹ For discussion of the tradition, see France, *Gospel of Mark* 525–26.

⁸² Collins, *Daniel* 392; Lucas, *Daniel* 295. Steinmann agrees that ׀ is partitive, but argues that “many of the dead” does not exclude “all of the dead” as a possibility, with support from the parallelism between “all the nations” and “many peoples” in Isa 2:2–3 (*Daniel* 560–61). While this analysis helps to reconcile the partial resurrection of Dan 12:2 with the NT evidence for a universal resurrection, it nonetheless seems improbable that Daniel would choose to use a partitive ׀ with רבים (“many”) unless he intended to signify a part of the whole (cf. Ezra 3:12; Esth 8:17).

under the fourth-kingdom persecution “in the time of the end” (11:40–45), and they are consequently rewarded in the fifth kingdom (12:3).

Given the theme of the return from exile after an unprecedented distress and the restoration of the people of God which underlies the language of Dan 12:1–3, the comparison of the *maskilim* to the stars of heaven (12:3) probably signifies the fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant, in which Abraham was promised descendants as numerous as the stars (Gen 15:5; cf. 22:17; 26:4; Exod 32:13), though fulfillment of the promise was to occur after the exodus (Gen 15:13–16). This promise was indeed fulfilled after the exodus, as stated several times with reference to the stars of heaven (Deut 1:10; 10:22; 28:62; Neh 9:23–25; cf. 1 Chr 27:23). However, Abraham’s descendants became disobedient and brought the covenantal curse upon themselves so that their numbers would dwindle through exile (Deut 28:62–68; Neh 9:26–31). The imagery of *maskilim* as the stars of heaven (Dan 12:3) therefore corresponds to a new, greater fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham to occur after a return from exile in a new exodus. The *maskilim* of Dan 12:3 certainly include the *maskilim* of 11:33–35, but are probably not limited to them; rather, the *maskilim* of 12:3 represent all those who return to God from spiritual exile.

c. *Historical fulfillment.* A partial resurrection at the inauguration of the fifth kingdom included the resurrection of Christ, as well as the resurrection of “many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep” (Matt 27:52–53; cf. Rev 20:4). The NT views Jesus’ resurrection as the first fruits of a universal resurrection at the consummation of his kingdom (1 Cor 15:20–25; John 5:28–29; Rev 20:5). Then Jesus will hand the kingdom back to the Father (1 Cor 15:24). Since resurrections bookend the messianic kingdom, resurrection imagery is an appropriate summary of the fifth kingdom (Dan 12:2–3).

VI. THE COHERENCE OF DANIEL’S PROPHETIC OUTLOOK

Since Dan 11:36–12:3 gives the most detailed of the descriptions of the transition between the fourth and fifth kingdoms in the book of Daniel, and since this passage describes the inauguration of the fifth kingdom as occurring in the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in AD 67–70, the corresponding descriptions of the fourth and fifth kingdoms in Daniel 2 and 7 should also match this history.

In Daniel 7, the fourth beast initially has ten horns representing ten kings, and then an eleventh little horn (king) grows and puts down three of the prior kings. This eleventh king makes war with the holy people for a time, times, and half a time until the fourth beast is slain and the Son of Man is given the kingdom instead. The little horn is therefore a fourth-kingdom Roman king who persecutes the holy people for three and a half years before the inauguration of the fifth kingdom. This three-and-a-half-year persecution is also described in Dan 12:7 as a shattering of the power of the holy people, which suggests that the little horn of Daniel 7 plays a role in the preceding prophetic narrative of 11:36–12:3. The fourth-kingdom king who plays a central role in the narrative of 11:36–45, before the inauguration of the fifth kingdom in 12:1–3, is the “king of the north.” Since the king of the north can

now be identified as Vespasian, the description of the little horn in Daniel 7 should match Vespasian.⁸³

Vespasian made war against Galilee and Judaea from roughly April 67 at Ptolemais (*J.W.* 3.29) until the fall of Jerusalem in September 70 (*J.W.* 6.407; 435), a period of three and a half years.⁸⁴ The three kings who fell in the context of Vespasian's rise to power were the Emperors Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, all of whom had unusually short reigns in the year AD 69, the same year in which Vespasian became Emperor.⁸⁵ Although Vespasian is usually considered the ninth rather than the eleventh Emperor, the "ten kings" of the fourth kingdom in Daniel 7 are a reasonable estimate of the actual number, while also being symbolic of completeness. The estimate is even more accurate if Julius Caesar is counted as the first Emperor, as some ancient witnesses attest, since Vespasian would then be the tenth Emperor.⁸⁶

⁸³ The fact that John adopts language from Daniel's description of the little horn (Dan 7:8, 11, 20–21, 24–25) to describe the beast (Rev 11:7; 13:5–7) is not in itself an objection to the identification of the little horn in Daniel 7 with an historical figure such as Vespasian, since John also adopts language from Daniel's description of Antiochus IV (Dan 8:10) to describe the dragon (Rev 12:4). The implications of the identification of Vespasian as the little horn in Daniel 7 for the interpretation of the beast in Revelation 13 still need to be worked out in a thorough study of the book of Revelation.

⁸⁴ Levick, *Vespasian* 31, 42. Although technically the Romans continued to war against the Jews until the fall of Masada in AD 73, Dan 9:26–27 and 11:36–45 associate the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the fourth-kingdom in Daniel's five-kingdom schema, so that Vespasian's role as a fourth-kingdom king ends in AD 70 from the perspective of Daniel's five-kingdom schema.

⁸⁵ Two modern works which chronicle this turbulent year in Roman history are Gwyn Morgan, *69 A.D.: The Year of Four Emperors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) and Kenneth Wellesley, *The Year of the Four Emperors* (3d ed.; London: Routledge, 2000).

⁸⁶ Suetonius *Jul.* 76; Josephus *Ant.* 18.32–33; *Sib. Or.* 5:12–15; 4 Ezra 12:10–14. On these and other early references see further Beale, *The Book of Revelation* 872; Kenneth L. Gentry Jr., *Before Jerusalem Fell: Dating the Book of Revelation* (San Francisco: Christian Universities Press, 1997) 154–59. Rashi also apparently counted Julius Caesar as the first emperor and consequently identified Titus, the eleventh emperor, as the little horn of Daniel 7. See Rosenberg, *Mikra ot gedolot: Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah* 64, 70; Goldwurm, *Daniel* 201–02. Moreover, Josephus boldly predicted that Vespasian would become the emperor (*J.W.* 3.399–408) on the basis of what he claimed was an inspired interpretation of a prophecy in the sacred books (*J.W.* 3.351–54, 361) which predicted the rise of a world ruler in Judea at about that time (*J.W.* 6.312–13). The prophecy could very likely be Daniel 7. Since Josephus counted Julius Caesar as the first emperor (*Ant.* 18.32–33), he would have considered Nero as the sixth emperor at the time at which he made the prediction about Vespasian. Since Josephus furthermore considered Daniel's fourth kingdom to be Rome (*Ant.* 10.208–10; 276), and since Vespasian was beginning to succeed at his commission to subdue Galilee and Judea, Josephus's prediction about Vespasian could have been based on a simple inference from Daniel 7 that Vespasian must be the little horn who would persecute the Jews for three and a half years and who within that time would become the tenth emperor after quickly subduing three contenders. Josephus indicates that the Jewish insurgents mistakenly applied the same ambiguous oracle to themselves (*J.W.* 6.313), which would suggest that they were competing amongst themselves to usher in the kingdom of the Son of Man in Daniel 7. F. F. Bruce suggests that the prophecy was Dan 9:24–27 and that Josephus identified Vespasian as the "coming ruler" (9:26) on the basis of the timing of the seventy heptads ("Josephus and Daniel" 28), but that passage does not speak directly of world dominion as does Daniel 7. Beckwith suggests that the oracle was Daniel 7 due to the mention of world dominion, but he maintains that Josephus interpreted the Son of Man (Dan 7:13) to be Vespasian, which seems unlikely because the Son of Man inaugurates the eternal fifth kingdom, whereas Josephus understood Rome to be the fourth kingdom. See Roger T. Beckwith, "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation," *RevQ* 10 (1981) 532, 535.

In Daniel 2, legs of iron represent an initially strong fourth kingdom, and feet of iron and clay represent the fourth kingdom as divided into strong and weak parts, the latter of which will be broken at the end of the fourth kingdom (2:42), *before* the inauguration of the fifth kingdom represented by a stone (2:44). Part of the fourth kingdom is therefore already broken before the stone shatters the feet of the statue (2:34, 44). The initially strong fourth kingdom corresponds well to the Roman Empire from Augustus to Nero (31 BC to AD 68). At the end of that kingdom, i.e. the year AD 69, there was one iron-strong king (Vespasian), and there were three weak-as-clay kings who were broken (Galba, Otho, and Vitellius). The previously ambiguous imagery of the fourth kingdom in Daniel 2 becomes clear when the end of the fourth kingdom is recognized as AD 69–70 based on the description in Dan 11:36–45.

The book of Daniel therefore consistently identifies the inauguration of the messianic fifth-kingdom as beginning *after* the Jewish-Roman war which culminated with the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in AD 70. This interpretation of history is consistent with Jesus' use of Dan 12:1 and 7:13 in the Olivet Discourse immediately after his warnings of the destruction of the temple within his generation (Matt 24:21, 30; Mark 13:19, 26; Luke 21:22–23, 27). When Jesus answers the high priest that "*from now on* you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Matt 26:64; cf. Mark 14:62, Luke 22:69), Jesus understands his impending death on the cross to be the beginning of a *process* of enthronement which culminates with the destruction of the temple in AD 70. His work on the cross brought a *theological* end to the OT sacrificial system, whereas the destruction of the temple in AD 70 brought an *historical* end to the sacrificial system. This interconnection between the atoning work of Christ at the cross and the destruction of the temple within his generation is evident in the A-B-A-B structure of Dan 9:26–27. Although some NT verses reflect the perspective that Jesus is already enthroned after his resurrection (e.g. Acts 2:32–36), in the imagery of Daniel's five-kingdom schema the fourth kingdom must continue to exist until Rome has played its divinely-given role of bringing judgment on apostate Jerusalem and the temple. Since Daniel's five-kingdom framework only allows for one universal dominion over the kingdom of man at a time, the fourth kingdom must extend in *Daniel's imagery* until the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in AD 70, at which point Jesus is fully vindicated as the new Temple and rightfully enthroned over the nations at the right hand of God.

The visions of Daniel also consistently indicate that the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom would bring an end to God's indignation upon his rebellious people as mediated by the first four of the kingdoms in Daniel's schema. Although the people of God were permitted to return to their homeland from exile after seventy years in Babylon, God's indignation and their continued spiritual exile was to extend for seventy sabbatical cycles (Dan 9:24). The distress of these times (Dan 9:25) was to culminate in an unprecedented time of distress (Dan 12:1; cf. Dan 9:26–27) from which God would deliver a remnant to serve the Messiah. The transfer of universal dominion to the Messiah at the inauguration of his kingdom therefore brought an end to God's indignation and the spiritual exile of his people. Since the nations are to be included in

Israel's return from spiritual exile accomplished by the Suffering Servant (Isa 49:5–13), the images of a worldwide kingdom in Dan 2:35, 44 and universal worship of the Son of Man in Dan 7:14, 27 are not foreign to the theme of return from exile.

The visions of Daniel thus align the inauguration of the messianic kingdom with the beginning of the spiritual return from exile. Consequently, the imagery of the Son of Man coming with the clouds in Dan 7:13–14 describes not only the enthronement of the Messiah but also the end of the spiritual exile and God's indignation as mediated by foreign overlords. Since the Son of Man coming with the clouds signifies the return from exile, a common theme can be seen in all three of Jesus' allusions to OT imagery which he employs to describe the time following the unprecedented tribulation of AD 70 in the Olivet Discourse. The darkened sun and moon imagery signifies judgment upon Israel's foreign overlords at the end of a period of exile in general, and in this instance it signifies the end of Daniel's fourth kingdom (Mark 13:24–25; cf. Exod 10:21–24; Isa 13:10; Joel 2:31; 3:15). The Son of Man coming on the clouds signifies the enthronement of the Messiah over the foreign overlords, which brings an end to the exile (Mark 13:26; cf. Dan 7:13–14). The angels gathering the elect from the ends of the earth signifies the return from spiritual exile (Mark 13:27; cf. Deut 30:4; Zech 2:6). Thus the Olivet Discourse as presented by Mark breaks down neatly into three sections, the first two of which occur or begin to occur in "this generation" as stated: (1) all those things which occur up to and including the unprecedented distress of AD 70 (Mark 13:5–23); (2) the messianic kingdom and spiritual return from exile which began in AD 70 and continue until the consummation (Mark 13:24–31); and (3) the return of Christ (Mark 13:32–37). The structure of the Olivet Discourse is thus influenced heavily by Daniel's placement of the inauguration of the messianic kingdom *after* the destruction of the temple, which is the second stage of the inauguration of the kingdom as indicated by the B-B lines of Dan 9:26–27. Other texts in the NT present the inauguration of the kingdom as occurring with Jesus' ministry, death, and resurrection, which is permissible because these events correspond to the first stage of the inauguration of the kingdom in the A-A lines of Dan 9:26–27.

The book of Daniel provides a completely consistent picture of the transfer of sovereignty over the kingdom of man from the kings of Rome to the messianic King of kings, Jesus Christ. The book of Daniel makes the inauguration of the messianic kingdom contingent on both the death of the Messiah and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the Romans. Jesus likewise understood that his enthronement entailed not only his death (Matt 26:64), but also the destruction of the temple, as is evident from his use of Dan 7:13 in the Olivet Discourse. The process of Jesus' enthronement was not complete until the temple, the center of OT modes of faith and practice, was destroyed. The inauguration of the messianic kingdom coincided with the beginning of the return from spiritual exile and the new exodus. The elect are now being gathered from the ends of the earth (Mark 13:27). When Christ returns, he will already be the King of kings and Lord of lords (Rev 19:16).