

Why Antiochus IV Is Not The Little Horn Of Daniel 8

By William Shea.

www.ThreeAngels.com.au

Significance of the Interpretation

The vision described in Daniel 8 may be outlined briefly as follows: The Persian ram appeared in the vision first, conquering to the north, west, and south (verses 3-4). The Grecian goat with its principal horn came on the scene of action next. By defeating the Persian ram it became the dominant power in view (verses 5-7). After reaching this position, however, the principal horn of the goat was broken and four horns, extending out to the four winds of heaven, came up in its place (verse 8). Commentators concur that the contents of the vision thus far are relatively straightforward, since these four horns can be identified readily with the four kings, and the kingdoms derivative from them, who divided the empire conquered by Alexander.

The interpretation of the next main element in the vision is more controversial. Another horn ("a little horn") which came either from one of the four winds or from one of the four horns appeared on the scene. The attack which this horn launched was not directed so much against other beasts or kingdoms as against God's people, identified here as "the host of the stars" (verses 10, 24). It was also directed against God's work of redemption in the form of the *tamid* ("daily") and the temple (verses 11--12), and against God's principal representative--"the Prince of the host," "the Prince of princes" (verses 11, 25).

Daniel then heard two heavenly beings discussing what he had seen. One asked the other, "For how long is the vision concerning the [*tamid*], the transgression that makes desolate, and the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot?" The answer given was, "Unto two thousand and three hundred evening--mornings, then the sanctuary shall be cleansed/restored" (tr. mine).

Crucial to the interpretation of Daniel 8:9-14 is the identification of this little horn which was to do all these things against God and His people. In their attempt to identify the little horn commentators have applied the methods advanced by the preterist, futurist, and historicist schools of prophetic interpretation.

Preterists are committed to the view that the majority of the prophecies of the book of Daniel have already been fulfilled and therefore have no significance for the present day. Thus they hold that the little horn rose from one of the divisions of Alexander's empire. [They conclude that the activities of the little horn unmistakably point to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Futurists generally follow this line of interpretation also.](#) In addition, they see Antiochus as a type of an end-time Antichrist who is to arise in the final years of earth's history before Christ's second advent.

Historicists, on the other hand, declare that the prophecies in Daniel portray an outline of human and ecclesiastical history and the story of the struggle between good and evil down to the end of time. Since a flow of history appears to be involved here, especially when this chapter is compared with the previous one, the historicist holds that the little horn represents Rome--pagan, papal, or both.

Just as there are three main identifications for the little horn, so three main applications have been made of the time period referred to in this passage. Preterists have proposed that the 2300 "evening-mornings" should be interpreted as 2300 individual morning and evening sacrifices, or 1150 literal

days. These should be applied to events in the career of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C.

Utilizing the day-for-a-year principle, historicists have held that this datum refers to a period of 2300 years which began sometime in the fifth century B.C. and ended in the nineteenth century A.D.

As a type of the work of the final Antichrist, some futurists have applied the "evening-mornings" as literal evenings and mornings, or 2300 days, which they claim have not yet begun, because the final manifestation of an Antichrist belongs to the future.

How is this prophecy dealing with a sanctuary to be interpreted? Preterists claim it refers to the purification of the temple in Jerusalem which was polluted by Antiochus in the second century B.C.

Since the earthly temple was destroyed in A.D. 70 (and this prophetic time period extends beyond this datum), historicists see in it a reference to the temple in heaven. As the principal representatives of historicist thought Seventh-day Adventists have understood the cleansing of Daniel 8:14 as a reference to the heavenly antitype of the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary which occurred in ancient Israel on the Day of Atonement. Since this was a day of judgment in Israel, the antitypical cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary has been interpreted as the time for a pre-Advent investigative judgment of God's people.

This position is quite different from that of the interpreters of the futurist school who hold that during the final seven years of earth's history a literal temple (to be rebuilt in Jerusalem) will be polluted by an Antichrist. It will be cleansed or restored when Christ comes and puts an end to his nefarious reign.

These three views on the interpretation of the various elements in Daniel 8:9-14 may be summarized as follows:

Element	Preterist	Historicist	Futurist
Little horn	Antiochus IV	Rome	Future Antichrist
2300 days	literal days past	prophetic years	literal days future
Temple	earthly	heavenly	earthly
Cleansing	from past defilement	judgment	from future defilement

This brief review of the various interpretations, as proposed by the three main schools of prophetic interpretation, makes it clear that widely varying conclusions concerning the nature of the events predicted in this passage of prophecy have been reached. Of particular importance in this study is the nature of the event which is to occur at the end of the 2300 days.

If one follows the first school of thought, the prescribed purification was all completed before January 1, 164 B.C. If one follows the second line of interpretation, it refers to a judgment going on now in heaven. This has not yet happened, according to the third view. When it does, events in Jerusalem and Israel will be involved. Considering the magnitude of these differences in interpretation and the importance of the events to which they refer, it is evident that these verses in Daniel need to be carefully examined. They demand our closest attention.

In order to properly evaluate the passage dealing with the little horn in Daniel 8 it is necessary to understand it in the context of the book. This is because the prophecies of Daniel parallel each other to a large extent. Consequently, a sound procedure would be to examine the prophecies of chapters 7, 9, 11, and 12 where they are relevant to the discussion.

Daniel 7

If we inquire of the various schools of interpretation as to how they identify the different beasts of Daniel 7, we will discover that all are agreed that the lion represents Babylon (verse 4). The historicist and futurist schools identify the bear as Medo-Persia, while the preterist school, which is essentially comprised of critical scholars, identifies it as Media only (verse 5). Thus while the historicist and futurist schools continue in the sequence to identify the leopard and the non-descript beast as Greece and Rome, the preterist lags one step behind, identifying them as Persia and Greece (verses 6-7).

Historicists and futurists finally diverge when they come to the little horn. The former identify it as the papal horn which came out of pagan Rome. The latter, holding to a gap in the flow of prophetic history, identify it as the final and still-future Antichrist (verse 8). Since they end their fourth beast series with Greece, preterists identify the little horn growing out of this beast as Antiochus IV.

There are, of course, variations in the applications made by individual commentators within each of these schools of prophetic interpretation, but these variations are not of real significance to us here. The essential difference for our present purpose is the divergence that has developed over the interpretation of the second beast and the consequences that flow from that divergence into the interpretation of the subsequent beast-nations.

By dividing Media from Persia, preterists have shortened this prophetic scheme to the point where Antiochus IV developed out of the Grecian beast as the little horn in the second century B.C. The other main scheme which identifies the second beast as a joint symbol for the combined kingdom of Media and Persia ends one historical step farther down the road with Rome as the fourth beast. These schemes and this particular difference can be outlined as follows:

	Preterist	Historicist	Futurist
Lion	Babylon	Babylon	Babylon
Bear	Media	Medo-Persia	Medo-Persia
Leopard	Persia	Greece	Greece
Non-descript beast	Greece	Rome	Rome
Little horn	Antiochus IV	Papacy	Final Antichrist

Since the interpretation of the symbols for these nations has a direct bearing upon the identification of the little horn in Daniel 7, these beast-nations must be identified before an interpretation can be proposed for the little horn which issued from the fourth one.

One of the principal supporting arguments relied upon by preterists here is that the author of Daniel committed a historical blunder when he referred to Darius the Mede in 5:31--6:28 and 9:1. The argument runs as follows: although no such figure is known from history, Daniel's reference to him thereby allowed for a separate Median kingdom between the NeoBabylonian rulers, Nabonidus and Belshazzar, on the one hand, and the Persian king, Cyrus, on the other. The foremost presentation of this view is found in H. H. Rowley's *Darius the Mede and the Four Kingdoms*, [1] which is dedicated to the proposition of proving this historical error in order to sustain the preterist interpretation of these prophetic symbols.

Rowley's classical conclusion is that "there is no room in history for Darius the Mede." Unfortunately, he did not study the relevant cuneiform sources directly but relied on secondary treatments of them. As I have pointed out in my study of the royal titles used in the Neo-Babylonian contract tablets written early in the reign of Cyrus, [2] there is room in history for Darius the Mede; and the amount of room available for him is delimited quite precisely.

The title "King of Babylon" was not used for Cyrus in the contract tablets dated to him during the first year after Babylon's conquest in October 539 B.C. Only the title "King of Lands" was used for him, and this referred to him in his capacity as king of the Persian empire. Late in 538 B.C., however, the scribes added the title "King of Babylon" to his titulary, and it continued to be in use through the rest of his reign and those of his successors down to the time of Xerxes.

There are only two possibilities here. Either there was an interregnum and the throne of Babylon went unoccupied for a year, or somebody else besides Cyrus occupied the throne for that period of time. In my opinion, the prime candidate for this other king of Babylon is Ugbaru, the general whose troops conquered Babylon for Cyrus. According to the Nabonidus Chronicle, he appointed governors in Babylonia (cf Daniel 6:1) and he resided in Babylon until he died there a year later, one month before the title "King of Babylon" was added to Cyrus' titulary.

Ugbaru could have been reasonably well advanced in age by the time of his death, a circumstance which would fit with the age of 62 for Darius the Mede (Daniel 5:31). Cuneiform sources do not provide us with any information about his father, Ahasuerus, or his ethnic origin as a Mede (Daniel 9:1). Darius could have been Ugbaru's throne name, as the use of throne names is known both in Babylon and Persia. The logical explanation why the dates in Daniel progress from the first year of Darius the Mede (9:1) to the third year of Cyrus (10:1) is that Darius died in the interval. This harmonizes satisfactorily with the cuneiform evidence.

While the case has not been proven conclusively for lack of direct reference to Darius the Mede in a cuneiform text, it should be kept in mind that by far the greater portion of Neo-Babylonian contract tablets are still unpublished; 18,000 of them from Sippar, for example, are in the British Museum. Even without the publication of those tablets a reasonable hypothesis for him can be made out of the published tablets.

One must also keep in mind how very fragmentary the picture of the past still is which has been recovered thus far from the ancient Near East. Thus the critical view that the author of Daniel blundered in identifying a Median king of Babylon has not been sustained by the historical sources of the sixth century B.C. On the contrary, the detailed knowledge of the history of Babylon of this period being revealed in this and other passages in the book of Daniel argues strongly that the author was an eyewitness to those events.

Lacking historical support for their interpretation of the second beast of Daniel 7, preterists must fall back on the interpretation of the symbols themselves. What has commonly been done here, as in the recent Anchor Bible volume on *Daniel*, [3] is to emend the text by transposing the phrase about the three ribs in the mouth of the bear forward, so that the ribs end up in the mouth of the lion instead. On the other hand, the phrases relating to a change in the lion are transferred to the bear. Thus the bear receives the heart of a man and stands on his hind legs, not on one side. This altered bear is then supposed to refer to the only ruler of the fictitious Median kingdom that the author of Daniel presumably knew--Darius the Mede.

In contrast to this garbling of history and of the text in support of a theory, the historicist interpretation of these symbols seems most reasonable. The raising up of the bear first on one side and then the other, can be seen quite naturally as a reference to the composite nature of the kingdom formed by a fusion of the Medes and Persians. When left in the bear's mouth, the three ribs may reasonably be taken as representing the three major conquests of the combined forces of the Medes and Persians in the sixth century B.C.: Lydia in 547, Babylon in 539, and Egypt in 525.

Support for this interpretation in Daniel 7 can be found on the basis of the interpretation of the ram in Daniel 8. Its two disproportionate horns are specifically identified as the kings of Media and Persia

(verse 20), expressing the same duality that is found in the prophet's view of the bear in chapter 7. The tripartite nature of the ram's conquests also parallels the three ribs in the mouth of the bear, since it expanded to the north (Lydia), to the west (Babylon), and to the south (Egypt).

The parallels between these two beasts support the interpretation of the former already arrived at from its context in Daniel 7, namely, that the bear represents Medo-Persia. This means that the non-descript beast, the fourth in order there, must represent Rome; therefore, the little horn that came from it cannot represent Antiochus IV.

From this conclusion about the little horn in Daniel 7, the next main question is, What is its relationship to the little horn in Daniel 8? Could the little horn in Daniel 8 still be Antiochus Epiphanes even though the little horn in Daniel 7 does not represent him?

Among historicist and futurist interpreters there have been a significant number who have opted for different interpretations of these two figures. Virtually all of the pre-Millerite interpreters of the historicist school from the 18th and 19th centuries referred to by L. E. Froom in volumes 3 and 4 of *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* [4] identified the little horn of Daniel 7 as the papacy. Only half of them identified the little horn in Daniel 8 the same way. The other half interpreted it as Mohammedanism.

A similar split can be seen among futurist interpreters of today. Some of them identify the little horn of Daniel 7 as the future Antichrist and the little horn of Daniel 8 as Antiochus IV. Thus the possibility should be left open and not ruled out *a priori* that these two prophetic symbols could refer to different historical entities.

On the other hand, there are significant arguments in favor of identifying the little horns in these two chapters as the same historical entity. First, the fact that the same symbol was used for both of them, whether in Aramaic (chapter 7) or in Hebrew (chapter 8), suggests at the outset that there could well be a connection between them. If a historical distinction had been intended here, the best way would have been to use a different symbol, but the symbol remained the same.

Second, the powers represented by this same prophetic symbol both engage in similar actions: both appear to arise at a somewhat similar time in history; both begin small and become great (7:8 and 8:9); both are blasphemous powers (7:8, 25 and 8:11, 25); both persecute the saints of God (7:21, 25 and 8:11, 25); both appear to endure for protracted periods of prophetic time (7:25 and 8:14); and both eventually suffer similar fates (7:26 and 8:25).

Thus when two powers represented by the same prophetic symbol arise and carry out the same kinds of action in the same time slot in the flow of the visions, the probabilities appear to be on the side of those commentators who have identified them as the same historical entity. Some of the aspects of the work of the little horn in chapter 7 are not mentioned in chapter 8, and vice versa. The number of correspondences between them, however, is greater than those aspects of their work not mentioned in both passages. None of these individual characteristics are mutually exclusive so as to rule out the possibility that they could refer to the same power.

Third, the book of Daniel indicates that its later prophecies were intended to be explanations of its earlier prophecies. This is evident from their parallel order, the interpretations given in them that deal with the same world powers, their similar imagery, and their similar phraseology. Furthermore, the book itself specifically states this in at least two instances (9:22-23 and 10:1, 14). Not only has the principle of amplification or expansion upon materials from the earlier visions in the later visions between recognized by virtually all commentators on the book, but it also provides a potential explanation for some of the differences between those prophecies.

The prophecy conveyed by a dream in Daniel 2 was given primarily to Nebuchadnezzar. Although the same vision was repeated to Daniel so that he could explain it to the king (2:19), he functioned essentially in that context as a wise man who interpreted the dream of the king. The vision of chapter 7, on the other hand, was given directly and personally to Daniel half a century later. Consequently, Daniel came to serve God as a full-fledged prophet in his own right. Being the first of the four main

prophecies given to Daniel, it is quite natural that the vision of chapter 7 stands out as the major outline of the future. Thus all of the subsequent prophecies related to him can be seen as amplifying this main original prophetic outline.

In this context, the vision of chapter 8 can be seen as an amplification of the vision of chapter 7. Even the datelines on the prophecies support that point. The visions of chapters 7 and 8 came together as one pair grouped two years apart (7:1; 8:1). The prophecies of a more didactic nature in chapters 9-12 formed a unit as a second pair grouped two years apart (9:1; 10:1). But the second pair of didactic prophecies came a decade later than the original pair of visionary prophecies.

Thus the vision of chapter 8 elaborates on the vision of chapter 7, while the *explanations* given in chapters 9-12 elaborate on the visions. Their explanations began already in chapters 7 and 8. This is another way of saying that all the prophetic imagery God wished to convey was in place by the time the vision of chapter 8 had been received. The final supplement to the basic vision had been given and no further visions in terms of prophetic symbols were necessary.

With the vision of chapter 8 standing in this relation to the vision of chapter 7, certain details of the basic vision could be further elaborated. It also means that other details did not have to be repeated. The clearest case of this comes from the fact that there is no beast to represent Babylon in Daniel 8. The common explanation is that the Neo-Babylonian empire was drawing to a close. Therefore, it did not need to be represented again. This is not entirely accurate from the human point of view.

The Harran inscriptions of Nabonidus state that he spent a decade at Tema in Arabia before returning to Babylon to defend it against the onslaught of Cyrus. The Verse Account of Nabonidus states that he entrusted the kingship of Babylon to his son Belshazzar when he took off on that journey. It was early during this regency of Belshazzar in Babylon that Daniel received both of these visions. The precise date when Nabonidus returned to Babylon is not known, but it could not have been any later than 540 B.C., the year before Babylon fell to the Persians. He could have returned there earlier, but this point cannot be determined with accuracy because of the damaged condition of Nabonidus Chronicle.

We estimate, therefore, that the vision of chapter 7 was given to Daniel around 550 B.C., and the vision of chapter 8 was given to him about 548 B.C. Even by the time Daniel had received this second vision Nabonidus still felt that his empire was sufficiently safe for him to spend another seven years in Tema. Judging by the situation in Babylon at that time, it is not at all clear that the Neo-Babylonian empire was passing off the scene of action by the time Daniel's vision of chapter 8 was given. From the divine perspective, the Neo-Babylonian empire was already doomed, but it was not yet evident in terms of human political circumstances experienced by Daniel and others living in Babylon at that time.

Instead of deleting Babylon from the vision because it was passing off the scene of action, it could equally well have been deleted because there was no further need to elaborate on the prophetic imagery used for Babylon in the first vision. As we follow the order in which God presented the elements of these visions, we may rather say that Babylon was deleted from the second vision not because the human political circumstances had already experienced dramatic changes, but because God desired to elaborate on other parts of the primary vision. Medo-Persia had already been introduced as the successor to Babylon in the first vision, and it was not necessary to repeat this point in the second.

A similar point can be made from the prophecy of chapter 11. With respect to the Persian kings, the angel says, "Behold, three more kings shall arise in Persia; and a fourth shall be far richer than all of them; and when he has become strong through his riches, he shall stir up all against the kingdom of Greece" (verse 2). It is clear that the fourth king mentioned is Xerxes and his invasion of Greece. At this point the focus shifts from Persia to Greece.

The next verse clearly outlines the actions of Alexander the Great, and the succeeding verse portrays the breakup of his kingdom in terms similar to Daniel 7:6 and 8:8, 22 (verses 3, 4). The question arises then as to what happens to the rest of the Persian kings. Seven kings ruled Persia after Xerxes: Artaxerxes I, Darius II, Xerxes II, Artaxerxes II, Artaxerxes III, Arses, and Darius III. Why aren't these seven other kings mentioned in this prophecy?

Is it true, as some critical scholars argue, that the author of Daniel knew of only four Persian kings because only four are mentioned by name in the Bible? We believe not. It is probable that any reasonably well-informed citizen of Palestine in the second century B.C. (the date critical scholars give for the writing of the book of Daniel) would have known about some of the later Persian kings. The papyri from the Wadi Daliyeh indicate that the people of Samaria were dating documents there to the last two Persian kings at least. Thus this information should have been common knowledge a century and a half later. We conclude that this criticism of Daniel is ill-founded and does not provide an adequate explanation for this problem.

Any attempt to solve the problem will have to come to grips with a basic principle for interpreting Daniel's apocalyptic prophecy. That principle is this: it is only necessary to continue with one kingdom, or line of kings, until the new one of importance is introduced on the scene of action. It is not necessary to describe the whole history of the earlier kingdom.

For example, the reason the Persian kings are only listed down to Xerxes is that it was he who by his wars against Greece caused it to rebound and to become a reputable power in the Near East. After this critical turning point in history the rest of the Persian kings no longer held any great prophetic significance and so were not mentioned.

A similar point can be made about the Seleucids and Ptolemies referred to in this same prophecy. Regardless of which school of interpretation one follows for the balance of Daniel 11, it is very unlikely that all the kings of the houses of Seleucus and Ptolemy are referred to in this prophecy. They are only listed down to the point where the next and more significant power is introduced. According to one school of thought, it is Antiochus IV. Another holds that it is Rome.

The same hermeneutic can be applied here. Power "A" is only of interest and significance in the visions or their explanations up to the point when Power "B" is introduced on the scene of action. The prophecy then takes up the details of Power "B." It is not necessary to list the entire line of rulers/history of Power "A." One must bear in mind, however, that the transition from Power "A" to Power "B" is not always sharply delineated.

The setting in which the little horn arose in Daniel 8 may now be viewed in the light of these parallels from earlier ones in the same chapter as well as from chapter 11. There is not just one beast or kingdom missing from this Vision. There are, in fact, two beasts missing, namely, Babylon and Rome. From the full vision in chapter 7 with four beasts and a little horn a reduction down to two beasts and the little horn has taken place. Evidently, further details concerning the two deleted beasts were not considered to be necessary and the details added here concentrate on the little horn.

In a similar manner, in Daniel 8 the four horns' expansion to the four winds was considered to be an adequate basis upon which to introduce the same little horn into the scene of action in this supplementary vision. It was not necessary to spell out everything that happened in the interim between the visions.

Once the transition has been made in this way, everything that follows concentrates on elaborating details concerning the little horn. This point is emphasized by the fact that the vision in chapter 8 was given a title which is related to the activity of that horn in verse 26 ("the vision of the evenings and the mornings").

The information available from Daniel 7 bearing on the question as to whether the little horn of Daniel 8 should be identified as Antiochus IV Epiphanes may now be summarized. First, the historicist position identifying the fourth beast of Daniel 7 as Rome seems to be a sound one. This means that the little horn coming out of Rome cannot be Antiochus IV. If the little horns of Daniel 7 and 8 refer to the same historical entity, we must conclude that the little horn of Daniel 8 cannot be Antiochus either.

Three important aspects support our conclusions. First, the same symbolic terminology is applied to both powers. Second, both are described as carrying out similar activities. Third, the general consideration that the later prophecies in the book of Daniel amplify his earlier prophecies.

In the light of this evidence it seems reasonable to conclude that the treatment of the little horn in Daniel 8 should amplify the statement concerning the little horn in Daniel 7 rather than introduce another entity. The third line of evidence noted above also explains why it was unnecessary to repeat in chapter 8 all the details of the vision in chapter 7.

These three related aspects concerning the little horns in chapters 7 and 8 make it probable that both refer to the same historical entity; but they do not prove that point conclusively. In order to reach a more definitive position, we must study the little horn in the context of the chapter 8 vision itself. Furthermore, it will be necessary to relate to it information that is available from the later prophecies of Daniel.

Daniel 8

Since Antiochus IV is commonly identified with the little horn of Daniel 8, arguments favoring this identification will be considered first.

1. Arguments in favor of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the little horn

A. Antiochus was a Seleucid king.

As one of this dynasty of kings, he could have proceeded from one of the four horns referred to in Daniel 8:8--provided that was the little horn's origin.

B. Antiochus' succession was irregular.

If the phrase, "but not with his power at the beginning of Daniel 8:24 is original with the MT (the Hebrew masoretic text of the OT) and not a dittography or scribal repetition from the end of verse 22, it would suggest that, historically speaking, the little horn came to power through an irregular succession.

A son of Seleucus IV Philopator should have succeeded to the rule after his father's assassination by the courtier Heliodorus. However, the king's brother, Antiochus IV, came to the throne instead, aided by the armies of Pergamos. It is possible to apply the phrase "but not by his own power" to this course of events.

C. Antiochus persecuted the Jews.

D. Antiochus polluted the Jerusalem temple and disrupted its services.

However, it remains to be seen whether in fact he did all the things against the temple that Daniel 8 says the little horn did.

There are, therefore, two reasonably straightforward arguments in favor of identifying the little horn as Antiochus IV: his irregular succession and his persecution of the Jews. There are two other arguments which may possibly support that identification, but they must be qualified to some extent. These have to do with his origin and his desecration of the temple. The question here is whether these four points, two reasonably straightforward and two qualified, provide a sound basis for making this identification. On the other side of this question there are a number of arguments from Daniel 8 against equating Antiochus IV with the little horn. Most of these are relatively well-known but will be repeated here. Some will require amplification.

2. Arguments against Antiochus IV Epiphanies as the little horn

A. Nature of the little horn--a kingdom

(1) *The horn as a symbol for king/kingdom.*

Daniel 8:23 identifies the little horn as a "king." But the question may be raised whether the term was not intended to stand for a "kingdom" rather than for a single "king." Several points suggest this possibility. Since the four preceding horns are identified as kingdoms in verse 22, one might expect them to be succeeded by another kingdom rather than an individual king. The two horns on the Persian ram represented the "kings of Media and Persia;" that is, the dynastic houses that ruled those nations (verse 20).

Going back to chapter 7, the historicist interpretation of the little horn suggests that it represents the papacy which came up among the horn-nations of Europe that resulted from the breakup of the Roman empire-beast. It should also be noted in chapter 7 that whereas the four beasts were referred to as "four kings" (verse 17), they were understood to represent kingdoms and not individual monarchs (verse 23). The same concept is evident as early as chapter 2, where Nebuchadnezzar was told that he was the head of gold to be succeeded by another kingdom (Daniel 2:38-39).

The only place among these symbols where one can clearly point to the identification of a horn as an individual king is in the case of Alexander, represented by the great horn of the Grecian he-goat (Daniel 8:21). Alexander's horn, of course, did not come up from the other horns of the goat. If the little horn of Daniel 8 came out of another horn and is interpreted as a king, such an interpretation would prove to be unique among this series of symbols. Although this point is not definitive when studied in isolation, it seems more reasonable to assume that the little horn represents a corporate kingdom rather than an individual king.

B. Comparative greatness of the little horn

The Persian ram "magnified himself" (8:4); the Grecian goat "magnified himself exceedingly" (8:8). By contrast the little horn magnified itself exceedingly in different directions. On the horizontal level it "grew exceedingly great" toward the south, east, and glorious land. On the vertical plane it "grew great ... to the host of heaven," and ultimately "magnified itself . . . up to the Prince of the host" (8:9--11).

The verb "to be great," *gadal*, occurs only once each with Persia and Greece, but it appears three times with the little horn. In view of this verbal usage and the adverb for "excessively," which accompanies it in the first instance, it is evident that this is a progression from the comparative to the superlative. Translating this into historical terms means that Antiochus IV should have exceeded the Persian and Greek empires in greatness. Obviously, this was not the case, since he ruled only one portion of the Grecian empire with but little success.

This argument finds further support as we return to the parallel of the little horn in Daniel 7. There we discover another point which militates against the identification of the little horn with Antiochus IV, the judgment scene. It seems unlikely that the heavenly court would have been called into session on such a grand scale in order to judge Antiochus IV. A setting far less glamorous, such as Micaiah ben Imlah's prediction concerning Ahab in 1 Kings 22, should have been adequate for Antiochus IV. To say it differently, because of its grandeur the vision of the heavenly court session in Daniel 7 would not at all match the political and religious importance of the party being judged there, if that little horn were Antiochus. Given the parallels between the little horns of Daniel 7 and 8, this merely emphasizes the disparity between Antiochus IV and the superlative greatness of the little horn in Daniel 8.

C. Activities of the little horn

(1) Conquests.

The horn "grew exceedingly great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the glorious land".

(a) To the south.

Antiochus III was the king who added Palestine to the territory ruled by the Seleucids when he defeated the Ptolemaic forces at Paneas in 198 B.C. Antiochus IV attempted to extend his southern frontier into Egypt with the campaign of 170-168 B.C. He was successful in conquering most of the Delta in 169 B.C. The following year (168 B.C.) he marched on Alexandria to undertake its siege, but was turned back by a Roman diplomatic mission and had to abandon his Egyptian conquests. Thus his partial success in Egypt was transitory, and it is doubtful that he really did grow "exceedingly great toward the south."

(b) To the east.

Antiochus III subjugated the east with his victorious campaigns of 210-206 B.C. that took him to the frontier of India. Most of the territories involved rebelled and became independent, however, after the Romans defeated him at Magnesia.

Antiochus IV attempted to regain some of this territory during the eastern campaign he conducted in the last two years of his reign. After some initial diplomatic and military successes in Armenia and Media, however, he found himself unable to make further headway against the Parthians. He died during the course of his campaign against the latter, apparently from natural causes, in the winter of 164/3 B.C.

While Antiochus IV did have some initial successes, he did not accomplish nearly as much in this area as Antiochus III; and this project was left incomplete at the point of his death. It is open to question, therefore, as to what extent these partial and incomplete military successes match the prophetic prediction concerning the little horn as "growing exceedingly great" toward the east.

(c) To the glorious land.

Antiochus IV is noted in 1 Macc 1-6 as the Seleucid ruler who desecrated the temple and persecuted the Jews. This did not occur because of any conquest of his own, but because Antiochus III had already taken Palestine away from the Ptolemies in 198 B.C. He could not have "grown exceedingly great toward the glorious land," Judea presumably, in any sense of conquest or acquiring control of it by military action. He could have "[grown] exceedingly" only in the sense of exercising or abusing his control over it, since it was already part of his kingdom when he came to the throne.

Although Antiochus IV was not the conquerer of Palestine, the defeats that his forces suffered there toward the end of his reign started the course of events which eventually led to the complete independence of Judea from the Seleucids. While he himself was campaigning in the east, his Palestinian forces suffered defeats at Emmaus (1 Macc 3:57) and Beth-zur (1 Macc 4:29) in Judea. Toward the end of 164 B.C. the Jews liberated the polluted temple from Seleucid hands and rededicated it (1 Macc 5:52). Antiochus died in the east shortly thereafter, early in 163 B.C. (1 Macc 6:15).

(d) Summary.

Antiochus IV never captured Alexandria, the capital of Egypt, but he enjoyed military successes in Lower Egypt during his campaigns from 169 to 167 B.C. However, he had to forsake these briefly held, ill-gotten gains, due to diplomatic pressure from the Romans. Only the first part of his campaign toward the east was successful. He died before he had carried out his plans for that region to consolidate his control over it.

Although he bore down harder on the Jews than had his predecessors, he was not the one who brought Judea into the Seleucid empire, since it was already part of that dominion when he came to the throne. The three defeats his forces suffered there shortly before he died signaled developments which ultimately led to Judea's independence.

The net results of what Antiochus accomplished in these three geographical spheres was rather negligible and even negative in some cases. Thus he does not fit very well the specification of this prophecy which states that the little horn was to grow "exceedingly great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the glorious land."

(2) Anti-temple activities.

It is fair to say that Antiochus took away the *tamid* the "daily" or "continual." It holds true if applied to the continual burnt offering that was offered twice daily on the altar of the temple, or to the ministrations of the priests who offered those and other sacrifices. Nevertheless, the phrase, "the place of his sanctuary was cast down" (8:11, KJV), which indicates what was done to the temple building itself by the little horn does not fit the activities of Antiochus. The word used for "place" (Hebrew, *makon*) is both interesting and important. It occurs in the Hebrew Bible a dozen and a half times. In every instance but one it refers to the place where God dwells or the site upon which His throne rests.

This word appears first in the Bible in the "Song of the Sea" which the Israelites sang on the shore of the Red Sea after their deliverance from Pharaoh's army (Ex 15:17). In that song God's *makon* is identified as the place in which he would establish His abode, that is, His sanctuary in the promised land. The term appears four times in the address Solomon gave when the temple was dedicated (see 1 Kgs 8 and its parallel passage of 2 Chr 6). Once the king uses the term to refer to the temple; three times it denotes God's dwelling place in heaven (1 Kgs 8:13, 39, 43, 49).

In Ps 33:14 the word likewise is used for God's dwelling in heaven. Three other texts employ *makonto* refer to the place of God's dwelling on earth. It occurs twice in Isaiah, once referring to the location of God's earthly abode on Mount Zion (Isa 4:5), and once referring to the place from which God looked upon Ethiopia in judgment (18:4), presumably the earthly temple again. In Ezra 2:68 it was used more specifically for the place upon which God's earthly temple was to be rebuilt. In Ps 89:14 and 97:2 this word was used in the metaphorical sense. Justice and righteousness are said to be the "foundation" of His throne.

Aside from this occurrence in Daniel, therefore, *makon* is used seven times for the place of God's dwelling in heaven, six times for the place of His earthly dwelling, and twice for the place of His throne in a metaphorical sense. The only instance where this word was not used for God's dwelling place, whether earthly or heavenly, is Ps 104:5 where it is used poetically for the "foundations" upon which the earth was set.

It was this "place" of God's sanctuary that was to be cast down by the little horn, according to Daniel 8:11. One could apply this to what the Romans did to the temple in A.D. 70. But Antiochus never did anything to the temple which would qualify as "casting down its *makon*," or place. Desecrate it he did; but, as far as is known, he did not damage its architecture in any significant way.

On the contrary, it would have been to his disadvantage to have done so, since he turned it over to be used for the cult of Zeus. Thus while it is fair to say that Antiochus suspended the daily or continual sacrifices/ministrations of the temple, we have no indication that he cast it down from its place, or cast down its place. Consequently, this aspect of the prophecy is in opposition to the interpretation of the little horn as Antiochus IV.

D. Time factors for the little horn

(1) Time of origin.

The rise of the little horn is dated in terms of the four kingdoms which came from Alexander's empire. It was to come up "at the latter end of their rule" (8:23).

The Seleucid dynasty consisted of a line of more than twenty kings who ruled from 311 to 65 B.C. Antiochus IV was the eighth in line, and he ruled from 175 to 164/3 B.C. Since more than a dozen Seleucids ruled after him and less than a dozen ruled before him, he can hardly be said to have arisen "at the latter end of their rule."

It would be more correct to fix the period of his rule in the middle of the dynasty; and chronology supports this argument. The Seleucids ruled for a century and a third before Antiochus IV and a century after him. [This fact places this particular ruler within two decades of the midpoint of the dynasty. Thus Antiochus IV did not arise "at the latter end of their rule."](#)

(2) Duration.

The chronological datum given in the question and answer of Daniel 8:13-14 has been interpreted as giving the length of time Antiochus IV was to have desecrated the temple or persecuted the Jews. Precise dates are available for the disruption of the temple services and its pollution. The pagan idol was set up on the altar of burnt offering on the 15th day of the 9th month of the 145th year of the Seleucid era, and pagan sacrifices began there ten days later (1 Macc 1:54, 59).

On the 25th day of the 9th month in the 148th year of the Seleucid era a newly built altar was consecrated and the celebrations continued for eight days thereafter (1 Macc 4:52, 54). Thus a period of three years, or three years and ten days, was involved here. Neither 2300 literal days (six years, four and two-thirds months) nor 1150 literal days (made by pairing evening and morning sacrifices to make full days) fits this historical period, since even the shorter of the two is two months too long.

Various attempts have been made to explain this discrepancy. None of them are satisfactory. The troops of Antiochus did sack the temple, though, on their way back from Egypt two years earlier, but that still falls a year and a half short of the longer period.

Since a connection between this time period and the temple is lacking, it has been suggested that it should be interpreted as referring to persecution. Menelaus (one of two rival Jewish high priests) talked Andronicus, an official of Antiochus, into killing Onias, a former high priest (2 Macc 4:34). This might have occurred in 170 B.C. (2 Macc 4:23), or six and one-half years (2300 days) before the cleansing of the temple late in 164 B.C. When he heard about it, Antiochus executed Andronicus (2 Macc 4:38).

Thereafter, Menelaus and his brother Lysimachus led a fight against some of the Jews who opposed them. This was not a Seleucid persecution. It was partisan Jewish in-fighting, and Antiochus executed his own official for his part in the affair. Thus neither the 2300 days nor the 1150 days fits Antiochus' desecration of the temple or his persecution of the Jews as some of the more candid critical commentators readily acknowledge.

The other way to look at the relationship of this time period to Antiochus is by taking the historicist interpretation into account. That school of prophetic interpretation utilizes the day-for-a-year principle for time periods found in apocalyptic contexts. If this position (see chapter 3) is correct, it means that we are dealing with a period of 2300 years, not 2300 literal days. Regardless of where one begins in the B.C. era, it is obvious that they must extend far beyond the narrow chronological confines of Antiochus' one-decade reign in the second century B.C.

(3) The End.

When Gabriel came to Daniel to explain the vision of chapter 8, he introduced his explanation with the statement, "Understand, O son of man, that the vision is for the time of the end" (8:17). At the beginning of his actual explanation Gabriel again emphasized this point by stating, "Behold, I will make known to you what shall be at the latter end of the indignation; for it pertains to the appointed time of the end" (8:19). The phrases, "the time of the end" and "the appointed time of the end," are also essential for a correct identify of the little horn.

Since the third and final section of the vision is mainly concerned with the little horn and its activities, it seems reasonable to conclude that the horn relates most directly to the "time of the end." The end of the little horn, therefore, should coincide in one way or another with "the time of the end."

At a bare chronological minimum Daniel's time prophecies (Daniel 9:24-27) had to extend to the time of the Messiah in the first century A.D. "The time of the end" could only arrive some time after the fulfillment of that prophecy. Therefore, there is no way for Antiochus' death in 164/3 B.C. to be made to coincide with "the time of the end" when the little horn was to come to its end.

E. Nature of the end of the little horn

According to the prophecy, the little horn was to come to its end in a particular way, "But, by no human hand, he shall be broken" (8:25). This phraseology sounds somewhat similar to the description of the fate for the king of the north in Daniel 11:45, "he shall come to his end, with none to help him". The end to the little horn in Daniel 7 was to come about by a decision of God in the heavenly court. In Daniel 2 the image was brought to an end by a stone that smote the image on its feet, and that stone was cut out without the assistance of any human hand (Daniel 2:45).

The conclusions to the prophecies in Daniel 2, 7, 8, and 11 are all to be brought about by God's direct intervention in human history. Given the nature of the statement in 8:25 (and its parallels in the other prophecies of Daniel), it is difficult to see how Antiochus IV could fulfill this particular specification. As far as is known (cf 1 Macc 6:8-17), he died of natural causes--not in battle nor from extraordinary circumstances--during the course of his eastern campaign in 164/3 B.C.

F. Origin of the little horn

A major question concerning the little horn in Daniel 8 is whether it came out of the four preceding horns or from one of the four winds toward which those horns extended. The obvious reason why this is important is that if the little horn came from the Seleucid horn, then it could have been a Seleucid king like Antiochus Epiphanes. However, if it came from one of the winds, then it would not represent Antiochus IV since he should more naturally issue from the Seleucid horn.

Given the importance of this point, the syntax of the statement on the origin of the little horn in Daniel 8:8-9 should be examined carefully. Any commentary which does not do this is shirking its exegetical duty, because the decision on how the Hebrew sentence structure should be translated will affect the subsequent interpretation of verse 9.

This problem involves the agreement in gender between a pronominal suffix at the beginning of Daniel 8:9 ("them") and the antecedents proposed for it in the preceding verse ("horns"/"winds"). Verse 8 concludes, "and instead of it [the great horn of Alexander that was broken] there came up four conspicuous horns toward the four winds of heaven." Drawing on this picture and relating to it, verse 9 continues, "Out of one of them came forth a little horn... ." The question is, To what in verse 8 does "them" refer--the horns or the winds?

The linguistic setting is more specific in the Hebrew than in the English translation, inasmuch as nouns and pronouns in Hebrew have gender which requires their agreement. The problem then is as follows: The pronominal suffix "them" in verse 9 is a *masculine* plural. On the other hand, the Hebrew word for "horn" is always *feminine*. The word for "winds" is written as a *feminine plural*, although it can

occasionally be written in masculine form. This means that as the Hebrew text stands there is no agreement in gender between the pronominal suffix "them" (verse 9) and either of its potential antecedents--"horns" [understood] or "winds"--in verse 8.

This problem is compounded further by the form of the numerals used in these two verses. The numeral "four" at the end of verse 8 and the numeral "one" at the beginning of verse 9 are both *feminine* in form. Thus this masculine pronominal suffix ("them") does not agree with the gender of either of its potential antecedent nouns ("horns/winds"), nor does it agree with the gender of the numerals ("four") used with "it" and "them." The nature of this problem, but not its final solution, has been summarized thus:

G. Out of one of them.

In the Hebrew this phrase presents confusion of gender. The word for 'them,' *hem*, is masculine. This indicates that, grammatically the antecedent is 'winds' (verse 8) and not 'horns,' since 'winds' may be either masculine or feminine, but 'horns' only feminine. On the other hand, the word for 'one,' *achath* feminine, suggesting "horns" as the antecedent. *Achath* could, of course, refer back to the word for 'winds,' which occurs most frequently in the feminine. But it is doubtful that the writer would assign two different genders to the same noun in such Close Contextual relationship. To reach grammatical agreement, either *achath* should be changed into a masculine, thus making the entire phrase refer clearly to 'winds,' or the word for 'them' should be changed into feminine, in which case the reference would be ambiguous, since either 'winds' or 'horns' may be the antecedent."^[5]

In my opinion, it is not necessary to resort to an emendation of the text if the syntax of this statement is understood. Verse 8 states that four horns appeared in the place of the great horn which was broken. The last phrase of the verse indicates that those horns extended "toward the four winds of the heavens." Verse 9 begins with the prepositional phrase, "Out of one of them" and goes on to describe how the little horn went forth and grew up to a position of great exaltation.

The English translation, "Out of one of them," however, obscures and smooths out the actual Hebrew construction. The sentence actually opens with two prepositional phrases. Translated literally the sentence reads, "and from the one from them . . .", etc. The reason why it is important to notice this literal construction is that it provides a precise parallel to the gender of the elements found in the last phrase of verse 8. This can best be shown by transposing the first phrase of verse 9 to line up beneath the last phrase of verse 8 with these elements in parallel columns. Such a procedure presents the following alignment:

		Fem.		Masc.
Verse 8	"to the four	<i>winds</i>	of the	<i>heavens</i> "
	<i>learba</i>	<i>ruhoh</i>		<i>hasamayim</i>
Verse 9		<i>min-haahat</i>		<i>mehem</i>
		"from the <i>one</i>		from <i>them</i>

When this procedure is carried out, it can be seen that the gender of the first two elements in verse 9 ("one/them") lines up perfectly with the gender of the last two elements at the end of verse 8 ("winds/heavens").

In writing his visions Daniel simply broke up the construct chain at the end of verse 8 ("the four winds of the heavens") and distributed its two elements to two separate prepositional phrases at the beginning of verse 9 ("from the one/from them"). This is not poetic parallelism, it is syntactic parallelism in which the gender of the elements in the second statement parallels the gender of the elements in the first, or preceding, statement.

Thus the antecedent of "them" in the phrase "from them" (verse 9), is neither "winds" nor "horns," but "heavens." Since "heavens" is masculine by gender and treated as a plural in biblical Hebrew, according to the verbs and adjectives used with it, there is perfect agreement in gender and number with the masculine plural pronoun "them." It is not necessary to resort to emendations to bring the text into line with one's preconceptions about where the little horn came from. The feminine "one" of verse

9 refers back to the feminine "winds" of verse 9. The text discloses the origin clearly enough: it came from one of the four winds of the heavens, That is, from one of the directions of the compass.

From this understanding of the syntax in verses 8-9, it is evident that when the little horn came onto the scene of action, it did not come from the Seleucid horn nor from the other three. In the pictorial vision it is simply seen as coming from one of the compass directions. Thus the syntax of this statement does not support the contention that the little horn developed from the Selucid horn/kingdom.

Daniel 9

The bearing of the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 on the question as to whether the little horn of Daniel 8 is Antiochus must now be examined. Some commentators claim that Antiochus IV may be found in this prophecy too.

The way to determine whether Antiochus is intended as a historical fulfillment of some of those things prophesied in Daniel 9:24-27 is to examine those verses on the basis of a phrase-by-phrase and verse-by-verse exegesis, comparing the results of that exegesis with potential historical fulfillments. Such an analysis has been carried out in a separate study on Daniel 9:24-27.^[6] The results of this particular aspect of that exegesis has proved to be negative in terms of showing any correlation between it and the historical actions of Antiochus IV. The whole of that exegesis need not be repeated here, but a few salient points from it will be mentioned in passing.

One major problem with the preterist interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27 has to do with the fact that there is no possible way to fit Antiochus IV into its prophetic time span, as the more candid interpreters of this school admit. There is no possible way to squeeze 490 years into the period from 587/6 B.C. to 165/4 B.C.

A second major problem with the preterist view of Daniel 9:24-27 is that Antiochus IV never did to Jerusalem what this prophecy says was to happen to it. The coming conquerer was to "destroy" it (verse 26a); it was to come to an "end" (verse 26b), and its "desolations" by a "desolator" (verses 26c-27) were decreed.

It is difficult to imagine a more emphatic way in Hebrew to have prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem than through this threefold description of its fate. Antiochus IV did not destroy, desolate, or bring to an end, either Jerusalem or its temple; he only desecrated the latter. Thus he does not fit this specification of the prophecy.

The linguistic evidence also tends to deny the allegation that Antiochus IV is the fulfillment of "the prince who is to come"(9:26). In a separate study on this subject I have presented the evidence from an analysis of the literary structure which supports the idea that the titles of Messiah Prince (verse 25), the Messiah (verse 26a), the Prince (verse 26b), refer to the same person, that is, to Jesus Christ.

Even if one applies only the title of Messiah to Jesus and that of the Prince to some other historical figure (which the majority of commentators do), *that latter historical figure must still be found in the same general period of history as the Messiah, in the first century A.D. of the Roman era.* He cannot be projected back to the second century B.C. of the Hellenistic era.

The reference to this *nagid*, or Prince, in this prophecy provides a historical and chronological frame of reference in which to evaluate his subsequent connection with the prophecy of Daniel II. It is to that prophecy that we turn next.

Daniel 11

1. Introduction

Commentators are generally agreed that the later prophecies in Daniel explain the earlier ones. They represent a progressive enlargement on the themes treated in the earlier prophecies. This is quite evident even from a cursory survey of the book. Its prophecies begin with kingdoms symbolized through the metals of the image of chapter 2. Those kingdoms are symbolized again in Daniel 7 through the use of beasts; but additional details are given about them and their divisions, in particular through the use of horns to represent some of their divisions. The same imagery is carried on into chapter 8 where additional details about them are given. Finally, in chapter 11 we no longer have beasts with their horns representing those kingdoms and their division, but rather a series of selected individual kings who ruled those kingdoms.

In a sense (which may not at first be apparent) the prophecy of chapter 2 balances that of chapter 11. The former presents an image of the individual man whose various parts represent the successive kingdoms that were to rise and fall. In Daniel 11, on the other hand, we come to a series of individuals who ruled over those kingdoms. The image of chapter 2 has, in a manner of speaking, come to life and now walks through history in the form of his individual embodiments. In between these two prophecies which use the imagery of man are found two back-to-back prophecies which employ beast + horn imagery (chapters 7-8). Therefore, as far as these four chain or outline prophecies are concerned, they are balanced in the literary structure of Daniel as follows:

Man (2): Beasts 4- horns (7): :Beasts + horns (8): Men (11)

This literary form lends further support to the idea that the later prophetic chapters of Daniel explain the earlier ones. This is also an argument supporting single authorship of the book.

The question might be raised here as to whether the prophecy of chapter 9 (absent from the above literary balance) is not wrongly placed in the second half of the book. While the element in the first half of the book which balances with chapter 9 is not prophetic in character, there is still a certain balance between them.

First, one might look at the structure of the first half of the book by itself. This has already been elaborated first by A. Lenglet^[7] and subsequently by Joyce Baldwin.^[8] The very precise literary structure to the Aramaic portion of the first half of Daniel, chapters 2-7, is as follows:

C: Prophecy against aC': Prophecy against a
Babylonian king, Babylonian king, Belshazzar
Nebuchadnezzar(4) (5)

B: Persecution and B': Persecution and
deliverance, Daniel's deliverance, Daniel (6)
friends (3)

A: Prophecy about A': Prophecy about
nations (2) nations (7)

This chiasmic or A:B:C :C':B':A' structure is known as a palistrophe, and it argues for a single authorship of this portion of the book.

At the center of this arrangement of narratives (B + B') are the chapters dealing with the fate of some of the people of God during their Babylonian exile (chapters 3, 6). At the center of the second section of

Daniel (chapter 8--12) is the prophecy of chapter 9 dealing with the future of the people of God after their return from Babylonian exile. This prophecy is introduced by a prayer of one of those exiles, Daniel, whose experience is described in more detail in the earlier chapters of the book. On the larger scale, therefore, one of the ways the total literary structure of the book of Daniel can be analyzed is as follows:

B: Narrative history, God's people in exile (3-6)		B': Prophetic history, Gods' people after exile (9)	
A: Outline prophecy, :Man (2)	C: Outline prophecy beasts/horns (7)	:: C': Outline prophecy, beasts/horns (8)	A': Outline prophecy, :Men (10-12)

Chapter 1 could be seen as a historical prologue to all of this, and verses 5-12 of chapter 12 could be seen as a balancing prophetic epilogue to it.

Even without a recognition of these intimate literary relations, it has already been evident to the vast majority of commentators that the later chapters in Daniel elaborate in detail various aspects of the earlier prophecies. The direct linguistic relations between these prophecies studied below present us with further evidence which tightens the interconnecting links between them. Thus a recognition of the clear relations between these prophetic passages is a safe basis upon which to proceed here.

Of particular importance is the direct linguistic evidence from chapter 11 locating the prophecies of chapters 8 and 9 in a historico-prophetic framework in such a manner as to relate these later chapters to each other. This relationship, already evident to some extent from an examination of their content, is thus clarified by the later prophecy of chapter 11. The clarification of these relations speaks directly to the question as to whether or not Antiochus IV is the little horn of Daniel 8.

While many prophetic details in Daniel 11 are difficult to interpret, nevertheless, certain elements stand out as reasonably apparent. No great difficulties have been encountered, for example, in interpreting verses 1-13. Interpreters who have proposed identifications for the successive kings alluded to are in general agreement up to this point. The Persian kings down to Xerxes are referred to in verse 2. By virtue of his attack on the Greeks, Xerxes brought this nation onto the scene of action with Alexander appearing in verse 3.

After Alexander died his kingdom was divided. Those divisions are referred to in verse 4. The prophecy then narrows, concentrating on "the king of the north" (the title given to the successive Seleucid rulers) and "the king of the south" (the title given to the successive Ptolemies). From verses 5-13 the Ptolemies and Seleucids follow in an order that can be determined with reasonable certainty down to the Seleucid Antiochus III.

Up to this point there is general agreement. Beginning with the troublesome reference to the "breakers of your people" in verse 14, however, interpretations diverge. Some would see the chapter continuing from Antiochus III to Antiochus IV and concentrating on him until the end of the chapter. Others would see this as a reference to the Romans whom the policies of Antiochus III drew into Near Eastern history for the first time--just as Xerxes drew the Greeks into that arena from the standpoint of this prophecy. For our present purposes it is not necessary to decide in favor of one or the other of those diverging interpretations of the prophecy.

Rather than debating over how different details can be applied to one lung or another from this point on, it is more helpful to see where (farther down the line of this prophecy) language from the earlier prophecies is introduced into it. If such formulation is recognizable here, the historical relationship between Daniel 11 and the earlier prophecies can be established. If such points of contact can be recognized, then Daniel 11 can be used in turn to relate those earlier prophecies to each other. The wording of Daniel 11:22 indicates that Daniel 11 first develops clearcut lexical relations with one of the earlier prophecies.

2. Verse 22

Here is my rather literal rendering of Daniel 11:22--"and the arms of a flood shall be flooded before him and broken, and the prince of the covenant also."

The text presents a picture of inferior forces being overwhelmed and defeated by superior forces. The forces on the defensive are referred to as "the arms of a flood." This construct chain ("the arms of a flood") is the subject of the two following passive verbs which echo each of the elements in the construct chain. Thus the "flood" is *to be flooded*, and the "arms" *are to be broken*. The lesser flood was to be flooded by an even greater flood of arms which was to come by an aggressor.

Now, of the five other cases where this Hebrew root word for "flood" occurs as a noun in biblical Hebrew it appears only one other place in Daniel--in 9:26 ("Its end shall come with the flood, and to the end there shall be war"). This already suggests a close relationship between 9:26 and 11:22. But these two verses are tied together even more closely by noting who else was to be broken by this aggressor besides the military arms he would defeat. The prince of the covenant would also be broken.

It is important to note the Hebrew word *nagid*, translated "prince" in this passage. *Nagid* stands in contrast to the word *sar*, translated as "prince" 11 times elsewhere in Daniel. Six times *sar* refers to human individuals as princes (9:6, 8; 10:13, 20 [twice], and 11:5). *Sar* is used five times for heavenly or superhuman figures in Daniel (8:11, 25; 10:13, 21; 12:1).

On the other hand, *nagid* occurs only three times in Daniel, namely, in 11:22 and twice previously in the prophecy of 9:24-27. In the prophecy of 9:24-27 it occurs first with the Messiah in verse 25 and then again alone in verse 26, where it refers to the prince "who is to come." The significance of the *nagid* from the prophecy of Daniel 9 has been noted in a separate study on Daniel 9: 24-27;^[9] there it was found to refer to the same individual in both instances--the Messiah Prince.

It is unfortunate that the distinction between *sar* and *nagid* has been lost in the English translations of Daniel by translating both terms with the same English word--"prince." This distinction is sharp and clear. Applying these terms prophetically to Christ, the former refers to Him in His heavenly capacity as the "Prince of the host," the "Prince of princes," and the "great Prince" who will stand up for His people.

Nagid on the other hand, refers to Christ in His earthly incarnate state. It is as this earthly *nagid* that He was to be anointed as Messiah, to be cut off or broken, to make atonement for sin, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to bring the significance of the sacrificial system to an end, and to make a strong covenant with His localized earthly people for one final prophetic week. Here again, therefore, is another term occurring in both Daniel 9:26-27 and 11:22.

The third Hebrew word occurring in both passages is *berit*, or "covenant." *Berit* does occur elsewhere in Daniel besides these two passages. Thus it is not exclusive to them. It is true to say, however, that its connection with the prince, or *nagid*, is exclusive to these two passages. In 9:26-27 it is the *nagid* who was to make strong the covenant for one week. In 11:22 we have the *nagid* of the covenant.

If intra-Danielic lexical relations mean anything, then the same individual should be referred to in these two passages. For our present purposes it does not matter whether one interprets the *nagid* of 9:26 as a Roman *nagid* or as Jesus the Messiah Prince, as outlined above. No matter which of these two options one follows, the fulfilment of these verses has to be put in the Roman period.

There are three points of contact between Daniel 9:24-27 and Daniel 11:22. The word for "flood" is common to both of these passages. but is not found elsewhere in Daniel. The same is true of the word *nagid* ("prince"). The word for "covenant," although found elsewhere in Daniel, is found only in these two passages in combination with the word *nagid* for "prince." In light of the three linguistic links between these two passages, it is evident that they should refer to some of the same events in one way or another.

Because of these linguistic relations interpreters who identify the "prince of the covenant" in 11:22 as the Jewish high priest Onias III (murdered ca 170 B.C.) are obliged to do the same for the *nagid* in Daniel 9:26-27. But since the historical correspondences of the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 found their fulfillment in the Roman period (discussed elsewhere in a separate study on Daniel 9:24-27),^[10] the *nagid* of the covenant referred to in 11:22 cannot be Onias III. The only way such an interpretation can be maintained is by breaking the linguistic relations between Daniel 9:26-27 and 11:22 or to date the former in the Maccabean period. Since the evidence discussed above indicates that both of these positions are incorrect, *a Roman date must be upheld for Daniel 11:22.*

This gives us a chronological fixed point from which to interpret the historical flow of the prophecy in Daniel 11. Everything that precedes Daniel 11:22 must precede the execution of Christ by the Romans, when they broke the prince of the covenant. Furthermore, everything that follows verse 22 must correspondingly be fulfilled after the crucifixion of Jesus. With this fixed point in mind, we must seek to discover where the prophecy of Daniel 11 locates events and activities related to the little horn of Daniel 8. Again, linguistic correspondences are the most direct evidence on which to rely.

3. Verses 32-34

A correlation of major importance between Daniel 11 and the preceding prophecies of Daniel is that which relates the persecution carried out by the little horn in Daniel 7:25, and the persecution described as occurring according to Daniel 11:32-34. The relations between these two passages must be elucidated through the conclusion to the latter (11:32-34) which is found in Daniel 12:6-7.

After Gabriel had rehearsed the whole prophecy of Daniel 11:2 through 12:4 to him, Daniel had one particular question, and that was about time: "How long shall it be till the end of these wonders?" (12:6). The divine-like figure whom he had seen in the vision of Daniel 10:5-6 appeared to him again at this time and swore by the eternal God, "that it would be for a time, two times, and half a time; and that when the shattering of the power of the holy people comes to an end all these things would be accomplished" (12:7).

From the contents of Daniel 12:7, it is evident that the prophetic time period of "a time, two times, and half a time," or a total of three and one-half times, related most directly to the period during which the power of the holy people was to be shattered--the time they were to be persecuted. This question-and answer dialogue comes at the end of the prophecy of Daniel 11--12 and, therefore, should relate to something that was previously described in that prophecy.

The question then is, where in Daniel 11 is this three and one-half times of persecution described? The one and only place in Daniel 11 where a persecution of God's people is described is found in verses 32-34: "And those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. When they shall fall, they shall receive a little help."

The logical connection between these two passages indicates that the three and one-half times of persecution referred to in Daniel 12:7 are described in more detail in 11:32-34, but without the more specific time element found in 12:7. The three and one-half times of 12:7 gives the length of that persecution, while 11:32-34 indicates where in the flow of Prophetic history this period of persecution was to occur.

These three and one-half times of Daniel 12:7 do not stand in isolation in Daniel, however; they have connections elsewhere in the book outside of chapter 11. The other place where they occur (in Aramaic instead of Hebrew this time) is in Daniel 7:25. The three and one-half times mentioned there were also to be a time of persecution during which the saints of the Most High were to be given into the hand (power) of the little horn, and be worn out by it.

These two passages (Daniel 7:25 and 12:7) thus contain equivalent elements in linguistic, chronological, and thematic terms. Both refer to a time of persecution, and both indicate that persecution was to last three and one-half times. These two time periods, the events that were to occur during them, and the perpetrator of those events can thus be identified as the same. Since the three and

one-half times of persecution were to be caused by the little horn in Daniel 7, it is evident that this equivalence between these two passages indicates that the little horn of Daniel 7 was to cause the persecution referred to in Daniel 12:7.

Since the little horn that caused the persecution in Daniel 7 came out of the fourth beast in the prophecy of that chapter, and since the fourth beast of that prophecy represented Imperial Rome, it is evident that the persecution of Daniel 11:32-34 was to be caused by a power that would arise some time subsequent to the establishment of dominion by Rome.

On this basis it is evident that neither the persecution of Daniel 11:32-34 nor the desecration of the temple referred to in the immediately preceding verse (verse 31, see below) can be projected back to the time of Antiochus IV in the second century B.C. They belong together during the distinctively religious phase of this Roman power's work, that is, in the medieval period. On the basis of these associations with the prophecies elsewhere in Daniel it can be said that the persecution described in Daniel 11:32-34 was not the persecution Antiochus IV Epiphanes brought down upon the Jews in Judea between 168 and 165 B.C.

4. Verse 31

Daniel 11:31 identifies three activities which the power in view will perform: Forces from him shall--

- A. Profane the strong temple (*hillelu hammiqdas hammaoz*).
- B. Remove the continual (*hesiru hattamid*).
- C. Set up the abomination which makes desolate (*natnu hassiqqus mesomem*).

These activities can be related to those activities conducted by the little horn in Daniel 8 as follows:

(1) Profanes the strong temple.

According to Daniel 8:11 the place of the temple of the Prince of the host was to be cast down. This refers to what the prophet saw in vision. While various aspects of the work of the little horn are explained at the end of chapter 8, this aspect of his work was not. Its more earthly equivalent is given here in Daniel 11. To some extent, therefore, this passage provides an explanation of what is meant by this antecedent phrase in chapter 8. A passive verb ("was overthrown/cast down") occurs with the pair of nouns written in 8:11, while an active verb ("profane") is used in 11:31. This appears to express one way in which the "casting down" of the temple of the vision was to be accomplished, that is, by its profanation. Note the comparison of 11:31 with this aspect of the horn:

8:11: "the place of his temple," *mekôn miqdaso*.

11:31: "the strong temple," *hammiqdas hammaoz*.

Although they are coupled in different ways, it is interesting to note that the nouns in both pairs ("place/temple"--"temple/strong") were written with *mem* preformatives (the letter "m" prefixed to certain words in Hebrew) in spite of the fact that it was not necessary to do so. This alliteration emphasizes the link between them. Both phrases are definite. The first is qualified through the use of the pronominal suffix ("his"), and the second through the use of the article ("the").

Maoz ("strong") agrees in number, gender, and determination with "temple." It was written following "temple" in the attributive position and functions like an adjective, in spite of the fact that it is a noun ("stronghold, fortress"). Either this noun was used irregularly as an adjective for alliterative reasons, or, perhaps more likely, it was meant to stand in apposition, "the temple, that is, the fortress." In either case, there is no conjunction between them. Since this is not a poetic passage, it is not legitimate to translate this phrase, "the temple and the fortress [= city]" (of RSV).

(2) Removes the continual.

According to Daniel 8:11 the *tamid*, or "continual" (sacrifice/ministry), was to be taken away from the Prince of the host. Daniel 11:31 identifies those responsible for taking the *tamid* away by using a verb in the causative conjugation ("shall cause to be removed"). In this sense the phrase in Daniel 11 comes closer to the second reference to *tamid* in Daniel 8:12 where it is said that the little horn was to be given a host (or army) over the *tamid*. This suggests that the army of the little horn was to exercise control over the *tamid*. According to Daniel 11:31 this is what the forces from this power would do by removing it.

The phrases in Daniel 11:31 probably should be interpreted as closely interrelated. Thus these forces stand up so that they may profane the temple (verse 31a). They would profane the temple by taking away the *tamid* (verse 31b) and substituting in its place the abomination of desolation (verse 31c). It is implied that it was necessary to remove the *tamid* in order to set up that abomination.

(3) Sets up the abomination which makes desolate.

The phrase, "abomination which makes desolate," also has linguistic links with earlier passages in Daniel. The Hebrew word for "desolator" or "that which makes desolate" is the same in both 9:27 and 11:31. A linkage also appears between the "abomination that makes desolate" (11:31) and the "transgression that makes desolate" (8:13), though not as precise. However, both of these expressions tie in with the *tamid* ("continual") in their respective contexts (of 11:31 with 8:11--12).

These linguistic relationships appear to be sufficiently close to indicate the same activity of the little horn in both Daniel 8:12-13 and 11:31. The same can be said about the preceding two phrases examined. The temple of 8:11 is linked to the temple of 11:31, and the fate of the *tamid* in 8:12 is also linked with its fate in 11:31.

Therefore, there is sufficient lexical evidence to identify these aspects of the work of the little horn with what was described as going to occur according to 11:31. This is another way of saying that, in terms of the prophecy of Daniel 11, the little horn (symbolized in chapter 8) was to appear on the scene of action and perform his deeds at an important historical juncture in the flow of history recounted in 11:31.

5. Conclusion

With Daniel 11:22 linked to chapter 9, 11:31 to chapter 8, and 11:32-34 to chapter 7, we are able to establish a relative chronology between Daniel 11 and these prophecies. Result: Daniel 11 clearly indicates that the actions of the little horn in chapter 8 *follow* the cutting off of the Messiah (chapter 9) and *occur in direct relationship to* the persecution by the horn in Daniel 7. See the following chart:

Historical and Chronological Interrelations of Daniel's Prophecies

Daniel 11	Daniel 9	Daniel 8	Daniel 7
Persian kings (verse 2)	Persian decree (verse 25)	<i>Persian ram (verses 2-4)</i>	Persian bear (verse 5)
Greek King (verse 3)		<i>Greek goat (verses 5-7)</i>	Greek leopard (verse 6a)
<i>Kings of the North and South (verses 4-14)</i>		<i>Four horns (verse 8)</i>	Four heads (verse 6b)
	Imperial Rome		Imperial Rome
<i>Nagid of covenant is broken (verse 22)</i>	<i>Nagid</i> confirms covenant and is cut off (verses 25-27)		Fourth beast (verses 8, 23)
<i>Forces:</i>		<i>Little horn:</i>	
<i>1. profane temple</i>		<i>1. downs temple</i>	
<i>2. remove daily</i>		<i>2. removes daily</i>	
<i>3. abomination of desolation (verse 31)</i>		<i>3. transgression of desolation (verses 8-13)</i>	
<i>Persecution by flame and sword for 3 1/2 times (verses 32-34, 12:7)</i>			Medieval Rome Little horn: wears out saints for 3 1/2 times (verse 25)

This arrangement indicates that although the actions of the little horn were described earlier in Daniel (chapter 8), the vision described events which were to occur after those prophesied in chapter 9. Chapter 11 locates these significant events from chapter 8 *after* those of chapter 9 and at essentially the same time as the persecution of the saints launched by Medieval Rome (chapter 7).

Since we have assigned the bulk of the events in the prophecy of chapter 9 to the Roman period, that is, the first century A.D., this means that the historical fulfilment of the activities of the little horn described in chapter 8 must be sought some time after the first century A.D. Just how long afterward is immaterial at this point, since we are only concerned here with the relationship of Antiochus IV to the little horn of chapter 8. Since Antiochus IV passed off the scene long before the events of the prophecy of chapter 9 had transpired, and since the activity of the little horn must be dated after those events, the little horn cannot represent Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Summary

The historicist position which interprets the four beasts of Daniel 7 as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome has been adopted above. The attempt by scholars to identify the second and third beasts as Media and Persia appears incorrect, because:

1. It requires making a distinction not made by the prophet in his own time (sixth century B.C.).
2. It necessitates the rejection of the most obvious historical application of the imagery of the second beast which makes full allowance for the dual nature of that kingdom.
3. The historicist alignment of the prophecy is reinforced by its parallels with the beasts and their explicitly stated identifications in chapter 8.

This means that the little horn (issuing from the fourth beast in oh 7) came out of Rome. Therefore, the little horn of chapter 7 cannot represent Antiochus IV Epiphanes who belonged to one of the divisions of the Greek kingdom represented by the third beast (four-headed leopard).

Since the last earthly figures in the prophecies of Daniel 7 and 8 are both represented by a little horn, and since a comparison of the activities of these little horns indicates that they are quite similar, the probabilities are that both prophecies describe the same historical entity. Since the little horn of chapter 7 cannot be Antiochus IV the little horn in chapter 8 should not represent him either.

The main arguments for identifying the little horn of 8 as Antiochus IV rest upon (1) his persecution of the Jews, (2) his suspension of their sacrifices and pollution of their temple, and (3) locating his origin from the Seleucid horn, one, of the four divisions developed from the break up of Alexander's empire. A certain tension is involved here, however, in utilizing the figure of a horn to represent both king and kingdom at the same time.

If the four horns represent the four kingdoms which arose from Alexander's empire, then the appearance of another horn on the scene of action might better represent another kingdom instead of just a single king in the line of one of those kingdoms. However much one makes out of the achievements of Antiochus IV, he cannot be considered greater than either of the preceding empires of Persia and Greece, although the superlatives describing the little horn imply its superior greatness.

The little horn was to conquer toward the south, the east, and the pleasant land, or Palestine. The victory of Antiochus IV in the delta of Egypt was short-lived since Rome forced him to withdraw after just one year of partial occupation. He attempted to regain the territories in the east that rebelled late in the reign of Antiochus III, but he was only partially successful in that pursuit by the time of his death.

Not only was he already in possession of Palestine by the time he came to the throne (thus could not have extended himself toward it), but he was the major reason for the Seleucid loss of Judea. Thus the results achieved by Antiochus in these three geographical regions do not fit with what the little horn was to accomplish in those same areas according to the prophecy.

While Antiochus IV did suspend the regular sacrifices of the temple in Jerusalem (and he did introduce the worship of another cult there), he did not cast down the "place" (*makon*) of the temple, which is listed among the things the little horn was to do to the temple in Daniel 8. Nor can the 2300 "evening-mornings" be applied to any known historical aspect of his anti-Jewish career, either in terms of the time he persecuted the Jews or suspended their sacrifices.

Gabriel told Daniel that the vision was for the time of the end. Since the bulk of this prophecy is taken up with the little horn and its activities, that portion of it can hardly be applied to Antiochus IV since he did not extend down to "the time of the end." As far as is known, his own demise was quite natural. This information does not match the end predicted for the little horn in Daniel 8. Chronologically, the little horn was to originate at the latter end of the rule of the Seleucid horns. Antiochus IV, however, ruled at the midpoint of the Seleucid dynasty.

The final point examined from oh 8 relates to the origin of the little horn. The best syntactical interpretation currently available for the antecedents of the pronouns and numerals in Daniel 8:8-9 indicate that this horn came out of one of the winds (from one of the four points of the compass), not from one of the horns. Some scholars who have identified the little horn with Antiochus IV have argued that his origin can be traced to one of the horns. If the interpretation of the syntax in these verses is correct, such an identification must be doubted. One could still argue that Antiochus, the personification of the little horn, came out of one of the winds rather than out of the Seleucid horn. Such an interpretation, however, makes the identification of this origin void of any significance.

In a separate study we have concluded that no evidence has been found for the existence of Antiochus IV in the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 in terms of its historical fulfilment. On the contrary, in the light of our exegesis of this passage, we have found compelling reasons for interpreting it more directly as a Messianic prophecy than some previous historicist interpreters have held. As far as Antiochus IV is concerned, the important point about the prophecy of Daniel 9 is not just his historical absence from it, but the way the titles for the Messiah were used there, especially that of *nagid* or prince.

When the use of this title in Hebrew is compared with Daniel 11, it can be seen that the *nagid* (prince) of the covenant, or Christ, appears in Daniel 11:22. This correlation provides us with a chronological fixed point which enables us to interpret the prophetic history of Daniel 11.

When that fixed point is utilized, it can be seen that the activities of the little horn, as described in oh 8, do not appear in oh 11 until verse 31, or some historical time after Christ's earthly ministry and death. These relations are reinforced by the identification of the persecution of Daniel 11:32-34 with the persecution conducted by the little horn, or Medieval Rome, in Daniel 7. Since Antiochus IV Epiphanes ruled Seleucia briefly during the second century before Christ, and the little horn's anti-temple activities from Daniel 8 were not to be carried out until some time after Christ's death, Antiochus IV cannot be that little horn.

Notes

- [1] H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four Kingdoms* (Cardiff, Wales, 1935).
- [2] William H. Shea, *An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid period*, Andrews University Seminary Studies, vols. 9-10, Nos. 1-2, (Berrien Springs, MI, 1971-1972).
- [3] *The Anchor Bible*, "The Book of Daniel," a new translation with notes and commentary on chapters 1-9 by Louis F. Hartman, C.S.S.R. Introduction and commentary on chapters 10-12 by Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M. (Garden City, NY, 1978).
- [4] LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* (Washington, DC, 1946, 1954), vols. 3, 4.
- [5] *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* (Washington, DC, 1955), 4:840-41.
- [6] William H. Shea, "Daniel 9:24-27," Euro-Africa Division Bible Conferences, 1982.
- [7] A. Lenglet, *Biblica* 53 (1972): 169-90.
- [8] Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel, An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL, 1978), pp. 59-62.
- [9] Shea, "Daniel 9:24-27."
- [10] Shea, "Daniel 9:24-27."