

CLASSIC REPRINT SERIES

---

THE PROPHECIES  
OF DANIEL  
EXPOUNDED BY  
MILTON S. TERRY

---



by  
Milton Spenser Terry

Forgotten Books

Forgotten Books

THE PROPHECIES  
OF DANIEL  
EXPOUNDED BY  
MILTON S. TERRY

*by*

Milton Spenser Terry

Published by Forgotten Books 2013

Originally published 1893

PIBN 1000753049

[www.ForgottenBooks.org](http://www.ForgottenBooks.org)

Copyright © 2013 Forgotten Books

# Forgotten Books

## eBook Terms & Conditions

[www.forgottenbooks.org](http://www.forgottenbooks.org)

### 1. This eBook\* may be

- a. Copied for personal and educational use.
- b. Printed for personal and educational use.

### 2. This eBook\* may NOT be

- a. Distributed in any form.
- b Sold individually or as part of a package.
- c. Modified in any way.
- d. Reversed-engineered.



This eBook\* and all its content including images are  
Copyright © 2014 FB &c Ltd - All rights reserved.  
Forgotten Books is a registered trademark of FB &c Ltd.

**FB &c Ltd**, Dalton House, 60 Windsor Avenue, London SW19 2RR  
Company number 08720141. Registered in England and Wales.

\*eBook' refers to this PDF and any of its content including pages and images in either electronic or printed form.

The paperback edition of  
this book can be purchased from

[amazon.com](https://www.amazon.com)


[amazon.co.uk](https://www.amazon.co.uk)

[amazon.de](https://www.amazon.de)

[amazon.fr](https://www.amazon.fr)

[amazon.es](https://www.amazon.es)


[amazon.it](https://www.amazon.it)



Over 1,000,000 eBooks  
are available to read at

*Forgotten Books*

[www.forgottenbooks.org](http://www.forgottenbooks.org)



484,473 eBooks  
are available to read at

# Forgotten Books

[www.ForgottenBooks.org](http://www.ForgottenBooks.org)



## Alchemy

*“In changing the base metals into gold and silver by the projection of the Stone, it follows (by an accelerated process) the method of nature, and therefore is natural.”*

The New Pearl of Great Price, by Peter Bonus, 1338 AD

[www.ForgottenBooks.org/Alchemy](http://www.ForgottenBooks.org/Alchemy)



# Forgotten Books

## Free App Download



Available on the  
**App Store**



Windows  
Store



ANDROID APP ON

**Google™ play**

Enjoy

**484,473 Books**

wherever you go

[www.ForgottenBooks.org/apps](http://www.ForgottenBooks.org/apps)




THE  
PROPHECIES OF DANIEL

EXPOUNDED

BY  
*penjer*  
MILTON S. TERRY, S. T. D.  
"

*Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Garrett Biblical Institute.*



*260944*

NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON  
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS  
1893



BS1556  
T4

Copyright, 1893, by  
HUNT & EATON,  
NEW YORK.

Electrotyped, printed, and bound by  
HUNT & EATON,  
150 Fifth Avenue, New York.



PL 111 A9 45

## P R E F A C E .

---

THIS little volume does not aim to furnish a commentary on the Book of Daniel, but consists rather of a series of exegetical essays on the apocalyptical portions of the book. It is sent forth with a hope of correcting, to some extent, the unsound methods of interpretation from which, we believe, this series of prophecies has greatly suffered. With a number of English expositors it would seem that the chief mission of Daniel, during the time of the Babylonian exile, was to foretell the rise and fall of the Roman papacy; and one might almost infer, from the tone and spirit with which some of them write, that, if this darling idea of theirs is to be rejected, the book would scarcely be entitled to a place in the inspired canon of Scriptures. There is also a singularly persistent presumption, fostered, no doubt, by the class of works just referred to, that the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse of John may be reasonably expected to contain a prophetic syllabus of

European politics. Ancient and mediæval history has, accordingly, been ransacked to find particular persons, kingdoms, and events answering to the supposed allusions of the inspired prophet. One may well be amazed at the amount of imperious dogmatism displayed in the writings of some who follow the line of such unwarranted assumptions.

A sound interpretation of these prophecies has also been embarrassed by an obvious desire, on the part of some theologians, to make the book a special contribution to apologetics. However commendable such a desire in itself, it is safe to say that, when interpretation is made subservient to such an ulterior polemic purpose, it will inevitably be too much governed by considerations outside the province of pure exegesis. In the study of such a work as Daniel all dogmatism must be set aside. We should study to place ourselves in the very position of the prophet, and attend carefully to the character of his language and his symbols. The ancient writer must be permitted, as far as possible, to explain himself; and the interpreter should not be so full of ideas derived from universal history, or from remote ages and peoples, as to desire to find in any prophecy what is not manifestly there. It is

fatal to a safe interpretation of any book to presume in advance what ought or what ought not to be found therein. We believe the best defense of the Book of Daniel may be found in a simple and self-consistent exposition of its prophetic elements. These are of such profound significance and imperishable worth that, when clearly apprehended in their relation to one another, and in their historical connection with the pre Christian literature of the Jewish people, they carry with them their own self-evidencing apology. Whatever may be the results of scientific criticism touching the date and authorship of the book, the apocalyptic chapters constitute a most original and important body of divine revelation. Whether written during the exile, or in the times of the Maccabees, they contain a picture of the kingdoms of the world and their ultimate subjection to the kingdom of God worthy of rank with any prophecies to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Nowhere else do we find, before the advent of Christ, such a magnificent conception of the kingdom of heaven.

The English text on which the following comments are based is mainly that of the Anglico-American Revision of 1885. But,

for reasons which our notes will show, we have modified and changed it in a number of places. The view of the four great kingdoms here presented (namely, as Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Grecian), although held probably at present by a greater number of distinguished exegetes than any other, is comparatively unknown to ordinary English readers. The opinion that the fourth kingdom is the Roman Empire has been so uniformly set forth in current expositions for the people that many have adopted it for no better reason than that they never had another clearly shown to them. Not given to original or independent inquiries, the majority of ordinary students of the Bible are generally disposed to follow that which comes first to hand. The exposition here offered only asks for a fair hearing.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

---

- AUBERLEN, KARL AUGUST. Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältniss betrachtet und in ihren Hauptstellen erläutert. Basle, 1854.
- Translated by Adolph Saphir. Edinburgh, 1856.
- BARNES, ALBERT. Notes, Critical, Illustrative, and Practical, on the Book of Daniel, with an Introductory Dissertation. New York, 1853.
- BERTHOLDT, LEONHARD. Daniel aus dem Hebräisch-Aramaischen neu übersetzt und erklärt, mit einer vollständigen Einleitung und einigen historischen und exegetischen Excursen. Erlangen. Erste Hälfte, 1806. Zweite Hälfte, 1808.
- BEVAN, A. A. A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel for the Use of Students. Cambridge, 1892.
- COWLES, HENRY. Ezekiel and Daniel, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, designed for both Pastors and People. New York, 1867.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Article "Daniel," in the ninth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica.
- DELITZSCH, FRANZ. Article "Daniel," in Herzog & Plitt's Real-Encyclopadie. 1878.
- DESPREZ, PHILIP S. Daniel and John: or the Apocalypse of the Old and that of the New Testament. London, 1878.
- EWALD, GEORG HEINRICH AUGUST VON. Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by J. F. Smith. Vol. v, pp. 152-324. London, 1881.

- HAEVERNICH, HEINRICH ANDREAS CHRISTOPH. Kommentar über das Buch Daniel. Hamburg, 1832.
- HENGSTENBERG, E. W. Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel. Translated by B. P. Pratten. Edinburgh, 1847.
- HITZIG, FERDINAND. Das Buch Daniel erklärt. Leipzig, 1850.
- KAMPHAUSEN, A. Das Buch Daniel und die neuere Geschichtsforschung. Ein Vortrag mit Anmerkungen. Leipzig, 1892.
- KEIL, C. F. Biblical Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Daniel. Translated by M. G. Easton. Edinburgh, 1872.
- KLIEFOTH, THEODOR F. D. Das Buch Daniels übersetzt und erklärt. Schwerin, 1868.
- KRANICHFELD, RUDOLPH. Das Buch Daniel erklärt. Berlin, 1868.
- LENGERKE, CAESAR VON. Das Buch Daniel verdeutscht und ausgelegt. Königsberg, 1835.
- PUSEY, E. P. Daniel the Prophet. Nine Lectures, delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. With Copious Notes. Oxford, 1864.
- ROSE, H. J., and J. M. FULLER. Introduction, Commentary, Critical Notes, and Excursus on Daniel (in the Speaker's Commentary). London and New York, 1878:
- STUART, MOSES. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Boston, 1850.
- ZOECKLER, OTTO. The Book of the Prophet Daniel, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded (Part of Lange's Biblework). Translated, enlarged, and edited by James Strong. New York, 1876.

# INTRODUCTION.

---

DANIEL is preeminently the apocalyptist of the Old Testament, but his book is not classed, in the Jewish canon, among the prophets. He seems to have been regarded not so much a prophet as a revealer of secrets, a sage, who easily surpassed the wise men of Babylon, and, like Joseph in Egypt, was brought into prominence and received great honor for his skill and wisdom when the sacred scribes and astrologers confessed their own inability. That this wise man of the captivity is identical with the Daniel referred to in Ezek. xiv, 14, and xxviii, 3, has been reasonably doubted; for it is highly improbable that Ezekiel would have thus named a contemporary between two ancient patriarchs. A certain Daniel is also mentioned among the returned exiles (Ezra viii, 2; Neh. x, 9), but no one believes that he was the great chief of the wise men of Babylon. The name, like many others among the Hebrew people, appears to have been a common one, and may have been borne by several in the ancient, as it has been by many in the later, times.

The literary problems of the Book of Daniel are peculiarly difficult. The two languages (or dialects) which furnish the oldest existing text do not correspond with a natural division of the work. The

Aramaic portion begins, somewhat naturally, at chapter ii, 4, where the Chaldeans first address the king; and had it ended with that chapter, or with chapter vi, some reason for the employment of another language might have been apparent in view of the contents of these chapters. But the Aramaic portion runs on without a break to the end of the seventh chapter, and includes what purports to be an independent vision of Daniel. Perhaps the simplest and most intelligible hypothesis is that this Aramaic section is not the original text of Daniel, but an ancient Targum, or paraphrase, which has been substituted for it. This conjecture is the more plausible, from the fact that the oldest versions of the book contain Haggadic additions both to the Aramaic and the Hebrew portions, and these additions are believed by many of the best critics to be translations of a Hebrew or Aramaic original. The ancient Alexandrian version was itself long set aside, and that of Theodotion substituted for it in the current copies of the Septuagint. Both these Greek versions insert, at chapter iii, 23, the song of the three Hebrews in the furnace of fire. The Alexandrian appends to the book the stories of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon, while Theodotion places Susanna at the beginning and Bel and the Dragon at the end. All these facts tend to create the suspicion that the original text of Daniel is lost, and in its place we have a compilation which probably embodies all its essential contents along with some Haggadic supplements.

Any attempt to determine, by internal evidence,



the limits of the original work must necessarily be conjectural in its nature, and, therefore, more or less unsatisfactory. It seems easy to exclude the apocryphal additions of the Greek versions; but it is maintained that the contents of chapters iii-vi and portions of chapters ix and x relegate them to the same class of legendary writings. Zockler's studies led him to reject also chapter xi, 5-39, as an interpolation of Maccabean times; for he declares his "conviction that a particularizing prophecy, embracing the history of centuries, as it is found in that section, forms so marked a contrast to everything in the line of specializing prediction that occurs elsewhere in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament, that only the theory of an interpolating revision of its prophetic contents imposed on it during the period of the Seleucid persecutions, or soon afterward, seems to afford a really satisfactory explanation of its particulars."<sup>1</sup>

But whatever our theories of the composition and present structure of the Book of Daniel as a whole, it is unquestionable that its apocalyptic portions possess a marked originality. Here, for the first time, we note a vivid conception of successive world-empire. The kingdoms of the wide world rise and pass away in the visions of this seer like so many huge monsters; but they are all under the dominion of the God of heaven, and are destined to give place, in the end, to the "kingdom of the saints of the Most High." The historical standpoint is a period extending from the time of the Babylonian

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Daniel, in Lange's *Biblework*.

Nebuchadnezzar to that of Cyrus the Persian, and the prophet's position is at Babylon or at Shushan. To him it was given to outline certain great events of human history which were to come to pass thereafter. According to the book itself Daniel lived to see the fulfillment of a part of his predictions. He witnessed the fall of Babylon, the reign of Darius the Mede, and the third year of Cyrus, the king of Persia. Then he is told by an angelic interpreter that, after four Persian kings have reigned, the dominion of the world will pass to the hands of Grecian rulers and become "divided toward the four winds of heaven." Under the crushing and bitter wars of these divided sections the people of God will suffer terrible persecutions, and their sanctuary will be polluted and destroyed; but in the end the Most High will avenge his people's woes, and bring in everlasting righteousness, and "the wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

All this differs notably from the manner of the earlier prophets. Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and even Ezekiel have their oracles against the heathen kingdoms, and predict their overthrow; but, with the exception of a few passages wrought out in a lofty symbolical style of language, they are not properly apocalyptic. Daniel, probably, more than any other one Old Testament writer, has exerted a controlling influence over all later apocalyptists in determining the form of their predictions. This fact is apparent in the pseudepigraphal books of

Enoch, Moses, Baruch, and Fourth Ezra, and especially in the New Testament apocalypse of John. A collation and comparative study of all these books are obviously helpful to the study of anyone.

The apocalyptic portions of the Book of Daniel may, for our purpose, be best arranged in five chapters, representing five distinct prophecies, as follows :

1. NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S PROPHETIC DREAM, ii, 31-45.

2. DANIEL'S VISION OF THE FOUR EMPIRES AND THE JUDGMENT, vii.

3. VISION OF THE RAM AND THE GOAT, viii.

4. THE SEVENTY WEEKS, ix, 24-27.

5. THE BROKEN AND DIVIDED KINGDOM AND THE END, xi, 2-xii, 3.

A careful examination of these passages will show that they go repeatedly over the same ground. The four kingdoms of Daniel's vision (vii) are evidently identical with those of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (ii). The vision of the ram and the goat is but another portraiture of the third and fourth kingdoms of the preceding prophecy, and the contents of the last section (xi, 2-xii, 3) are but a more detailed outline of events to occur in connection with the fourth kingdom.



# THE PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

---

## FIRST PROPHECY.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM. CHAP. II, 31-45.

Verses 31-36 describe the vision ; verses 37-45 give the interpretation.

31 THOU, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This image, which was mighty, and whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee ; and the aspect thereof was terrible.

---

### COMMENT AND EXPOSITION.

31. **A great image**—A colossal human figure, standing, apparently, in an open plain. There is an obvious naturalness in Nebuchadnezzar's dreaming of such an image, for probably similar stupendous statues of the gods of Babylon and kings of Assyria were familiar to his eye. Such huge figures as the statues of Remeses and Memnon in Egypt were probably known to him, and the golden image, which he himself set up in the plain of Dura (chap. iii, 1), is evidence of his fondness for such monuments. The *brightness* and *terrible aspect*, or *appearance*, contributed also to the deep impression made upon the king.

32 As for this image, his head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, 33 his legs of iron, his feet part of iron, and part of clay. 34 Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces. 35 Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together,

---

32, 33. **Gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay**—These materials deserve notice, especially in comparison with a similar designation of the ages of human history found in other places. In the Parsee tradition Zoroaster was shown four trees—one of gold, another of silver, another of steel, and the fourth of iron—and he was told that these four trees represented four ages of the world.—*Bahman Yasht*. Ovid sings of the ages of gold, silver, bronze, and iron (*Metam.*, i, 89–129); and though Hesiod (in *Works and Days*, 109–201) mentions five ages, he has for them only four metallic names—gold, silver, brass, and iron.

34. **Stone cut out without hands**—Stone, in the thought of the king, would have been notably inferior to any of the metals of the image. The description suggests a huge boulder, loosing itself from a neighboring steep mountain and rolling down upon the image with irresistible force. This stone was seen to smite the image *upon its feet*, a fact which receives no notice, as having any special significance, in the subsequent interpretation (verse 45), but which some exegetes have magnified as if it were a most important point in the vision.

35. **Broken in pieces together**—Because all these

and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. 36 This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king.

37 Thou, O king, art king of kings, unto whom the God of heaven hath given the king-

---

parts constituted one image they were broken as one. The imagery naturally suggests that head, breast, body, legs, and feet perished simultaneously, and this must have been the case with the image itself. But why do not the rigid literalists explain how this comports with the facts of history? As a matter of fact, according to the prophet's own explanation, the head of gold was the first to be overthrown, and next the silver breast and arms, and last of all the feet of iron and clay. **Like the chaff**—Comp. Job xxi, 18; Psalm i, 4; xxxv, 5; Isa. xli, 15. **Stone . . . became a great mountain**—The word טוֹר, may mean either *mountain* or *rock* (=Heb. צוּר). Both ideas seem blended, for according to verse 45 the stone was “cut out of the mountain,” as if the mountain were itself a lofty bluff of rock, and in its progress it grew into a mountainous rock that seemed to fill the whole earth.

36. **We will tell**—Daniel here associates with himself the three friends who had united with him in prayer to God concerning the secret of the king. Comp. verses 17, 18, 23.

37. **King of kings**—Common title assumed, as the

dom, the power, and the strength, and the glory; 38 and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all: thou art the head of gold. 39 And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to

---

monuments show, by Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian monarchs.

**38. Beasts...fowls**—These are also enumerated as indicating the absolute rule of the king, and his supposed ownership of everything whatever in the bounds of his empire. Comp. Jer. xxvii, 6; xxviii, 14. The universal dominion here ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar is obviously to be understood in a general way as denoting the Asiatic world known to the writer. Beyond the limits of the Babylonian empire, whether east or west, he has no occasion to carry the thoughts of his reader. Whatever regions or peoples beyond these limits are in anyway involved in the visions must be determined by inference. **Thou art the head of gold**—Appropriately said, under the circumstances, to him who in his own person represented the empire which he did more than any other one to establish and make glorious. Comp. the language of chap. iv, 30. This explanation is so specific as to leave no question that the first of the four kingdoms was the Babylonian, of which Nebuchadnezzar was then the ruling sovereign.

**39. Another kingdom inferior to thee**—According to this Book of Daniel, “Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, was made king over the realm



of the Chaldeans" immediately after the capture of Babylon by the Medes and Persians (ix, 1). In chapter vi, 28, "the reign of Darius" is distinguished from "the reign of Cyrus the Persian." This "Darius the Mede" is said to have been about sixty-two years old, when, on the death of Belshazzar, he "received the kingdom" (v, 31). He "set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty satraps" (vi, 1), and signed and sealed royal statutes (vi, 7-9, 17), and issued royal proclamations "unto all the people, nations, and languages that dwell in all the earth" (vi, 25). In this form of royal edict he employed the same language and assumed the same absolute dominion of empire as Nebuchadnezzar. Comp. iv, 1. If, therefore, the Book of Daniel is permitted to explain itself, the second and "inferior" kingdom is to be understood of the dominion of Darius the Mede. The silence of history touching this Mede does not in the least change the statements of Daniel. A similar mystery long hung over the person of Belshazzar, and it was stoutly affirmed that no such ruler had a place in Babylonian history. But all the older discussions concerning him have in modern times been rendered obsolete by the discovery of his name and royal rank among the Babylonian inscriptions. See Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 130-133. London, 1888. This fact should make us slow to pronounce judgment against other historical statements of the Book of Daniel.

The word rendered *inferior* (אַרְעָא) may mean *earthwards*; that is, *downward, below* (comp. לְאַרְעִיתָ, *to the ground*, vi, 25), and allude to the position of the silver breast and arms as *lower down* in the image than the head of gold. But the more satisfactory explanation makes it a feminine form qualifying *kingdom* (מַלְכוּת). It is the kingdom represented, the kingdom to arise after that rep-

resented by Nebuchadnezzar, which is the lower or inferior object designated. In this interpreters are nearly all agreed. But those who understand it to refer to the Medo-Persian monarchy are obliged to contradict all known facts of history bearing on the subject in order to explain this statement. Notice the following :

1. According to Kliefoth the Medo-Persian was smaller in extent than the Babylonian. But it is notorious that the former, under Cyrus and Darius Hystaspis, was extended over a much wider territory. Any trustworthy map of the oriental monarchies will clearly show this.

2. It was inferior in moral condition (Calvin, Auberlen). How, when, where, one may ask in wonder? So far as can be shown to-day the Persian monotheism was much superior to the Babylonian polytheism, and the morals cultivated under it were not likely to have been inferior.

3. Keil thinks the inferiority lay in a want of inner unity, since the Medes and Persians were rivals for the supremacy. But the facts of history do not sufficiently warrant this statement; for the union of Medes and Persians was rather a notable element of strength to the empire, and the internal divisions of Babylon after Nebuchadnezzar were such that Nabonadius, the father of Belshazzar, usurped the throne, and held it until conquered by the Medes and Persians. Moreover, the fourth kingdom, which figures in the vision as preeminently strong and terrible, is clearly not thought of as inferior, because composed partly of iron and partly of clay.

4. Archdeacon Rose (in the Speaker's Commentary) has made the strange assertion that the Persian rule was "of shorter duration." But the Babylonian monarchy at the longest extended from Nabonassar (B. C. 747) to Cyrus (B. C. 538), or about two hundred and nine years, while the Medo-Persian continued from Cyrus to Alexander

(B. C. 330), or about two hundred and eight years. If, however, we reckon only the later Babylonian monarchy, founded by Nabopolassar (the one which Nebuchadnezzar properly represented), we find its duration little more than one hundred years.

5. J. M. Fuller (in the same Commentary) attempts to supplement the statement of Rose by ascribing greater antiquity to Babylon! And then, as if conscious of unsuitableness in that suggestion, immediately adds that it was inferior "in power and in wealth; not morally, but politically." But history does not confirm any of these latter statements. Neither in power, nor in wealth, nor politically was the Babylonian superior to the Persian empire; and for Daniel to inform Nebuchadnezzar that the kingdom to arise after him would be "inferior in antiquity" is too puerile to be seriously imagined.

The only natural explanation of the inferiority of the second kingdom is that which the book itself furnishes, namely, the explicit record of a Median regency at Babylon, succeeding that of Belshazzar. The inferiority is suggested in the statements that "Darius the Mede received the kingdom" (v, 31), and "was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans" (ix, 1). These words imply that the kingdom fell to him by some election or appointment. His dominion was a regency, confirmed by the suffrages of Medes and Persians, and, perhaps, a stroke of policy on the part of Cyrus to secure the good will of the Medes whom he had lately conquered. But the regency, like Belshazzar's in the absence of his father, was to Daniel as absolute as the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, or of Cyrus. Comp. vi, 28. The interpreter of Daniel is bound to give strict attention to what he says, and accept and explain his statements of fact, no matter what "profane history" says or fails to say.

thee; and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. 40 And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that crusheth all these, shall it break in pieces and crush. 41 And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, it shall be a divided kingdom; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch

---

**Third kingdom . . . over all the earth**—That this well describes “the reign of Cyrus the Persian” (vi, 28) and the dominion of his successors for some two centuries there can be no question.

40. **The fourth kingdom**—The Grecian, or, as it is often more specifically designated, the Græco-Macedonian empire. Founded by Alexander, it more completely obliterated the petty Asiatic kingdoms and subdued the Orient to one broad civilization than any of the great world empires before it. Hence the statements that it was to be *strong as iron*, and would *break in pieces and crush* whatever came in its way, were most suitable in describing it. The best evidence of the all-subduing force of Grecian rule is the well-known fact that the language of the great conqueror was made the common dialect of all western Asia, and maintained itself long after Rome became victorious there. The last royal representative of the Græco-Macedonian dominion was the famous Cleopatra, whose death occurred about B. C. 30.

41. **A divided kingdom**—No better explanation is

as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay.  
 42 And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. 43 And whereas thou sawest the iron mixed with

---

needed than what the prophet gives in chap. viii, 21, 22. Upon the death of Alexander the Great, who is there called "the first king," four kingdoms arose in his place, namely, the famous Diadochi, who divided Alexander's empire among themselves. In chap. xi, 4, it is further said that this Grecian kingdom was destined to be "broken and divided toward the four winds of heaven."

42. **Partly strong, and partly broken**—The elements of strength and weakness were notably mingled in the later history of the Grecian rule. In verse 33 the legs were said to be of iron and the "feet part of iron, and part of clay." Here it is said the *toes of the feet* were part of iron and part of clay. The main thought apparently intended by this is that the incoherent nature and the diverse elements were noticeably at the extremities of the image, and to be understood of what would be especially true of the later period of the kingdom. Comp. chap. viii, 23. It is not said that the image had ten toes, but interpreters generally assume this, and make the toes identical with the ten horns of chap. vii, 7, 24. Such assumptions, however, are uncalled for, and tend to magnify as something important what the sacred writer passes over in silence. For anything that appears to the contrary the image may, like the giant of Gath (2 Sam. xxi, 20), have had twelve fingers and twelve toes!

miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron doth not mingle with clay. 44 And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. 45 Forasmuch as thou sawest that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great

---

43 **Mingle themselves with the seed of men**—Most naturally explained of representatives of the heterogeneous elements of the fourth kingdom seeking to strengthen themselves by alliances and intermarriages. This is illustrated by the statements of chap. xi, 6, 17, where also the failure of such efforts is related.

44. **In the days of those kings**—What kings? Those “denoted by the ten toes of the feet of the image,” says Keil. But we have not been told that those feet had *ten* toes, nor that the toes represented kings or kingdoms. The next verse (45) says that the stone broke in pieces, “the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold,” and verse 35 declares that all these were “broken in pieces together.” But as a matter of fact the golden head was first broken, and then the silver part, and next the brass, and finally the iron kingdom crushed “all these”

God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter : and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

---

(verse 40). How can these conceded facts be harmonized with the idea that all "those kings" or kingdoms were "broken in pieces together," and yet that the stone "smote the image upon its feet?"

The true answer is, as we have shown elsewhere, that many of the details of apocalyptic symbolism are merely the formal elements of visions, introduced to make a coherent image, and not to be pressed as having special significance in the interpretation. This dream-vision presented a sublime ideal of world-empire ultimately overthrown by "the God of heaven;" but incidental features of the imagery will not admit the narrow process of literal interpretation, as the above facts show. But, according to Daniel, "the God of heaven" is continually "changing times and seasons, removing kings and setting up kings" (verses 20, 21); he "rules in the kingdom of men and gives it to whomsoever he will" (iv, 17, 25); "his dominion is an everlasting dominion," continuing without interruption "from generation to generation" (iv, 34). In harmony with this teaching the setting up of *a kingdom which shall never be destroyed* need not be limited to such a specific date as some expositors have thought to find in the indefinite phrase, *the days of those kings*. The general idea is that the heavenly kingdom will succeed and supersede *all these kingdoms*. The words *those kings* in the first part of this verse are not to be rigidly pressed in the interpretation more than the words *all these kingdoms* in the latter part. The truth is that in the overthrow of all those

kingdoms—Babylon as well as Persia or Grecia—the Most High God was setting up his kingdom by preparing the way of his Messiah. This kingdom of God is identical with that of “the saints of the Most High,” described in chap. vii, 14, 18, 27, where see further comments.

Before leaving this passage, however, we should expose the fallacy of those who find in the words “the days of those kings” (verse 44) a proof that the fourth kingdom must have been the Roman empire. We are reminded that the Christ was born in the days of Augustus Cæsar (Luke ii, 1), at which time the Græco-Macedonian empire had passed away. But let the unbiased student look for a moment at the facts. Cleopatra, the last representative of the Greek dominion, died about B. C. 30, but the Roman empire was then just rising. Augustus was the first emperor. If, however, we go back to the beginning of Roman history (as in the other kingdoms we note their rise as well as their fall), then we must face the troublesome incongruity that this fourth kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream was already a century old when Nebuchadnezzar himself began to reign! On the other hand, it was three hundred years after Christ when the Roman empire was divided into eastern and western (the two legs of the image, as those interpreters hold), and more than a thousand years later before all the toes of this image were broken in pieces!

Interpreters who stagger at the fact that the Grecian power disappeared a half century before Christ, and yet presume to find the chronology of these symbols satisfied in events more than a thousand years after the Christ, are very much like those who “strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel” (Matt. xxiii, 24).



## SECOND PROPHECY.

### DANIEL'S VISION OF THE FOUR EMPIRES AND THE JUDGMENT. CHAP. VII.

Verses 1-14 describe the vision ; verses 15-27 give the interpretation.

I IN the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions

---

#### COMMENT AND EXPOSITION.

1. **First year of Belshazzar**—Another vision of Daniel is dated in the third year of this king (viii, 1), and the events narrated in chap. v explain how important a person, from Daniel's point of view, was this Belshazzar, **King of Babylon**. But it appears, from other records, that Nabonadius was the last king of Babylon, that he was not in the city at the time of its capture by the Medes and Persians, and that he surrendered to Cyrus and was honorably treated by that conqueror. Did not Daniel know this, we are asked ? And if the author of this book knew these things why should he represent Belshazzar as the last king of Babylon and speak of his first and third years ? Here again we have only to enter protest against any assumption of what the Book of Daniel ought to have said. The interpreter is bound only to that which is written, not to what some one thinks ought to have been written therein. He is under no obligation to account for what Daniel does not say, but only to give a rational explanation of what he does say. The inscrip-

of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream and told the sum of the mat-

tions attest the existence of Belshazzar, the eldest son of Nabonadius, and Herodotus (i, 191) says that when Babylon was taken a portion of its population were holding a feast. These corroborations of the biblical record sufficiently vindicate it from the charge of contradicting history. But the author of this Book of Daniel was not writing a history of Babylon, or any of the other kingdoms to which he refers. He calls Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon in chap. i, 1, although other history makes it quite clear that Nebuchadnezzar's father, Nabopolassar, was yet upon the throne. Comp. chap. ii, 1, and Zockler's and the Speaker's Commentary on these passages. The practice of thus associating father and son in the royal dominion is nothing uncommon in oriental history. So, too, while Darius the Mede appears to have been only regent of Babylon, and this, too, by favor of Cyrus the Persian, he assumes and executes the affairs of the kingdom as if he were absolute monarch. In all this we see that Daniel is consistent with himself. He appears to have had no occasion to speak either of Nabopolassar or of Nabonadius, but his relations both to Nebuchadnezzar and to Belshazzar were such as to make it superfluous to mention their associate regency with others. The first and the third year of Belshazzar's regency were made memorable in Daniel's career by reason of the apocalyptic visions described in chaps. vii and viii, and the events recorded in chaps. v and vi sufficiently account for the prominence which he gives to Belshazzar and Darius the Mede.

**Wrote the dream**—This statement, as well as xii,

ters. 2 Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven brake forth upon the great sea. 3 And four great beasts came

---

4, shows that Daniel wrote down his apocalypse, although he does not, like John (Rev. i. 11), say that he was commanded to write it. **The sum of the matters**—These words are generally understood to denote a summary or chief points of the vision. They imply, however, that he wrote the sum and substance of what he saw.

2. **Four winds**—Comp. chap. viii, 8 ; xi, 4 ; Jer. xlix, 32, 36 ; Zech. ii, 6 ; vi, 5. **The great sea**—Not to be thought of as the Mediterranean or any other particular sea. Both *winds* and *sea* are to be taken in connection with the entire symbolical vision, the former suggestive of the manifold forces which are sent forth by the Lord of all the earth (comp. Zech. vi, 5), and the latter of peoples and nations (comp. Rev. xvii, 15 ; Isa. viii, 7, 8 ; xvii, 12), whom he can put in commotion, or reduce to quiet, according to his will.

3. **Four great beasts**—Interpreters have often called attention to the contrast between the symbols of this vision and the dream of chap. ii. Fairbairn states them very clearly as follows :

“As presented to the view of Nebuchadnezzar, the worldly power was seen only in its *external* aspect, under the form of a colossal image possessing the likeness of a man, and in its more conspicuous parts composed of the shining and precious metals ; while the divine kingdom appeared in the meaner aspect of a stone, without ornament or beauty, with nothing, indeed, to distinguish it but its resistless energy and perpetual duration. Daniel’s visions,

up from the sea, diverse one from another.  
 4 The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made to stand upon two feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. 5 And

---

on the other hand, direct the eye into the *interior* of things, strip the earthly kingdoms of their false glory by exhibiting them under the aspects of wild beasts and nameless monsters (such as are everywhere to be seen in the grotesque sculptures and painted entablatures of Babylon), and reserve the *human* form, in conformity with its divine, original, and true idea, to stand as the representative of the kingdom of God, which is composed of the saints of the Most High, and holds the truth that is destined to prevail over all error and ungodliness of men." Fairbairn on Prophecy, p. 122.

**Diverse from one another**—And so well adapted as emblems to represent the distinctive qualities of the different kingdoms symbolized.

4. **Lion . . . eagle's wings**—Combination of strength and swiftness, notable qualities of the Babylonian power under Nebuchadnezzar. Comp. Jer. iv, 7; Hab. i, 8; Ezek. xvii, 3, 12. The winged lions and other colossal animals found among the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon add interest to the study of these symbols. **Wings plucked**—This implies the stopping of rapid conquest, a time when the power to move swiftly in campaigns of conquest and for extension of empire was taken away. **Stand as a man, . . . man's heart**—This obviously points to some notable *humanizing* of this kingdom, and

behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it was made to stand to one side, and

---

seems to be an allusion to the remarkable event in Nebuchadnezzar's life which he proclaims in chap. iv. See especially iv, 33-37. (Aramaic text, verses 30-34.)

5. **Like a bear**—The fact that no wings appeared on this animal, and the statement that **it was made to stand to one side** are unfavorable to the interpretation which sees in it a symbol of the great Medo-Persian empire. But the figure appropriately depicts an "inferior kingdom," as the second one is called in ii, 39, and what is further said about it in this verse tends to confirm the view which makes the Median domination of Babylon the second of the four empires. Different explanations are possible of the words rendered *made to stand to one side*. Some explain the word יָטָר, here rendered *side*, as equivalent to קִיטָר which occurs in Job xxxviii, 33, in the sense of *dominion*, and translate *one dominion it raised up*. But the ancient versions and most interpreters adopt the meaning *side*, yet differ in their explanation of the verb קוּם, which is here pointed as in the Haphel הִקִּימָה (some copies הִקָּמָה), not Hophal (הִקִּימָה), as in the preceding verse. Taken in the active Haphel form it is explained as "leaning to one side," or "standing on one side," or "raising up (its body) on one side." Inasmuch, however, as the Haphel form of this verb is always elsewhere accompanied by an accusative object expressed, there appears no sufficient reason for forcing such an active meaning here. The Hophal meaning, which all allow to this same form in the preceding verse, is much more natural, and therefore preferable: *and to one side it was made to stand*. This statement obviously implies some limita-

three ribs were in his mouth between his teeth : and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. 6 After this I beheld, and

---

tion, and, like the "inferior" character of the second kingdom as seen in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (ii, 39), appropriately describes the Median regency of Darius, who "was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans" (ix, 1).

The **three ribs between his teeth** are obviously symbols of prey already seen and held in readiness to dispose of as the beast may choose, and the number *three* most naturally points to the territory of the three chief divisions of the kingdom, from which the king derived his revenue of substance (vi, 2). It is singular that interpreters should reject so simple and natural an explanation and yet rest apparently satisfied with the view which makes the bear a symbol of the all-conquering Medo-Persian empire, extending from India to Ethiopia, and the three ribs Babylon, Lydia, and Egypt. Why leave out Persia and Media and Palestine? The ribs are best explained, not of kingdoms, nor of peoples, but of subject-lands so divided and officered for purposes of revenue "that the king should have no damage." Comp. chap. vi, 2, and Ezra iv, 13, 16.

**Arise, devour much flesh**—These words were addressed to the bear, but there is not a syllable to show that the beast obeyed. The whole picture is that of a sluggish animal, raised up, or made to stand to one side, and holding a few ribs in its mouth. The call to "rise up and eat much flesh" implied a supposed opportunity and ability to obtain more flesh than it already held "between its teeth;" but the fact that no response to this call

to another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it.

---

was seen or recorded by the prophet implies that no response was made. It is perfectly supposable that such counselors as plotted for the ruin of Daniel (chap. vi) might have advised Darius the Mede to rise up and employ the resources at his command to recover the lost dominion of his fathers and extend his empire. But the torpid Median bear was too contented with his three ribs to run the risks of rising up for doubtful wars of conquest and plunder.

6. **Another, like a leopard**—The word sufficiently designates the great spotted animal of the feline genus which anciently infested the wild regions of western Asia. The panther and the tiger are sufficiently near akin to be included in the same genus. The leopard is noted in Scripture for swiftness of movement (Hab. i, 8), and the habit of lurking by the way to pounce upon its victims (Jer. v, 6; Hos. xiii, 7). The **four wings** and **four heads** of this leopard were symbols adapted to impress upon the prophet the world-wide extent of its conquest and dominion. The Babylonian lion had eagle's wings which the prophet saw plucked (verse 4), but the *four wings of* (an unnamed) **fowl** suggest the idea of more extensive conquests. This appropriately represented the world-conquests of Persia. If the speed of those conquests were not as with eagle's wings, but the slower flight of a less regal bird of prey (comp. Isa. xlvi, 11), they penetrated to the four quarters of the earth, and ceased not until the Persian monarchs ruled "from India even unto Ethiopia," and "laid tribute upon the land

7 After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, terrible and powerful, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before

---

and upon the isles of the sea" (Esther i, 1; x, 1). This world-wide **dominion**, which is emphasized both here and in chap. ii, 39, is also represented by the *four heads*. These heads can hardly stand for the four kings of Persia mentioned in chap. xi, 2, as some interpreters hold; for the apocalyptic symbol for a king is a horn (verse 24 and viii, 21). Nor can we limit them to the composite nationalities or countries of the empire, for these were many more than four in number. Rather do they indicate the government or dominion as established in the four quarters of the world. Observe the language of Cyrus the conqueror, in Ezra i, 2, as acknowledging how this *dominion was given to him*, and comp. Isa. xli, 2, 25; xlv, 1-3; xlvi, 11.

7. **Fourth beast**—The terribly destructive character of this beast is most graphically described, and corresponds notably with chap. ii, 40-43. In the notes on that passage we have shown how the description suits the Grecian, or Græco-Macedonian, empire. The power and success with which it broke down and crushed in pieces all the oriental kingdoms which stood against it is one of the conspicuous facts of history. Notably **it was diverse from all the world-powers that were before it**, for it was of European origin, and carried a western language and civilization over all that Orient. Rome never was able to carry her triumphs in the East with anything like the



it; and it had ten horns. 8 I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great

---

vigor and success displayed by Alexander. **Ten horns**—Symbols of so many kings. Comp. verse 24, and Rev. xvii, 2. In accordance with general symbolic usage we regard the number *ten* as a round number, not designed in such a context to designate precisely ten kings, but rather a notable number, it may be ten or more. So in Gen. xxxi, 7, 41, ten times is used in a general way for many times; in 1 Sam. i, 8, ten sons means many sons; and in Eccles. vii, 19, ten mighty ones are to be understood as many mighty ones. The spirit and general import, not the precise letter, are to be our guides in the interpretation of symbolical numbers.

8. **I considered**—More literally, *I was attentively observing*. **Another horn, a little one**—It appeared little at the first, but grew until its “look was more stout than its fellows” (verse 20). **Three of the first horns**—Three may stand for several, as ten for many. The obvious import is that several of the many horns, which at first appeared to the seer, were torn up or displaced by the rise of this notable little horn. **Eyes of a man**—Symbols of remarkable wisdom or political sagacity. Such wisdom would enable one to “obtain a kingdom by flatteries,” practice deceit in statecraft, and form shrewd devices for advancing his conquests. Comp. chap. xi, 21, 23, 24. **Speaking great things**—Utter-

things. 9 I beheld till thrones were placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit:

---

ing arrogant words against God (verse 25), and exhibiting vain-glory and pompous self-conceit. Comp. chap. xi, 36, 37. How all this applied to Antiochus Epiphanes will be shown further on.

9. **Till thrones were placed**—The rest of the vision (9-14) is a sublime apocalyptic picture of the truth stated in chap. iv, 17, 25, 32, 34, 35, and also in other parts of this book, namely, that the MOST HIGH RULES IN THE KINGDOM OF MEN. In other words, as in iv, 26, THE HEAVENS DO RULE. God and his associate judges and ministers occupy thrones of judgment, and the forces which are ready to execute the divine will are an innumerable company.

To symbolize all this **thrones** are first placed in view, as in the similar picture of Rev. iv, 2-4, twenty-four thrones are seen arranged round about the central throne of God. All this accords with those oldest ideals of God's relations to the world, by which it is shown that no events occur on earth which have not been duly considered in the counsels of heaven. Comp. Gen. i, 26; iii, 22; vi, 3, 5-7; xi, 5-7. **Ancient of days**—Appropriate title for him whose dominion is an everlasting one. The entire picture here given of the throne and the ancient eternal Judge is a composite symbol, designed to convey an overpowering conception of the splendor and majesty of God. Comp. the language at the beginning of Psalm xciii :

Jahveh reigns ; in majesty is he clothed ;

Clothed is Jahveh ; with strength has he girded himself ;

Yea, established is the world ; it cannot be moved.

Established is thy throne from of old, from eternity art thou.

his raiment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, *and* the wheels thereof burning fire. 10 A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. 11 I be-

---

Comp. also the description of **raiment, hair, head, throne,** and **wheels,** with Isa. vi, 1-4; Ezek. i, 4-7, 26-28.

10. **A fiery stream issued**—Keil appropriately remarks: “Fire and the shining of fire are the constant phenomena of the manifestation of God in the world, as the earthly elements most fitting for the representation of the burning zeal with which the holy God not only punishes and destroys sinners, but also purifies and renders glorious his own people.” **Thousand thousands ministered**—This adds to the picture the idea of the infinite resources of the heavenly Ruler. Whatever he plans he can execute, whether “in the army of heaven or among the inhabitants of the earth” (iv, 35). Comp. Zech. i, 10, 11, and vi, 5-8. The number of ministrant spirits at his command is such as no man can number. **The judgment was set**—The great tribunal was formally opened and the processes of the heavenly court began. The thrones mentioned in verse 9 were now seen to be occupied, and **the books were opened,** in which the record of men’s deeds are supposed to have been written. Comp. chap. xii, 1, and Rev. xx, 12. Comp. the familiar doctrine of Eccles. xi, 9; xii, 14; 2 Cor. v, 10.

held at that time because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and he was given to be burned with fire. 12 And as for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away:

---

11. **Till the beast was slain**—This slaying of the beast is to be understood as the direct result of the judgment just depicted. Because the heavens rule (iv, 26) the beast cannot prevail, but must sooner or later go down under the fiery stream of God's judgment. The destruction of **his body** and delivering it over **to be burned with fire** are symbolical descriptions of the righteous retribution sure to come on all nations and governments that exalt themselves against the Lord Almighty. Comp. Rev. xix, 20; xx, 10. As these governments exist only in time the retribution must of course be understood as taking place in this world.

12. **The rest of the beasts**—The other three, although they had in fact been destroyed before the fourth one came to full power, were slain by the same fiery stream of divine judgment. Comp. our notes on chap. ii, 35 and 44. There it is said that all parts of the image were broken in pieces together, although in fact the kingdom represented by the head of gold fell long before that represented by the legs and feet came into being. So, though the judgment is here represented as taking place and effect after the fourth kingdom has run its course, it was holding its sessions during the whole period of the several kingdoms, and by its power **their dominion was taken away**. They were thus shorn of their power to do

yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. 13 I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. 14 And

---

evil, each in his own time, as determined in the council of heaven. **Yet their lives were prolonged for a season**—Judgment may visit a nation or a kingdom, and yet not blot it out of existence. The rule of the heavens consists with the rule of tyrants on earth, and we find no warrant in this Scripture or elsewhere for the assumption that God can have no kingdom in this world except all wickedness be at once destroyed. The coming and kingdom of Christ consist with the lingering existence of many forms of evil, and he is to be thought of as reigning and ruling a long time before all his enemies are put under his feet. Comp. Psalm cx, 1; 1 Cor. xv, 25.

13. **Came with the clouds**—Such a coming or movement of God himself is a familiar figure in the poetic language of the prophets. Comp. Psalm xviii, 9–11; xcvi, 2; civ, 3. “Who maketh the clouds his chariots, who walketh upon the wings of the wind.” Isaiah (xix, 1) speaks of Jahveh as “riding upon a swift cloud, and coming unto Egypt” to execute judgment, and Nahum (i, 3) says: “Jahveh has his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.” But in this passage in Daniel **one like unto a son of man** is represented as thus coming **to the ancient of days** and receiving a kingdom at his hand. Whether the clouds, or some of the ministrant thousands of verse 10, **brought**

there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

---

**him near before him** is not clearly stated, for the subject of the verb *brought* is left indefinite, and may be treated as impersonal, and so equivalent to "he was brought."

14. **There was given him dominion**—The *dominion* is here described as **an everlasting dominion**, and a **kingdom which shall not be destroyed**, and is obviously the same as that which was symbolized by the stone that was "cut out of the mountain without hands." See chap. ii, 44, 45. It is described in the same terms as that of the Most High God, in chaps. iv, 3, 34; vi, 26, and must be identical with the kingdom of the heavens which rule (iv, 26), the eternal dominion of him "who changeth the times and the seasons : removeth kings, and setteth up kings" (ii, 21).

Here we observe a remarkable advance in Messianic prophecy. It is the distinct conception of a SON OF MAN receiving from the eternal God the dominion of heaven and earth. We conceive this Son of man as identical with the Messianic prince of chap. ix, 25, 26 ; presented also again in chaps. x, 21, and xii, 1, under the symbolical name of Michael. His "coming with the clouds" is the basis of such New Testament language as that of Matt. xxiv, 30 ; xxvi, 64 ; Mark xiii, 26 ; and Rev. i, 7. His receiving *dominion, and glory, and a kingdom*, is explained in John v, 22, 27 : "The Father hath given all judgment unto the Son, and he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is Son of man."

15 As for me Daniel, my spirit was grieved in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. 16 I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth concerning all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. 17 These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. 18 But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess

---

So, too, in Matt. xxviii, 18 : "There has been given to me all authority in heaven and upon earth." Comp. also Matt. xi, 27 ; Luke x, 22 ; Acts ii, 36 ; Eph. i, 20, 21 ; Phil. ii, 9, 10. How he has his saints associated with him in this dominion is seen in verses 18 and 27, below. The originality and grandeur of this conception of the Messiah place the Book of Daniel very high among the pre-Christian records of this hope of Israel.

17. **These great beasts are four kings**—That is, they represent or symbolize four kings. In brief statements like this, where no question can arise as to the general meaning, the words *kings* and *kingdoms* are used interchangeably. In prophetic symbolism beasts represent kingdoms and horns individual kings ; but where the horns only appear, as in Zech. i, 18, 19, they may mean either kings or kingdoms. Strictly speaking *these great beasts* symbolized four kingdoms, as appears from verse 23. But any ruler who impersonates the spirit and power of the kingdom may be spoken of as the beast.

18. **Saints...receive the kingdom**—Both here

the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.  
 19 Then I desired to know the truth concerning the fourth beast, which was diverse from

---

and in verse 27, *the saints of the Most High receive the kingdom*, which in verses 13 and 14, above, is represented as given to "one like unto a son of man." From this fact some interpreters deny the doctrine of a personal Messiah in the latter passage, and explain the title "son of man," as the personified community of the saints, the ideal Israel of God. It ought to be frankly admitted that, so far as these passages alone may determine the exposition, such an ideal personification of "the saints of the Most High" does no violence to the language or conception of this vision of Daniel. For verses 18 and 27 are written as an interpretation of verses 13 and 14, and that which is affirmed of the son of man in the vision is affirmed of the saints in the interpretation of the vision. But on the other hand it should be remembered that these two ideas are not exclusive of each other. As this dominion is the kingdom both of God and of the saints, so also is it the kingdom of the Son of man. As "Michael, the great prince," is not identical with the people of God (x, 21; xii, 1), but rather their representative and defender, so here it seems most satisfactory to understand the Son of man (verse 13) as the personal representative and prince of "the people of the saints" (verse 27). Our exposition of the anointed prince, in chap. ix, 25, 26, confirms this view, and the New Testament conception is that the saints of Christ shall reign with him in glory (Rom. viii, 17; 2 Tim. ii, 12; Col. iii, 4; 1 Peter iv, 13; 1 John iii, 2; Matt. xix, 28; Luke xxii, 30; Rev. ii, 26, 27; iii, 21; xx, 4; xxii, 5).



all of them, exceeding terrible, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; 20 and concerning the ten horns that were on his head, and the other *horn* which came up, and before which three fell; even that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. 21 I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; 22 until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. 23 Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth, which

---

23. **Fourth kingdom**—Reasons for identifying this with the Grecian dominion of Alexander and his successors have been given in the notes on chap. ii, 40-43, and on verses 7 and 8, above. Let it be further noted, (1) that Daniel's visions are not concerned with nations and governments all over the habitable world: else why should he have omitted those of India and China? Nor does he (2) furnish any syllabus of human history after the appearance of the Son of man, or the stone cut out of the mountain. But he (3) does specify four nationalities and kingdoms as succeeding each other and passing away before that time, and designates them as Chaldean, Median, Persian, and Grecian. (4) In chap. viii, 21, and

shall be diverse from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. 24 And as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the former, and he shall put down three kings.

---

xi, 2, Javan or Greece, is presented as the last world-power that appears in the vision of the prophet. (5) The "little horn" of chap. viii, 9-12, corresponds strikingly with that of verses 24-26, which here follow, and according to all analogies of apocalyptic repetition should be considered as identical, unless insuperable reasons appear to the contrary. But in chap. viii this little horn springs from the Grecian kingdom. These considerations, in addition to those previously given, seem to us abundantly sufficient to settle the question of the *fourth kingdom* with all who are willing to allow Daniel to explain himself. If the writer's own statements are to be overridden and set aside by presumptions of dogmatists, and by inferences from "profane history," there must be an end of grammatico-historical interpretation.

24. **Ten kings shall arise**—Here note that, when *kingdom* and *kings* are distinguished, horns represent kings. These kings are obviously a group arising out of the fourth kingdom, but it is not said that they were all the kings that ever would appear in that kingdom, nor is enough said about them to make it clear whether they would be contemporary or successive. All that is definite is that the one represented by the little horn (verse 8) arose **after them**, was **diverse from the former**, and was

to put down three kings. Observe further that in verse 8 it is said that before this horn "three of the first were rooted up," in verse 20 "three fell," and here that "he shall put down," or humble, three kings. On all rational principles of interpretation these different expressions should be allowed to explain each other. A displacing, a superseding, or pushing aside of the other, so as to make way for the rise and power of this destructive king (the little horn), is all that the symbol or the language requires. Hence to assume, as some expositors do, that the three kings must have been "dethroned," or "utterly destroyed" by the direct act or order of the one denoted by the little horn, is to insist on reading into the text what is not there.

On the principle of allowing Daniel to explain himself we turn to the eleventh chapter, and find in verses 4-20 what all interpreters acknowledge as a rapid sketch of Alexander's successors in Syria and Egypt before the rise of Antiochus Epiphanes (who is introduced at verse 21). Here we find no attempt to furnish a complete account of all the Seleucidan and Ptolemaic kings, but we find five of each class sufficiently noticed to furnish a satisfactory explanation of these symbolic horns. There is little or no dispute among exegetes that in verse 5 we have allusion to Ptolemy Soter and Seleucus Nicator; in verse 6 to Ptolemy Philadelphus and Antiochus Theos; in verses 7-9 Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinicus; in verses 10-11 Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus the Great; and in verses 17-20 Ptolemy Epiphanes and Seleucus Philopator. During the period of their rule these kings of the north and the south represented and controlled the vast domain of Alexander's empire. They were for the time monarchs of all western Asia, and between them, as upper and nether millstones, Judea was made to suffer

most miserably. Dismissing, then, the baseless assumption that the prophet must needs take cognizance of all the kings and events of this period, and understanding the number ten here as a round number (as explained in note on verse 7, above), we find in the ten Greek kings here referred to what abundantly fulfills the language of this passage.

Those exegetes who find the ten kings solely among the Seleucidæ fail to note that these represented only a part of Alexander's empire, whereas the Ptolemies of Egypt were as truly successors of Alexander as the Seleucidan rulers of western Asia. But taken together they directed the destinies of the Macedonian empire from the death of Alexander (B. C. 323) until its last regal representative disappeared in the person of Cleopatra (B. C. 30).

Those who attempt to find these ten kings in the later divisions of the Roman empire illustrate the absurd extremes to which men will go under the pressure of a dogmatic theory. It is noticeable that the advocates of the Roman theory, almost without exception, insist that the "ten kings" mean kingdoms. Then they go hunting through successive periods of the later empire to find just ten petty states or kingdoms that will presumably meet the case. Here follow a few specimens. According to Mede the ten kingdoms are : (1) Britons, (2) Saxons in Britain, (3) Franks, (4) Burgundians in France, (5) Visigoths in southern France and Spain, (6) Sueves and Alans, (7) Vandals in Africa, (8) Alemanes in Germany, (9) Ostrogoths, (10) Greeks. According to Bishop Chandler they are : (1) Ostrogoths, (2) Visigoths, (3) Sueves and Alans, (4) Vandals, (5) Franks, (6) Burgundians, (7) Heruli and Turingi in Italy, (8) Britons, (9) Huns, (10) Lombards. According to Bishop Lloyd : (1) Huns, (2) Ostrogoths, (3) Visigoths, (4) Franks, (5)

Vandals, (6) Sueves and Alans, (7) Burgundians, (8) Herules, (9) Saxons, (10) Lombards. According to Bishop Newton: (1) Senate of Rome, (2) Greeks in Ravenna, (3) Lombards, (4) Huns, (5) Alemanes in Germany, (6) Franks, (7) Burgundians, (8) Goths in Spain, (9) Britons, (10) Saxons in Britain. According to Sir Isaac Newton: (1) Vandals in Spain and Africa, (2) Suevians in Spain, (3) Visigoths, (4) Alans in Gaul, (5) Burgundians, (6) Franks, (7) Britons, (8) Huns, (9) Lombards, (10) Ravenna. Others have taken a somewhat wider range, and designated different states as, (1) Syria, (2) Asia, (3) Egypt, (4) Africa, (5) Greece, (6) Italy, (7) Germany, (8) France, (9) Spain, (10) England. Others, following the same general order, substitute Poland and Hungary for Asia and Africa.

Aside from the inextricable confusion and uncertainty that must attach to any such explanation of the "ten kings," consider the absurdity of making Daniel at Babylon foretell such details of European history in a sublime vision of the kingdom of heaven, as given in bold outline in this chapter. Many of the most learned and devout interpreters have felt that the detailed prophecy of the eleventh chapter of Daniel involves a burden on the apocalyptic Scriptures extremely difficult to bear, but the detailed history of Syria and Egypt therein given is luminous in comparison with this labyrinth of barbarous hordes that peopled mediæval Europe, and are supposed to have come under the eye of the Hebrew prophet.

Those who find the ten kings among the nations of mediæval Europe are generally quite unanimous in making the "little horn" represent the pope of Rome, or the papacy as a temporal power. This power was obtained, we are told, by the destruction of the Roman state, the

exarchate of Ravenna and the kingdom of the Lombards, and these three were the three kings put down. Others, however, reckon the kingdom of the Franks among the three subdued kings, a kingdom which Mede sees continued in the German empire, whose kings the pope humbled, as, for example, Henry IV. Calvin explains the little horn to mean the Roman Cæsars, who took to themselves the sole dominion of what had previously been in the hands of the senate and people; but he allows no special significance to the numbers ten and three, but affirms that a definite number is put for an indefinite one. Others have understood the little horn to mean the Mohammedan power, and the three uprooted ones three provinces of the Roman empire subdued by the Saracens, as western Asia, Africa and Spain.

We turn away from these confusing and self-contradictory explanations, ranging, as we believe, far beyond the historical horizon of Daniel's visions, and return to that more simple and natural exegesis which finds its main support in the statements of the book itself. After alluding to some ten different successors of Alexander in chap. xi, 5-20, the writer passes to an extensive description of Antiochus Epiphanes (verses 21-45), who is there called "a contemptible person," and described, especially in verses 36 and 37, in language closely corresponding to that employed here (verses 25 and 26) and chap. viii, 10-12, 23-25.

No individual known in connection with Jewish history so completely corresponds to these word-pictures of Daniel as this notorious Antiochus. He figures in Jewish literature as the very incarnation of wickedness, and is called in 1 Macc. ii, 62, *ανήρ αμαρτωλος*, *sinful man*. In the first chapter of the same book we read that after Alexander's death his generals "and their sons after them

for many years put on crowns, and evils were multiplied in the land. And there came out of them a sinful root (*ρίζα ἀμαρτωλός*), Antiochus Epiphanes (verses 9 and 10). And he went up against Jerusalem with a great multitude, and entered into the sanctuary with contemptuous arrogance, and took away the golden altar and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels " (xx, 21). It is further stated that he perpetrated much murder and spoke with the greatest arrogance, and caused " great lamentation in Israel," so that " all the house of Jacob was covered with shame " (24-28). At a later time he again sent a multitude against Jerusalem, and prevailed " with guile " (30), and destroyed much people, took the spoils of the city, " set it on fire, and pulled down the houses and the walls " (31). Still further it is written, as the result of his continuous persecutions, that the devout Israelites were driven into secret places, they were forbidden to observe the religious customs of their fathers, and the servants of Antiochus " set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and erected idol-altars in the cities of Judah " (54). They also rent in pieces and burned the books of the law, and committed barbarous outrages upon the women and children (56-61). Josephus also says (*Wars of the Jews*, Book I, i, 1) that " Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, . . . came upon the Jews with a great army, took their city by force, slew a great multitude, spoiled the temple, and put a stop to the constant practice of offering a daily sacrifice of expiation for three years and six months."

This monster of impiety is, according to all expositors, the person referred to in this book, after the mention of the ten kings that succeeded Alexander (xi, 21). He was notoriously **diverse from the former** by reason of the daring impiety which is everywhere ascribed to him.

Not only is he represented as doing "that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers," but also as utterly disregarding "the gods of his fathers," having no respect for any god, but rather "magnifying himself above all" (verses 24, 36, 37). How all this accords also with chap. viii, 9-12, 23-25, will be shown in the notes on those passages.

But according to what is herein written this ruler **put down three kings**. In verse 20 the three are said to *have fallen before him*, and in the symbol "three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots" (verse 8). We have shown above that none of these terms necessarily imply that all the three were dethroned or utterly destroyed, or that their fall was brought about in each case by the immediate act of the person represented by the little horn. But that he was the occasion of their fall, and that his exaltation resulted somehow *in putting down three kings*, is the obvious meaning of the language. Now, the facts are that Antiochus usurped the throne upon the assassination of his elder brother, Seleucus Philopator; he superseded the rightful heir, Demetrius, who was at that time a hostage in Rome; and he humbled by sore defeat his nephew, Ptolemy Philometer, who had as good a right to the throne of Asia as himself. Comp. 1 Macc. xi, 13. Here then are the three kings that fell before him: Seleucus, who was poisoned by Heliodorus, who sought to obtain the throne, Demetrius, who was pushed aside, and Ptolemy, who was bitterly humbled. Demetrius, the rightful heir, succeeded, after the death of Antiochus, in obtaining the throne of his father, but that did not alter the fact that he was put down and humbled so long as his uncle Antiochus reigned. Some reckon Heliodorus among the three who fell before Antiochus, for Appian (*De Reb. Syr.*, 45) testifies that he had seized the gov-



25 And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High: and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times

---

ernment by force. This view is open to no valid objection, for we should no more insist on a rigid interpretation of the number three than of the number ten, nor should we expect mathematical precision in the incidental statements of apocalyptic writers. The main thought is that the advancement of this notorious king who "obtained the kingdom by flatteries" (xi, 21) displaced several others of royal rank. How this occurred is not important to the prophecy, so long as before him they in any sense were uprooted, and fell, and were humbled.

**25. Speak words against the Most High**—As affirmed of Antiochus in chap. xi, 36. **Wear out the saints**—By the massacres and bloody persecutions described in 1 Macc. i, which were authorized by him. **Change times and law**—By his forbidding the observance of the Jewish sabbaths and feast days, and commanding the people to violate their sacred customs, "so that they might forget the law and change all the ordinances" (1 Macc. i, 41-49). **Time, times, and half a time**—This symbolic number is best explained by the statement of Josephus quoted above, that Antiochus "spoiled the temple and put a stop to the constant practice of offering a daily sacrifice for three years and six months" (*Wars of the Jews*, Book I, i, 1). The thought is, one time, plus twice one time, plus a divided time, and

and half a time. 26 But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. 27 And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people

---

the simplest period of time suggested is the space of a year. This number is the half of seven, and suggestive of a broken covenant, or some disastrous period that breaks the sacred number. Comp. chap. ix, 27; xii, 7; Rev. xii, 14. See further on chap. viii, 14, and xii, 7, 11, 12.

26. **Judgment shall sit**—See notes above on verses 9 and 10. **They shall take away his dominion**—Observe that many take part in this judgment. God's day and method of judgment, as presented in this apocalypse and elsewhere, are not to be thought of as consisting solely in a great assize, a court in session for the formal trial of alleged crimes, but also as the execution of judgment on men and nations. Hence the "thousand thousands" (verse 10) that administer judgment and execute the penalties of heaven. **Destroy it unto the end**—The ministering agents of the Most High are continually interposing in human history, "removing kings and setting up kings" (ii, 21), and this they will continue to do *unto the end*—that is, until the divine purpose is consummated. Just when this *end* will be, and how it will be reached, are matters on which no specific revelation is here given.

27. **Kingdom . . . dominion, . . . greatness**—Comp. the similar triad ("dominion, glory, kingdom") in verse 14. This ultimate kingdom and glory of the saints of God are without limitation, extending **under the whole**

of the saints of the Most High : his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. 28 Here is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my thoughts much troubled me, and my countenance was changed in me : but I kept the matter in my heart.

---

**heaven.** Like the supernatural stone (ii, 34, 35), it is destined to fill the whole earth and endure forever. This **everlasting kingdom** is no other than the kingdom of God, referred to, as we have already shown, in various passages of this book (as ii, 21, 37 ; iv, 3, 25, 26, 34, 35 ; vi, 26), but at that world-historical period when the Son of man, the Messiah of prophecy, assumes the dominion. To Daniel and to all the Old Testament prophets this was an undefined but unspeakably glorious future for the people of God. These prophets were not able to comprehend beforehand the exact character of "the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them" (1 Peter i, 11), but the Spirit within them testified enough to assure them of ultimate triumph. We learn from the New Testament revelations that the kingdom of God and of Christ is not of this world. Its throne center is in the heavens, whither Christ has ascended. All things are not yet put under him, but his kingdom and power are the mightiest influences at work for the uplifting of humanity, and according to his apostle (1 Cor. xv, 25), "he must reign till he has put all his enemies under his feet."

## THIRD PROPHECY.

VISION OF THE RAM AND THE HE-GOAT. CHAP. VIII.

1 IN the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first. 2 And I saw in the vision ; now it was so, that when I saw, I was in Shushan the palace, which is in the prov-

---

### COMMENT AND EXPOSITION.

1. **Third year**—Some two years or more after that of the preceding chapter. **At the first**—or, at the former time ; in allusion to the vision seen in the beginning of Belshazzar's regency (vii, 1).

2. **I was in Shushan the palace**—He may have been there on the business of the king (comp. verse 27), but the language is compatible with the supposition that he was at Shushan only in vision. So Ezekiel was taken “in the visions of God to Jerusalem,” and “into the land of Israel” (Ezek. viii, 3 ; xl, 2). Comp. xxxvii, 1 ; Rev. xvii, 3 ; xxi, 10 ; Gen. xli, 1. Shushan is called *the palace* because it was the city of the royal palace, the castle-city, the capital of the Persian empire. Comp. Neh. i, 1 ; Esther i, 2 ; ii, 3 ; iii, 15, etc. It was fitting that this vision, which contemplated the future from a point of time subsequent to the fall of Babylon, and also of the Median

ince of Elam ; and I saw in the vision, and I was by the river Ulai. 3 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns :

---

dominion there, should have for its local and historical standpoint the great Persian capital, situate upon the banks of **the river Ulai** (called *Eulæus* in Pliny and Arrian). For we shall find that the following vision is but another apocalyptic picture of the third and fourth kingdoms of the preceding chapter. Whether **the province of Elam** was at that time a part of the Babylonian empire cannot be determined from this verse, for Daniel's presence there, whether in reality or only in vision, does not imply that Shushan must have been subject to Babylon. Because the Greek and Latin writers locate Shushan in Susiana, not in Elam, it is inferred that our book must have been written before the time of the Greek dominion. Hence an argument for its early date and genuineness. **By the river**—Comp. Ezek. i, 1, 3 ; iii, 23. Probably the palace stood on the banks of the stream.

3. **A ram . . . two horns**—The animals which appear in this vision are not wild beasts, as in chap. vii, but of a more domestic kind. No special reason need be sought for this more than why Joseph should have first dreamed of sheaves, and next of sun, moon and stars (Gen. xxxvii, 7, 9). But as contrasted with the goat (verse 5), the ram suggests a heavier and slower power. It represented the Medo-Persian empire at a period when its movements of conquest were less rapid and brilliant than at the beginning of its history. The *two horns* are commonly supposed (from verse 20) to represent the union of Medes

and the two horns were high ; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came

---

and Persians in one kingdom. But there is something inconsistent with the analogy of symbolism in making the horns of an animal represent the constituent elements or nationalities incorporated in a kingdom. Horns are symbols especially of kings, and, even when they may stand for a kingdom, it is always with the implication that the kingdom is for the time impersonated in the ruling king. It was the ram itself, not the two horns, as distinguished from the ram, that represented the king or kingdom of Media and Persia. See further on verse 20. But we have no other explanation of the two horns than that **they were high ; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last.** This is generally explained as meaning that the Persian element became predominant, compelling the Medes at last to be content with a subordinate position. This would be a very natural explanation, if, indeed, the two horns truly represented the Median and Persian elements in the body of the nation ; but as this violates symbolic analogy, as shown above, we much prefer the old view of Theodoret, which sees in the **two horns** the dynasties of Cyrus and Darius Hystaspis. This is confirmed by chap. xi, 2, where the last king of Persia referred to, and representing the second dynasty, “ shall be far richer than they all : and when he is waxed strong through his riches, he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece.” As the several kings of the Persian dominion have no separate or special notoriety in the Book of Daniel, it was sufficient to represent them by two horns, inasmuch as rams have, naturally, but two horns.

up last. 4 I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; and no beasts could stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and magnified himself. 5 And as I was considering, behold, an he-goat came from the west over the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his

---

4. **Pushing**—For the figure comp. Deut. xxxiii, 17; 1 Kings xxii, 11; Psalm xlv, 5. **Westward, . . . northward, . . . southward**—Indicating the direction of the more notable military movements of the Persian kings. Asia Minor and Greece in the west, Scythia in the north, and Egypt in the south were the objective points of numerous campaigns. **Magnified himself**—Like the four-headed leopards to whom dominion was given (vii, 6), and the “third kingdom of brass which bore rule over all the earth” (ii, 39).

5. **He-goat from the west**—Symbols of a more rapidly moving world-power, as compared with the heavy ram. **Touched not the ground**—So rapid was his movement that he seemed to fly over the surface of the earth. **A notable horn**—Conspicuous for its magnitude, and so called “the great horn” in verses 8 and 21. This symbol is clearly explained in verse 21 as representing “the king of Greece;” that is, the Græco-Macedonian empire as impersonated in the marvelous king Alexander, who so rapidly subdued all the nations of the East, and broke in pieces the Asiatic world-power. The word-

eyes. 6 And he came to the ram that had the two horns, which I saw standing before the river, and ran upon him in the fury of his power. 7 And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him: but he cast him down to the ground, and trampled upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. 8 And the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and there came up the appearance of four instead of it toward the four winds of heaven. 9 And

---

picture of verses 6 and 7 is a most vivid description of the movements of Alexander in his rapid conquest of the oriental world, and especially in the irresistible power with which he put down everything that opposed his progress.

8. **Magnified himself exceedingly**—Even more than had been the case with the powerful ram. Comp. verse 4. **The great horn was broken**—Denotes the sudden fall of Alexander. **There came up the appearance of four instead of it toward the four winds of heaven**—There may be an allusion in this fourfold division of Alexander's kingdom to the famous Diadochi, and the partition of the empire after the battle of Ipsus, between Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and



out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the glorious *land*. 10 And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host and of the stars it cast down to the ground,

---

Ptolemy. But as this division did not take place until long after the death of Alexander, and continued but a little while, it is perhaps better to understand the number four as symbolical, and referring to a breaking up of the empire in all directions, toward the four quarters of the heavens.

9. **A little horn, which waxed exceeding great**—How closely this corresponds with the same symbol in chap. vii, 8, must be obvious to every reader, and as it is explained below (verses 21–25), as springing out of the kingdom of Greece, nearly all interpreters agree in making it represent the notorious Antiochus Epiphanes.

**The south** here points most naturally to Egypt, whither Antiochus carried successful wars. Comp. xi, 25, 42, 43.

**The east**—Referring to Armenia and Elymais, whither he went on military expeditions of conquest (1 Macc. i, 31, 37; iii, 31, 37; vi, 1–4).

**The glorious land**—Comp. xi, 41; Ezek. xx, 6, 15; Zech. vii, 14. A poetic name for Palestine, which the Jew regarded as the “glory of all lands.” Comp. also Isa. xix, 24, where Israel is conceived as “a third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land.”

10. **Even to the host of heaven . . . stars cast down**—That is, in the vision this notable horn seemed to grow until it reached to the starry hosts in the sky, and

and trampled upon them. 11 Yea, it magnified itself, even to the prince of the host; and it took away from him the continual *burnt offering*, and the place of his sanctuary was

---

cast down some of the stars, and **trampled upon them**. The pride and self-conceit of the king of Babylon are represented in Isa. xiv, 13, as his saying, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God." Comp. the description of Antiochus in chap. xi, 36, 37. This *host of heaven* and the *stars*, according to verses 24, 25, symbolize the holy people of Israel.

11. **The prince of the host**—This is no other than Jehovah of hosts, called the "Prince of princes" in verse 25. **It took away from him**—That is, from the prince of the host. Another reading, given in the margin, simply makes this passive and impersonal. **From him was taken away the continual**—The continual daily service consisted in a burnt offering of one lamb in the morning and another in the evening (Exod. xxix, 38-41; Num. xxviii, 3-6). According to Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, Book I, i, 1), Antiochus Epiphanes "spoiled the temple, and put a stop to the constant practice of offering a daily sacrifice of expiation for three years and six months." This also explains how **the place of his sanctuary was cast down**. In 1 Macc. i, 39, it is said "the sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness." The temple was not destroyed by Antiochus, but "he took away the golden altar, and the candlestick, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of showbread, and stripped the temple of all the ornaments of gold" (1 Macc. i, 21, 22).

cast down. 12 And a host was given over *to it* together with the continual *burnt offering* through transgression ; and it cast down

---

12. **Host was given**—The word translated *host* (אֲנָחַ) is here construed as feminine, and subject of the verb *was given*. It appears as feminine elsewhere only in Isa. xl, 2, where it has the meaning of *warfare* or calamity. This fact and the absence of the article before the word favor the view that a different host from that of verses 10, 11 is here intended. Accordingly Ewald, Hitzig, Stuart, Zockler, and others understand that a hostile host was set or placed over [or set against] the daily sacrifice, substituting in its place an idolatrous worship. This was done by the armed forces of Antiochus when “they set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judah” (1 Macc. i, 54), and sacrificed swine’s flesh thereon. Others maintain that, as the word *host* in verses 10, 11, and also in verse 13, refers to God’s host, it is better to understand the same meaning here, and the same host as that of verse 13. This host or company of God’s people were to be given over into the power of the destructive horn **together with the continual offering** (וְעִם in the sense of *in addition to, along with*). The same general thought is brought out by either construction. The violent horn is permitted to stop the daily offerings and act the tyrant with the people of God. The words **through transgression** may be explained differently, according to the sense in which the word *host* is taken. The reference may be to the wickedness displayed by the hostile host (comp. verse 13), or the trans-

truth to the ground, and it did *its pleasure* and prospered. 13 Then I heard a holy one speaking; and another holy one said unto that certain one which spake, How long shall be the vision *concerning* the continual *burnt offering*, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both sanctuary and host to

---

gressions of the Jewish people, which brought upon them these calamities as a divine judgment. **Cast down truth**—Any such triumph of a heathen power over the representatives of the true religion is a casting down of truth to the ground. **It did**—The object of the verb is left unexpressed. The imagination of the reader is left to supply the obvious thought of the *will, purpose, pleasure* of the persecutor, who has his hour of prosperity.

13. **I heard**—All this hearing, and **speaking**, and responding is the apocalyptic machinery of visions and dreams. The holy myriads who act as God's ministers (comp. vii, 10), are the appointed mediators of revelation (comp. also Zech. i, 9, *ff.*; ii, 3; iv, 1-5). **How long**—Natural cry of a prophet beholding a vision of mystery and affliction. Comp. xii, 6; Isa. vi, 11; Zech. i, 12; Psalms vi, 3; xc, 13. **Transgression that maketh desolate**—Others render, *transgression of desolation*, or *transgression of horror*, that is, horrible transgression, astounding wickedness. Stuart gives *transgression* a concrete meaning here, and renders: *the wicked one to be destroyed*. A sound opinion as to the meaning can hardly be formed without observing Daniel's use of the word שׁוּמִים here and in xii, 11; שׁוּמִים in ix, 27; and the form

be trodden under foot? 14 And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings *and* mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

---

משמים in ix, 27; xi, 31. The adjective form השמים in ix, 17, and the plural of the participle in ix, 18, 26, are also to be noticed. A comparison of these passages will show that in every case the temple is contemplated either as *desolated* (that is, in a desolate condition), or as the object of some desolating person or power, that is, a desolater. A comparison of xi, 31; xii, 11, where the word שפיץ, *abomination*, is used in the one case with the form משמים, and in the other with שמים, seems to warrant the opinion of Gesenius that the two forms have the same meaning, the ם being merely dropped, or else the Kal used in the same sense as the Polel participle. In both cases “the abomination that made desolate” was some form of idolatry that virtually laid waste the sanctuary; and in this passage *the transgression that maketh desolate* is most naturally understood of the transgression mentioned in verse 12, through which, by means of which, or on account of which the daily offerings were stopped, and the place of the sanctuary was cast down and made a ruin. Hence the naturalness of the words that follow, **to give both sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot.** Sanctuary and host are without the article, and are to be understood as the same which have been mentioned before in verses 10 and 11.

14. **Evenings and mornings**—Literally, *evening morning*. This is best understood as an asyndeton for the fully written expression *evening and morning* of verse 26.

15 And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, that I sought to understand it; and, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. 16 And I heard a man's voice between *the banks of* Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision. 17 So he came near where I stood; and when he came,

---

The mention of the continual offering (תמיד) in the three preceding verses forbids our taking the words *evening* and *morning* in any other sense than successive evening and morning offerings, as required by the law of the continual burnt offering (Num. xxviii, 3, 4). **Two thousand and three hundred** such offerings would fill the space of half that number of days, or one thousand one hundred and fifty days. This should be compared with the one thousand two hundred and ninety and the one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days of chap. xii, 11, 12; and the "time and times and half a time" in vii, 25; xii, 7. All these time-periods approximate three years and a half, and yet there is obviously a design to vary them so that no mathematical certainty of reckoning them is open to interpreters. This variety of numerical statements seems to be itself a symbolical suggestion that it is not for prophet or reader "to know times or seasons, which the Father has set in his own authority" (Acts i, 7). See the excursus on the symbolical numbers of Daniel at the end of the notes on chap. xii.

15-19. In these verses we have again a fine specimen of the visional machinery of apocalypics. It is in its general

I was affrighted, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man; for the vision belongeth to the time of the end. 18 Now as he was speaking with me, I fell into a deep sleep with my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright. 19 And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the latter time of the indignation: for it belongeth to the appointed time of the end. 20 The ram which thou sawest that had the two horns, is the king of Media and

---

character analogous with that of all dreams which leave a deep impression on the soul. The **time of the end** (17), and the **appointed time of the end** (19), to which also belongs the **latter time of the indignation**, are all to be understood of the consummation of the period of persecution and trouble, which is to be succeeded by the reign and triumph of the Prince of the hosts of heaven. That end is wrapt in mystery. So far as Daniel's visions extend, the impious horn is the last great hostile figure that appears on the horizon of the future, and with his overthrow the dominion of the saints of the Most High is supposed to begin.

20. **The ram . . . is the king of Media and Persia**—We follow here all the ancient versions, which read *king* (not *kings*) as in the following verse, where the goat is said to be the “king of Greece.” The word *king* here stands for the empire as represented by the king. Comp. note on vii, 17. **The two horns** are not, as we have observed on verse 3, above, the Median and Persian

Persia. 21 And the rough he-goat is the king of Greece: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. 22 And as for that which was broken, in the place whereof four stood up, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not with his,

---

elements in the body of the ram, but the two dynasties of kings, represented by Cyrus and Darius, which ruled Media and Persia. The particular king, which represented the ram at the time of its destruction by the Grecian power, was Darius Codomannus, the last of the dynasty of Darius Hystaspis.

21. **Goat...king of Greece**—That is, he embodied and represented the Græco-Macedonian empire. The empire was represented alike by **the first king** and all those who succeeded him. To make this *first king* represent one kingdom, and the four who succeeded him out of the same nation another and distinct kingdom, violates all the analogies of symbolism. On the same principle we should, in chap. vii, be obliged to explain the ten horns as a kingdom distinct from that of the beast on whose head they appeared, and the little horn which “came up after them” might indicate even another kingdom. When a distinction is made as here between beast and horn, the horn is to be understood of a king or dynasty, not as equivalent to another beast. Hence the fundamental error of those who would make Alexander represent the third kingdom and his successors the fourth.

22. **Four kingdoms out of the nation**—That this refers to the division of Alexander’s dominion after his death is conceded by all, but that the *four kingdoms*



power. 23 And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to

---

here mentioned denote specifically four distinct kingdoms known as such in history may be doubted. For (1) there were more than four rulers with separate dominions who succeeded Alexander; (2) Interpreters differ as to the four, as (*a*) Porphyry, who made them Macedonia, Syria, Asia, and Egypt; (*b*) Hitzig says Thrace, Egypt, Syria, and Macedonia; (*c*) Bevan says Syria, Egypt, Parthia, and Macedonia; (*d*) others name the dominions of Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy. (3) But supposing the last named to fulfill best the terms of the prophecy, it is to be noted that those four remained distinct but a little while, and were so unequally distributed as illy to represent the four points of the compass. Cassander and Lysimachus were virtually put off with European provinces, as Macedonia and Thrace, for Seleucus claimed dominion from the Hellespont to India. (4) The more detailed description of chap. xi, 4, *ff.*, takes no note of four kingdoms rising out of Alexander's dominion, but says simply, "his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven," and then goes on to describe the conflicts between north and south as if these were the only notable divisions of the empire. Since, therefore, the Diadochi ruled about three hundred years, and of this period there were four distinct divisions of the empire for less than a score of years, it seems better to understand the number *four* symbolically, as in xi, 4, and referring broadly to the rule of the Diadochi in the four quarters of the world.

23. **Latter time of their kingdom**—The writer evidently thinks of the rule of Antiochus as close upon the

the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.  
 24 And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and do *his pleasure*:

---

end of the Grecian domination. **Transgressors are come to the full**—These transgressors are most naturally understood of those who commit the transgression of verses 12 and 13. Some understand the heathen persecutors who fill the measure of their sins; others the apostate Jews whose daring impiety was punished by the judgment visited on the holy places of the temple and on the chosen people. There is nothing to determine this point absolutely, for it seems to have been left designedly uncertain, as if implying both ideas. **Of fierce countenance**—Strong and unbending, having no regard for age or weakness. Comp. Deut. xxviii, 50. **Understanding dark sentences**—Versed in arts of deception, flattery, and fraud. Comp. verse 25 and xi, 21, 23, 25, 27, 32.

24. **Not by his own power**—Some think this is erroneously repeated from verse 22, where it refers to Alexander. Others see in the words here an implied thought: “His power was really not his own, but given him for the time by the Most High.” According to others the implied thought is, “not by his own power but rather by his cunning and strategy.” **Destroy wonderfully**—This is generally explained that he will spread desolation in a marvelous manner wherever he moves with his forces. But the expression is strange, and a comparison with xi, 36, where the same word (נפלאות) is used with *speak*, makes very plausible the conjecture of Bevan that instead

and he shall destroy the mighty ones and the holy people. 25 And through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and in *their* security shall he destroy many: he shall also stand up against the prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

---

of שחית we should read שיה, *he will utter monstrous things*, that is, blasphemies against God. **Destroy the mighty ones**—His powerful political enemies. **The holy people**—Or, *people of the saints*, who also, according to vii, 25, are “worn out” and bitterly afflicted by this impious king.

25. **His policy**—His wisdom and cunning. The Alexandrine Greek version here supplies an emendation which greatly relieves the syntax of the beginning of this verse. By repeating the word saints it reads, *and against the saints was his policy, and he caused deceit to prosper in his hand*. All this refers to the well-known skill of Antiochus in statecraft. He not only “obtained the kingdom by flatteries,” but was full of subtlety and mischief in his dealings. Comp. xi, 21, 27. **In security destroy many**. In their supposed security, or when these *many* suspected no attack, he suddenly turned his destructive forces on them. This is illustrated by the record of 1 Macc. i, 30, *f.*, where it is said that the officer of Antiochus came to Jerusalem with a large army and spoke peaceable words to the Jews, and when he had deceitfully won their confidence he suddenly fell upon the city and destroyed a multitude of the people. **Prince of princes**—Same as the “Prince of the host” in verse 11. Comp. also xi, 36. **Broken without hand**—Comp. chap. ii,

26 And the vision of the evenings and mornings which hath been told is true: but shut thou up the vision; for it belongeth to many days *to come*. 27 And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; then I rose up, and did the king's business: and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.

---

34, 45. Without human hand, but rather by some judgment stroke of heaven. The various accounts of Antiochus' death imply that he came to his end in some miserable way. The descriptions found in 1 Macc. vi, 8-16, and 2 Macc. ix, 1-10, are highly colored, but probably have a considerable foundation of fact.

## FOURTH PROPHECY.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS. CHAP. IX, 24-27.

THE three preceding visions are notable for their striking symbols of empires and kings ; the two which follow take the form of direct communications from a revealing angel. The prophecy of the seventy weeks is dated "in the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans" (ix, 1). This was the same Darius, then "about threescore and two years old," who "received the kingdom" upon the death of Belshazzar and the fall of the Babylonian dynasty (v, 30, 31). Under this king, according to chapter vi, Daniel obtained great distinction, and held a high office. During the first year of his reign the prophet "understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of Jehovah came to Jeremiah the prophet for accomplishing the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years" (ix, 2). By the term *the books* we are not to understand, as some critics assume, a collection of canonical books, but the rolls of Jeremiah's prophecies. The plural *books* (סִפְרֵיִם) is employed in Jer. xxix, 25, and 2 Kings xix, 14, for copies or parchments of a written communication. From the rolls of Jeremiah Daniel *understood* (that is, perceived, or discerned) *the number of the years* of Jerusalem's desolations. He perceived that the desolations were to continue *seventy years*, for this is the express statement of Jeremiah in chaps. xxv, 11, 12, and xxix, 10. That oracle is dated in the fourth

year of Jehoiachim (Jer. xxv, 1). From that date (about 606 B. C.) unto the first year of Cyrus (536 B. C.) full seventy years elapsed. As Daniel was carried into exile about the time of this oracle (comp. Dan. i, 1), he would very naturally have computed the seventy years as beginning with that date.

Understanding, therefore, that the end of the seventy years was near at hand, he humbled himself before God, and made confession and supplications, as recorded in this chapter, verses 3-19, and, while yet in the act of prayer, "the man Gabriel," who had explained to him the visions of chapter viii (comp. verses 15-19), came and touched him and bade him consider and understand the revelation, of which we give, in connection with our comments, a new translation. In this translation we have aimed to give what we believe to be the nearest approach to the meaning of the original writer. But every scholar knows that there are great difficulties to encounter, and several possible explanations between which he has to decide. And there is no interpretation that is altogether free from objections. To give some idea of the wide range of research and comment on these four verses we furnish a very condensed summary of divergent views.

1. "The word to restore and build Jerusalem" (verse 25) has been supposed to refer (*a*) to Jeremiah's prophecy in Jer. xxv, 11 (Calmet); (*b*) to the prophecy of Jer. xxix, 10 (Vatablus); (*c*) to this word of the angel to Daniel (J. D. Michaelis); (*d*) to the proclamation of Cyrus in Ezra i, 1 (Calvin); (*e*) to the prophesying of Haggai and Zechariah (Bengel); (*f*) to some word issued in the second year of Darius Nothus (Scaliger); (*g*) or in the second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (Luther); (*h*) or that of the seventh year of this king as given in Ezra vii, 11-26 (Prideaux, Auberlen, and many); (*i*) or that of the twen-

tieth year of the same given to Nehemiah as stated in Neh. ii, 1-8 (Hengstenberg, Cowles, and others).

2. The "anointed prince" has been understood of Zerubbabel, of Joshua the priest, of Ezra the scribe, of Nehemiah, of Onias III, of Cyrus, and of Jesus Christ. Besides those who identify the "anointed prince" of verse 25 and the "anointed one" of verse 26, and understand Jesus Christ in both references, there are those who distinguish them, and make the first refer to Cyrus and the second either to Onias III (as Zockler), or to Seleucus Philopator (Ewald), or to Alexander the Great (Bertholdt).

3. The "prince who is to come" (verse 26) has been understood of (*a*) Antiochus Epiphanes, (*b*) Titus, with the Roman army, or (*c*) some antichrist of a future day; and "its end" or "his end" is explained differently, either as the end of the city and sanctuary, or the end of the prince Antiochus, or the end which he effects. The "end" mentioned immediately afterward in the same verse has been explained as (*a*) the end of the prince, or (*b*) end of the war, or (*c*) end of the sanctuary, or (*d*) end of the seventy heptades, or (*e*) end of the world.

4. The "covenant" of verse 27 is either (*a*) that which Antiochus formed with many apostate Jews or (*b*) that which Christ established with his disciples and followers.

5. The "one heptade" is variously understood, (*a*) of the seven years in the midst of which Antiochus polluted the temple; (*b*) of the seven years from John's baptism and the public appearance of Christ unto the conversion of Cornelius, in the midst of which Christ was crucified; (*c*) of a symbolical period without definite limit, considered as the last disastrous heptade, with which the ruin of the sanctuary would be forever associated; (*d*) seventy years between the death of Christ and the reign of Trajan; (*e*) last heptade of time, yet future.

6. The "sacrifice and oblation" (verse 27) are explained (*a*) of those which Antiochus made to cease for three and a half years, or (*b*) of the final abrogation of typical offerings by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

7. The division of the seventy heptades into seven and sixty-two and one ( $7 + 62 + 1 = 70$ ) has also furnished a disturbing puzzle ; (*a*) some follow the masoretic punctuation of verse 25, and separate the seven from the sixty-two, so as to read : " Unto an anointed one, a prince, there are seven heptades ; and sixty and two heptades it shall be built again," etc. ; (*b*) others unite the two clauses as we have done in our translation which follows ; (*c*) others, unable to find satisfactory meaning in either of these ways, have ventured to transpose the order of the numbers, and some make them both date from the same point of time, and so run parallel to each other.

In view of the great variety of opinions here outlined we ought to consider the following facts :

1. The language is notably obscure, and in some cases almost enigmatical. The interpreter who fully appreciates the textual difficulties will, accordingly, refrain from assuming to make the passage so plain as to remove all obscurity and doubt.

2. There is no probability of arriving at satisfactory conclusions so long as mathematical precision in the use of symbolical numbers is assumed as essential to a valid interpretation. All possible dates and reckonings have been tried to fit the exact numerical specifications of this book ; but hitherto they have all failed to command any general confidence. Is it not time to ask whether such assumptions of exact conformity are not misleading, and without sufficient authority in Scripture ?

3. There are two interpretations about which most of the statements of these verses may find a fairly satisfactory



solution. According to the first, the “word to restore and to build Jerusalem” is Jeremiah’s prophecy to that effect (Jer. xxix, 10 ; xxxi, 38) ; the anointed prince of verse 25 is Cyrus, and the anointed one who is to be cut off (verse 26) is Onias III, who was assassinated about 172 B. C. ; the “prince who is to come” is Antiochus Epiphanes, and the destruction of city and sanctuary, and making sacrifice and oblation to cease, are the well-known desolations which he wrought or ordered at Jerusalem.

The other interpretation is the Messianic, according to which the “word to restore and build” is the proclamation of Cyrus (Ezra i, 1-4), or that of Artaxerxes (in Ezra vii, 11-26, or Neh. ii, 5-8). The anointed prince both in verses 25 and 26 is the Messiah ; the people of the prince to come (verse 26) is the Roman army under Titus, and the destruction of the city and sanctuary that effected by the Romans in A. D. 70.

Both these theories labor under difficulties, and, if put to the rigid test of numerical precision, which interpreters insist on, both utterly fail. The first has in its favor the fact that the prophecies of the seventh, eighth, and eleventh chapters represent the calamities of the Jewish people and their holy city as reaching their worst under Antiochus, and the half week of verse 27 seems most naturally parallel with the “time, times, and half a time” of chap. vii, 25, and the days of viii, 14. Comp. also xi, 31, and xii, 7, 11, 12. If this passage, therefore, be explained as referring to the same catastrophe, we have a harmony of subject-matter and a unity of scope which the unbiased grammatico-historical interpreter cannot fail to appreciate.

But the directly Messianic interpretation seems best to satisfy some of the terms employed, and will probably always maintain a strong claim to the support of Christian expositors. The language of verse 24 is strikingly

24 SEVENTY heptades are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to close up

---

comprehensive, and is without doubt to be understood in a Messianic sense, as we understand the glorious vision of the judgment and the triumph of the saints in chap. vii, 9-14, 26, 27. It is not satisfactory to assume in verse 26 a different "anointed one" from the anointed prince of verse 25, and the overthrow of city and sanctuary, and the entire picture of overwhelming destruction given in verses 26 and 27, do not accord with the partial and only temporary injury wrought by Antiochus. While, therefore, here, as well as in vii, 26, 27, and xii, 1-3, the Messianic triumph may be explained as following immediately on the fall of the ungodly Antiochus, there is so much in the oracle, taken by itself, that truly forecasts the final ruin of Judaism, and the beginning of the Gospel age, that we give the preference to that interpretation.

24. **Seventy heptades**—As Daniel had been pondering the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy (verse 2) the angel appropriately employs the symbolical term here written. The position and gender of the word translated *heptades* attract attention. It is the first word in the sentence, *heptades seventy decreed*, and nowhere else appears in the masculine gender, except in chap. x, 2, 3, where it is expressly defined by the appositive "days" (literally, *three heptades, days*). This masculine plural is construed with a singular verb, *is decreed*. The seventy heptades are conceived as a unit, a round number, and are best understood and explained as approximately so many heptades or weeks of years. As if the angel had said to Daniel: "These seventy years of 'desolations of Jerusalem,' on which thou art thinking, suggest another

the transgression, and to consummate sins, and to expiate iniquity, and to introduce eternal righteousness, and to seal up vision

---

period—a seven times seventy years, which must elapse before that consummation which shall introduce the everlasting righteousness.” This seven times seventy is no more to be pressed into the service of literal interpretation than the “seventy times seven” of Jesus’s response to Peter in Matt. xviii, 22. But Daniel is informed that even the restoration from exile, and the rebuilding of city and temple, will not terminate the desolations of that holy place. The seventy years of exile and desolation must yet be repeated seven times before the end will come. This thought should be compared with the fourfold statement in Lev. xxvi, 18, 21, 24, 28, that disobedient Israel must needs be smitten “seven times” for their refusal to obey the commandments of Jehovah.

**Close up the transgression**—To complete or fill up the measure of *the transgression* mentioned in chap. viii, 12, 13. **Consummate sins**—An emphatic repetition of the preceding statement, and both together indicate that completion of transgressions which is contemplated in the parallel statement of chap. viii, 23, where the same word (התם) is used. The idea of ripeness for judgment is in both these terms. Comp. Gen. xv, 16.

**Expiate iniquity and introduce righteousness**—This twofold statement corresponds with the two immediately preceding. We understand it of the mediation and righteousness of the Messianic kingdom, which is here conceived as following the judgment of those transgressors whose sins “are come to the full.”

and prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies.  
 25 And thou shalt know and understand  
 that from the issue of a word to restore and

---

**Seal up vision and prophet**—To confirm the oracles which had continually spoken of “the end of the days,” and of the great day of Jahveh, and of the glorious age to come, and the kingdom of God. And this period of consummating the old eon and introducing a new one was also *to seal up* prophecy by bringing in the final revelation, and making further visions and oracles like these unnecessary. **Anoint a holy of holies**—Institute a new sanctuary, of which the first, as also the Mosaic tabernacle, was but a symbolic figure (Heb. ix, 8). Into this holy of holies the saints of the Messianic age have boldness to enter by the new and living way provided through the redemption of Jesus (Heb. x, 19).

The six statements of this verse may be arranged in three lines of Hebrew parallelism, each line containing a double statement :

To close up the transgression and to consummate sins,  
 And to expiate iniquity and to introduce righteousness eternal,  
 And to seal up vision and prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies.

These three lines represent (1) judgment, (2) redemption, and (3) completed revelation, and so, in full accord with other apocalyptic conceptions, they point to an end wrought by God upon the representatives of evil and the introduction of a new and glorious age.

25. **Issue of a word**—This word is most naturally explained of Cyrus’s proclamation, written in Ezra i, 1-4,

and referred to in Isa. xliv, 28. The decree of Artaxerxes in Ezra vii, 11-26, or that of Neh. ii, 5-8, sufficiently accords with the language. Either of these decrees seems better to meet the import of the language than any word of Jeremiah (as, for example, Jer. xxxi, 38). To assume that, because the seventy weeks are the seventy years of Jeremiah multiplied by seven, "it is therefore clear that the seventy weeks must begin in the time of Jeremiah" (Bevan), is entirely without warrant. Jeremiah's word, prominent in Daniel's thought, was that concerning the desolations of Jerusalem (ix, 2; comp. Jer. xxv, 11), and his occasional oracles touching the return from exile (Jer. xxix, 10; xxxi, 38; xxxii, 37-40) are not the most obvious meaning of Daniel's language in this verse. The **word to restore and build** is somewhat indefinite, and דָּבַר, *word*, is without the article. We have no ground for saying that Daniel himself understood the *times* indicated by the angel. His language in chap. vii, 28; viii, 27; xii, 8, 9, forbids our making this assumption. He was to *know and observe* the general purport of what the angel said, but it is clear from his own repeated statements that he did not clearly comprehend all the details of the revelation, and especially "what, or what manner of time" (comp. 1 Peter i, 11), the spirit pointed out. Daniel informs us that he received this communication when Darius the Mede was king of Babylon (ix, 1), and this was before Cyrus had issued his proclamation for the Jews' return. Hence the decree is spoken of, not as something well known, but indefinitely, *a word to restore and to build*. These two verbs may be understood idiomatically as equivalent *to build again*, and most exegetes so translate them in the latter part of the verse. But perhaps we should read לְהוֹשִׁיב, or לְהוֹשִׁיב, *to people*.

to build Jerusalem unto an anointed one, a prince, (there are) seven heptades and sixty and two heptades. It shall be restored and built with open court and narrow street,

---

**An anointed one, a prince**—We understand here the Messiah, the anointed Prince and Mediator of the new covenant, whose judgments and redemptive work have been so magnificently presented in verse 24. He is spoken of indefinitely, but this fact accords with the character and style of the whole prophecy. Those who understand that Cyrus is here referred to (see above) are of course obliged to explain the *word to rebuild Jerusalem* of Jeremiah's prophecy, and they also labor under the necessity of explaining the "anointed one" (Messiah) of the next verse as referring to a different person. These facts are strong objections to that explanation.

**Seven heptades and sixty and two heptades**—Here we discard the masoretic punctuation and unite these two statements into one sentence. The seventy weeks are thus divided into three sections of seven, sixty-two, and one ( $7 + 62 + 1 = 70$ ). For reasons already given (but see more especially the excursus at the end of chap. xii), we dismiss all attempts to find in these symbolical numbers a definite chronology. We take the *seven heptades* as pointing to the time of the restoration from exile, and the fulfillment of such prophecies as Jer. xxix, 14; xxx, 3; xxxii, 44; Ezek. xxviii, 25, 26; xxxiv, 13; xxxvi, 24; Isa. xlv, 28; xlviii, 20; lii, 9. It was during this first period that the city was to be built again **with open court and narrow street**. There is a measure of doubt as to the exact meaning of these two words. Some render

and in trouble of the times. 26 And after the sixty and two heptades there shall be cut

---

*street and moat, or street and ditch.* But the mention of *moats* or *ditches* in a city built like Jerusalem on high hills seems out of place. Some of the old versions read *broad places and walls.* But the etymology of the words points to some designed contrast, as *broad places* and *narrow places,* or courts and alleys. The probable meaning is that, in the rebuilding of Jerusalem, such open courts and narrow streets as are common in all great cities were to be builded. **In trouble of the times**—Intimation that this period of rebuilding will be noted for annoyances and troubles. The disturbances and interruptions, caused by hostile peoples, as recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah, furnish ample commentary on these words.

26. **After the sixty and two heptades**—After that longer but indefinite period succeeding the time of rebuilding Jerusalem, and, as verse 27 shows, in the midst of the last or seventieth heptade. **There shall be cut off an anointed one**—Although without the article the *anointed one* here referred to is most naturally understood of the same prince so designated in the verse preceding. In an oracle so brief, and where everything is so indefinite, we should not assume that the writer must needs specify the exact allusion of every word. But we may insist that he should not in such close connection employ words in a double sense or a manner obviously misleading. As the word *host* in viii, 12, is most naturally understood of the same host mentioned in the preceding verse, so here we understand the *anointed one* to be the same Messiah as the one referred to in verse 25, who, according to Heb. ix, 26, “at the consummation of the ages, for

off an anointed one, and no one for him. And the city and the sanctuary will a people

---

putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself, has been manifested." To one who has any faith in the supernatural element of other Messianic prophecies there is nothing unnatural or far-fetched in this interpretation of Daniel. The prophet is given to understand that the seventy heptades consummate a great prophetic age and introduce an eternal reign of righteousness. That consummation is marked by the notable exhibition of *an anointed one*, but the manner of his appearance and of his being cut off is left in mystery. There is no sufficient reason to say that Daniel himself obtained any clear understanding on those points of the vision. But it is ours, who live in the after times, to recognize in the facts of gospel history what neither prophet nor angel in those former times could look into. See 1 Peter i, 10-12. And we may see in those facts a clearer fulfillment of these words than in any other group of facts presented to us in the course of human history. **And no one for him**—In accord with our Messianic interpretation we may best explain these obscure words as meaning that there was no force or helper provided for the Messiah to prevent his being cut off. The picture presented is a true parallel of Isa. liii, 8, which declares of the suffering servant "that he was cut off from the land of the living, because of the transgression of my people, a stroke for them." Others who adopt the Messianic exposition take the words to mean that "he had no adherents," or "no possessions," or there was "not for him what he should have," or as the Authorized Version, "cut off but not for himself." Those who reject the Messianic interpretation understand that



of a prince who is to come destroy, and its end (will be) in the flood. And until the end (there will be) war; determined (are the) desolations. 27 And he will confirm a covenant

---

the person referred to (whether Alexander, Seleucus Philopator, or Onias) had no son as successor.

**People of a prince who is to come**—The Romans, as led by Vespasian or Titus, both of whom afterward attained to the throne of the Cæsars. Others, as shown above, explain this of Antiochus and his forces; but it cannot be fairly maintained that the people of Antiochus **destroyed the city and the sanctuary**. This destruction, which overwhelms as with a flood, is best explained of the utter overthrow of the sanctuary by the Roman power.

**Its end**—The end of the sanctuary, involving, as it did, the final cessation of the Jewish sacrificial worship. **In the flood**—The overwhelming rush of conquering and desolating armies. Comp. Nahum i, 8. **Until the end war**—Until the end of city and sanctuary war will be prosecuted with resistless energy. Witness the disastrous siege which ended with the destruction of the temple.

**Determined desolations**—The construction is difficult. There are various versions, as “a determination of desolations,” which is the most literal rendering of the words; “a determined measure of desolations;” “a decision of desolations;” “a decree of ruins.” The allusion appears to be to the נִחְתָּם, *decreed*, in verse 24. The divine decree is that certain desolations, ending with ruin of city and sanctuary, are determined or destined to come upon Jerusalem.

27 **He will confirm a covenant with many one**

with many one heptade, and in the midst of the heptade will he cause sacrifice and obla-

---

**heptade**—As the principal subject of the two preceding verses is the “anointed one,” so here it is the same Messiah who in the final heptade makes strong his covenant unto many. As the great “mediator of a new covenant” (comp. Heb. ix, 15), Christ introduced and established his Gospel during the last period of the Jewish dispensation (“at the end of those days,” Heb. i, 2 ; comp. ix, 26). For it was necessary that his new covenant should be proclaimed fully in the world before the consummation of that age. Comp. Matt. xxiv, 14. **In the midst of the heptade**—And so, of course, some time before “the end.” The word *בְּתוֹכָהּ* may mean either the *half* or the *midst*. Taken in the sense of *one half of the week*, it certainly favors the interpretation which refers it to the three and a half years (“time, times, and half a time”), during which Antiochus put a stop to the daily offerings in the temple. But in the Messianic explanation it is best interpreted of the self-sacrifice of the Christ, “who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God,” and having “offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God ; from thenceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. ix, 14 ; x, 12–15). In view of these established facts of the redemption of Christ we may see the clearest fulfillment of this **causing sacrifice and oblation to cease** in the offering of Jesus the Messiah, at whose death the veil of the temple was rent and the further offerings of the Hebrew ritual were made void.

tion to cease. And on a wing of abominations a desolator, and, until the consummation and that which is determined, it shall be poured upon a desolate one.

---

**On a wing of abominations a desolator**—The exact sense of *wing* is quite uncertain here, and the entire phrase is obscure. The translations are various, as “on a wing (or pinnacle of the temple) abominations of desolation;” “above shall be a horrible wing of abominations;” “on a desolator’s wing of abominations;” “on the head (summit) of abominations is a desolator;” “a waster over a winged fowl (statue of Jupiter) of abominations,” etc. We understand the reference to be to the Roman army, which spread desolation along its way and lifted up its signs of idolatry wherever it encamped. This is confirmed by Matt. xxiv, 15, Mark xiii, 14, and Luke xxi, 20. The *desolator* is, accordingly, best understood of the “people of the prince” mentioned in verse 26. **Until the consummation and that which is determined**—Namely, the end of the age which concludes with the termination of the seventieth heptade, and finishes the desolations which, according to verse 26, are *determined*, or, according to verse 24, are *decreed*. Such consummation and determined judgment are conceived as fixed in the counsels of God. **It shall be poured upon the desolate**—The subject of the verb *poured* is left indefinite, but is to be understood as the divine judgment implied in the *consummation and that which is determined*. Comp. the use of this word *poured* in verse 11 of this chapter, and in 2 Chron. xii, 7; xxxiv, 21, 25; Jer. vii, 20; xlii, 18; xliv, 6; Nahum i, 6. The *desolate* one is

the city and sanctuary of Jerusalem, the object and victim of the wrath of the desolator. Comp. Matt. xxiii, 38. The language of Jesus in the passage here referred to is a suggestive comment on the words of Daniel. Her divine Lord would often have gathered the children of Jerusalem under his wing of protection, as a hen protects her brood, but her manifold sins condemn her and deliver her over to be covered by the desolator's wing of abominations.

The foregoing interpretation seems on the whole best to satisfy the import of this mysterious prophecy of the seventy weeks. The consummation to which it points is the "end of the age" of which Jesus spoke in Matt. xxiv, and the relentless war, which ended in the desolation of Jerusalem, occasioned the "time of trouble" mentioned in chap. xii, 1, such as never previously befell the nation. Comp. Matt. xxiv, 21. In fact, there are weighty internal reasons for the conjecture that chap. xii, 1-3, is the true conclusion of this prophecy of the seventy weeks, and all that comes between in chaps. x and xi are a later interpolation.

To sum up all in a single paragraph, the seventy heptades represent an indefinite period extending from the end of the exile until the final disruption of national Judaism by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. This was a period of nearly six centuries (from B. C. 536 to A. D. 70). The symbolical number 70 is divided into three parts of 7, 62, and 1. The first indicates the period of restoration from exile; the third the end of the age—the last days of the pre-Messianic era, conceived vividly as a single heptade. The intervening period of sixty-two heptades is of course the undefined space of time between the restoration from exile and the final heptade of consummation. The seventieth heptade is the time when Messiah appears, establishes a new covenant with many,

and, to use the language of Isaiah (liii, 10), it pleases Jehovah to bruise him and to make his soul an offering for sin, and so to supersede and do away the temple sacrifices. The end of that eventful heptade is signalized by the total destruction of the Jewish sanctuary, which pouring out of judgment on the desolate was the sign of the coming of the Son of man and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness. This was the eonic crisis, which, according to Heb. xii, 27, 28, marked the removal of the temporary and the typical and the coming of "a kingdom that cannot be shaken."

It deserves more notice than is commonly given it that the uniform teaching of the New Testament places the ministry and sacrifice of Christ in the closing period of an eon, or age. No recorded words of Jesus himself are more emphatic than that the end of the age in which he and his contemporaries were living would occur before that generation passed away (Matt. xxiv, 34; Mark xiii, 30; Luke xxi, 32; comp. Matt. xvi, 27, 28; Mark ix, 1; Luke ix, 27). Neither the death of Jesus, nor his resurrection, nor the day of Pentecost, marked the end of that age. For the apostles, many years after these events, considered themselves still living "in the end of the days." Paul speaks of himself and contemporaries as those "upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (1 Cor. x, 11). Peter says that Christ was "manifested at the end of the times for your sake" (1 Peter i, 20). In Heb. i, 1, it is written: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers, . . . hath in the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son." And again, in Heb. ix, 26: "Now, once, at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The consummation of that old pre-Messianic age was reached with the destruction of the sanctuary and the desolation of Jerusalem.

## FIFTH PROPHECY.

THE BROKEN AND DIVIDED KINGDOM AND THE  
END. CHAPS. XI, 2-XII, 4.

To the angelic communication recorded in this chapter the narrative of chapter x serves as a preface, and chapter xii, 5-13, as an appendix. It is dated in the third year of Cyrus (comp. i, 21), and the twenty-fourth day of the first month. The prophet was by the great river Hiddekel (the Tigris), and was accompanied by some men who were smitten with fear and fled away at the coming of the angel (x, 7). The description of the angel in verses 5 and 6 is grand and impressive, and was appropriated to a considerable extent by John in his description of the Son of man in Rev. i, 13-16. Whether this glorious angel was the same whose hand touched him (verse 10), or whether he was identical with the Gabriel of viii, 16, and ix, 21, and what were his relations to Michael (verse 21 and xii, 1) or the two angels referred to in xii, 5, are questions more curious than profitable. The doctrine of angels, as presented in these chapters, makes Michael the guardian prince of the Jewish people, and recognizes the existence of similar angelic princes devoted to the interests of Persia and Greece (x, 13, 20). Whether this is merely apocalyptic machinery, the visional drapery of prophetic symbolism, or also an intimation of realities existing in the world of spirits, is a question impossible to determine with absolute assurance. But whatever the origin of the doctrines here implied, it is in strict accord with other representations of the Holy Scriptures to suppose that

2 AND now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and when he is waxed strong through his riches, he shall stir up all against

---

there is a wonderful world of spiritual life above us. God has his innumerable company of elect spirits, who minister unto such as are heirs of salvation (Heb. i, 14). Jehovah's angel encamps about them that fear him (Psalm xxxiv, 7; comp. Psalm xci, 11). But over against Michael and his angels are set the great adversary Satan and his angels. These latter are conceived as making themselves lying spirits to influence the counsels of kings (1 Kings xxii, 19-23). Such is our most natural inference from the contentions between these angelic princes mentioned in verses 13 and 20. The purposes of the kings of Persia were liable to be influenced by angelic spirits inimical to God's people, and holy angels, like Michael and Gabriel, are conceived as fighting against them and frustrating their evil counsels. But as all this appears in prophetic vision in this book, and is concerned with the *form* rather than the *substance* of the revelation, it is not important in our interpretation to discuss the doctrine further here.

2. **Yet three kings in Persia**—Between Cyrus and Darius Codomannus, the last king of Persia, there were ten kings, and those two made in all twelve kings who ruled the so-called Medo-Persian empire. The fact that these are not all mentioned, or even recognized, shows that the writer does not essay to write down a complete epitome of history. **The fourth**, whose great **riches** are noticed, is generally believed to be Xerxes, who led

the realm of Greece. 3 And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. 4 And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven ; but not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion wherewith he ruled ;

---

his immense host of half a million against Greece and fought the battles of Thermopylæ and Salamis. The three intervening kings, if one insists on literal exactness, must then be Cambyses, Smerdis, and Darius Hystaspis. But to mention the first four, including such a usurper as Smerdis, and then pass over the other eight, not even alluding to the last Darius, whose almost countless thousands fought Alexander at Issus and Arbela, and whose immense treasure, amassed at Shushan, fell into the Grecian conqueror's hands, is quite inexplicable. Better, therefore, to understand Darius Codomannus by *the fourth*, and explain the number four symbolically, somewhat as the four kingdoms of chap. viii, 22. In the vision of chap. vii, 6, the third beast, representing the Persian kingdom, had four wings and four heads.

3. **A mighty king**—Alexander the Great, who has already been represented by the great horn of the he-goat in chap. viii, 5, 21.

4. **Divided toward the four winds**—Referring to the division of Alexander's dominion among his successors, as explained above in the note on viii, 22. **Not to his posterity**—For his sons and proper heirs were put to death soon after Alexander's decease. **Nor according to his dominion**—Not one of his successors ruled



for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside these. 5 And the king of the south shall be strong, and *one* of his princes ;

---

so wide a dominion or exhibited such superior ability to rule as Alexander. **Beside these**—That is, others besides his own posterity.

5. **King of the south**—Ptolemy I, known as Ptolemy Soter, son of Lagus, one of Alexander's generals. After the death of the great conqueror this general secured to himself the dominion of Egypt and founded what is commonly known as the kingdom of the Ptolemies. *The south* is a geographical term used of the whole region bordering on the south of Palestine, and also including Egypt, as may be seen in Isa. xxx, 6. **One of his princes**—Some explain, one of Alexander's princes; but the more obvious and grammatical construction requires us to understand one of Ptolemy's princes, namely, Seleucus, who for a time was befriended by Ptolemy, and, some say, served as one of his generals. He had previously obtained the government of Babylon, but having incurred the anger of Antigonus, another of Alexander's generals, who at the time ruled all Asia Minor and Syria, he fled to Ptolemy in Egypt. But having collected an army he marched to the east, recovered Babylon and the adjacent regions, and, later, joined Ptolemy, Cassander, and Lysimachus against Antigonus, and defeated him in the battle of Ipsus. Thereupon, Seleucus, who had already assumed the title of Nicator, the conqueror, obtained dominion of all Syria, part of Asia Minor, and all the more easterly provinces of Asia, and so became the most powerful of

and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion. 6 And at the end of years they shall join themselves together; and the daughter of the king of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but

---

the successors of Alexander. Hence he **became strong above** Ptolemy, and obtained **a great dominion**. He founded the famous city of Antioch, and named it in memory of his father Antiochus, who had been one of the generals of Philip of Macedon. His dynasty, reckoned from B. C. 312, is known in history as the *Seleucidæ*, who are the kings "of the north" referred to in this chapter. Nicator is known as Seleucus I.

6. **At the end of years**—The son and successor of Seleucus, Antiochus (I) Soter, is passed over without mention, and we are taken at once into the times of Antiochus (II) Theos, grandson of Seleucus, and his contemporary Ptolemy (II) Philadelphus, son and successor of Ptolemy Soter. **Join themselves together**—Make an alliance and confirm it by intermarriage of their families. **Daughter**—Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was given in marriage to Antiochus Theos. This latter is here called the **king of the north**, because in Jewish thought his dominion lay opposite the *Negeb*, or Southland. The whole territory extending from Asia Minor eastward, and including even Babylon, Assyria, Media, and Persia, bears this name of Northland (*Tsaphon*) in the prophets (Zech. ii, 6; vi, 6, 8; Jer. iii, 18; iv, 6; vi, 1, 22; Isa. xli, 25; Zeph. ii, 13). **To make an agreement**—To effect equitable conditions and

she shall not hold fast the strength of her arm, nor shall his seed stand ; but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that

---

make things smooth and agreeable. So it was ostensibly hoped to secure a lasting peace between the two realms. **She will not hold fast strength of the arm**—She lacked the personal power and wisdom to retain and turn to advantage the position which her marriage gave her. The expression *strength of the arm* seems to point to the political influence which the marriage alliance was supposed to secure. **Nor shall his seed stand**—That is, Ptolemy's seed, the issue of the marriage of Berenice and Antiochus, which it was agreed should succeed to the throne of Syria. But the son of Berenice and Antiochus was put to death by Laodice. This is the reading of the Septuagint and the Vulgate (זרעו instead of זרעו, a change in pronunciation, not of what is written), and is much simpler than *neither shall he stand nor his arm*, as commonly translated. But if this common reading be followed the most probable sense is that the king of the south, her father, and his political power shall be as ineffectual as that of his daughter. **She shall be given up**—After the death of her father Berenice was repudiated and expelled by Antiochus, who recalled his former wife Laodice. She at once avenged herself by poisoning the king, her husband, securing the assassination of Berenice and her son, and declaring her own son, Seleucus (II) Callinicus, king of the north. **They that brought her**—Those who helped negotiate the marriage and brought her out of Egypt into Syria. **He that begat her**—Her father.

begat her, and he that strengthened her in the times. 7 But out of a shoot from her roots shall one stand up in his place, and he shall come unto the army, and shall come into the fortress of the king of the north, and shall

---

As her father, however, is known to have died a natural death it is perhaps better, in accord with the Septuagint and Vulgate, to read *him whom she begat*.

**He that strengthened her in the times**—Her husband, by whom she had for the time maintained some “strength of the arm.” The main thought is that all these negotiations of alliance between the kings of the north and the south came to naught, and most of the parties engaged in them went down in the struggle, and secured no advantage to themselves.

**7. Out of a shoot from her roots**—That is, out of the same ancestry from which Berenice sprung, but not from her. **Shall one stand up**—Her brother, Ptolemy (III) Euergetes, who was son and successor of Ptolemy Philadelphus. **In his place**—In place of his father of the same dynasty. Comp. the expression in verses 20 and 21. **Shall come unto the army**—Many understand this of his own army, and his coming to place himself as leader at the head of it to march against the king of the north. But such a manner of statement would be unusual and bootless, and the expression *coming to* is used to denote a hostile coming. Comp. Gen. xxxii, 8, 9; Isa. xxxvii, 33. It is better, therefore, to construe the words in connection with the following **come into the fortress of the king of the north**, and understand the whole passage of the triumphant march of Euergetes

deal against them, and shall prevail: 8 And also their gods, with their molten images, *and* with their goodly vessels of silver and of gold, shall he carry captive into Egypt; and he shall refrain some years from the king of the north. 9 And he shall come into the realm of the king of the south, but he shall return

---

against Seleucus (II) Callinicus, at that time *king of the north*. He not only *came to the army* of the northern king and put it to flight, but went into the various strongholds of Syria and avenged his sister's death by slaying Laodice. So he wrought his pleasure with the subjects and possessions of the northern kingdom, and became very mighty.

8. **Also their gods, . . . images, . . . captive into Egypt**—These statements show the extent and completeness of his triumph. He marched even to Babylon, and returned to Egypt with a vast amount of spoil. **Refrain from the king of the north**—Having brought much spoil into Egypt, Ptolemy Euergetes stood aloof from the king of the north, and did not for **some years** attempt further conquests there.

9. **He shall come . . . and return**—The subject here is the king of the north, mentioned at the close of the preceding verse. The reference is to the expedition which Seleucus (II) Callinicus made against Egypt about two years after Euergetes had retired from Syria. He attempted to recover his losses by an attack on Egypt both by land and sea, but his fleet was scattered by a storm, and his land force suffered disastrous defeat, so that he was obliged to make a hasty retreat to his own land.

into his own land. 10 And his sons shall war, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces, and it shall come on persistently, and overflow, and pass through: and it shall return, and they shall war even to his fortress. 11 And the king of the south shall be moved

---

10. **His sons**—Sons of Seleucus Callinicus, known in history as Seleucus (III) Ceraunus and Antiochus (III) the Great. Ceraunus, after a short reign of three years, during which he undertook various wars, was slain in a campaign against Attalus of Pergamos, and his brother Antiochus succeeded him, and made several attempts to invade Egypt. **And it shall come on persistently**—The subject is the *multitude of great forces*, and the emphatic repetition of the verb *come* (infinitive absolute following the finite verb and denoting continual or persistent action) denotes the intense persistency with which Antiochus the Great fought Egypt. **And it shall return, and they shall war even to his fortress**—The changes from plural to singular and from singular to plural make the exact meaning of this verse obscure. It is probable that some errors have crept into the text. As it now stands the two sons seem to be the first subject; then the “multitude of great forces” comes to the writer’s thought, and he speaks of them both as singular and plural. *His fortress* is best understood as the fortress of Ptolemy, and probably Gaza, to which stronghold Antiochus led his victorious forces after his conquest of Phœnicia and Palestine.

11. **King of the south**—Ptolemy (IV) Philopator, son and successor of Ptolemy Euergetes. **Moved with**

with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the king of the north: and he shall set forth a great multitude, and the multitude shall be given into his hand. 12 And the multitude shall be taken away, and his heart shall be exalted, and he shall

**choler**—Become deeply embittered and enraged. Comp. the word in viii, 7. **Come forth and fight with him**—The weak and effeminated Ptolemy Philopator aroused himself from his usual inactivity and marched against Antiochus with a force of seventy thousand foot soldiers, besides cavalry and elephants, and defeated the king of the north at the battle of Raphia. **And he shall set forth a great multitude**—This is by many understood of the multitude raised by Ptolemy, and with which he fought so successfully at Raphia. But it would be strange to introduce this statement after that of his going forth and fighting with the king of the north. Better, therefore, to understand Antiochus as the subject here, who raised a great force to resist the attack of Ptolemy. **And the multitude shall be given into his hand**—That is, the multitude raised by Antiochus shall be given into Ptolemy's hand. This construction best satisfies the meaning of *giving into one's hand*, which does not signify giving into one's hand to lead into battle, but *given over*, by defeat, into a conqueror's hand.

12. **The multitude shall be taken away**—That is, the same multitude mentioned in the preceding verse, the forces of Antiochus, which were utterly routed and dispersed before the army of Ptolemy. **His heart exalted**—The heart of Ptolemy naturally became puffed

cast down tens of thousands, but he shall not become strong. 13 And the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former; and at the end of the times, years, he shall come on persistently, with a great army and with much substance.

---

up with pride at this great victory. **Cast down tens of thousands**—According to Polybius (Book v, 86), the loss inflicted on the host of Antiochus consisted of ten thousand foot soldiers, three hundred of the cavalry, five elephants, and the capture of over four thousand prisoners. **But he shall not become strong**—Ptolemy did not profit by his victory, but hastily concluded a peace with Antiochus, and soon after retired into Egypt, and there gave himself over to the indolence and vices to which he was addicted.

13. **King of the north**—The same Antiochus the Great who suffered the defeat near Raphia. **Shall return**—Some thirteen years after the battle of Raphia. During this time Antiochus had strengthened himself by several successful wars in the north and east, and could now call to his aid **a multitude greater than the former**. As in the former case (verse 10), so again **he will come on persistently**, for at this time Ptolemy Philopator was dead, and his young son, only four or five years old, known as Ptolemy (V) Epiphanes, was acknowledged as his successor. This young prince was for a time under the guardianship of his father's profligate minister, Agathocles. **At the end of times, years**—A somewhat vague expression, but most obviously referring to the twelve or more years since Antiochus's former attempts to invade Egypt. **With much substance**—Obtained, no doubt,



14 And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south; and the builders of the breaches of thy people shall lift themselves up to establish vision: but

---

in his successful wars in Asia Minor and the East. Just in what the *substance* consisted we are not told, but probably treasures of gold and silver and implements of war. Comp. the word in verse 24.

14. **Many against the king of the south**—Philip III, of Macedon, joined Antiochus in this movement against the young Ptolemy Epiphanes; and there were also insurrections in upper Egypt, provoked by the corrupt administration of Agathocles. There was also a conspiracy among the friends of Agathocles to set him on the throne. **And the builders of the breaches of thy people will lift themselves up to establish vision**—This is the reading suggested by the Alexandrine version and secured by a very slight change in the Hebrew (read וּבְנֵי פְרִצֵי עִמּוּד). According to Josephus (*Ant.*, xii, 3, 3), the Jews of Jerusalem, having become enraged at Ptolemy Philopator for his persistence in entering the temple, hailed Antiochus with delight after his reconquest of Cœle-Syria and Samaria, received him into the city, plentifully supplied his army, and assisted him to besiege the garrison which the Egyptian general Scopas had left in the citadel of Jerusalem. In view of this coming of Antiochus and the great favors he thereupon bestowed on the Jews, we may readily suppose that those who longed to see the breaches of the Israelitish people restored and built would be lifted up in the hope that now, by the help of the Syrian king, they would see the fulfillment of visions

they shall fall. 15 So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take a well-fenced city: and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people,

---

and prophecies which pointed to the ultimate glorification of their holy city. The common reading, *children of the robbers* (or *violent ones*), is open to several weighty objections. (1) It is on its face a very singular expression to designate robbers or oppressors. (2) Those who allied themselves to Antiochus were in no sense robbers, or violent ones, in the sense that their conduct could be spoken of by a Jew with disapprobation. They sought the restoration of their rights, not anything ignoble. (3) The words *to establish vision* are unnaturally explained here of an actual fulfillment of prophecies by blameworthy methods. We are immediately told that **they shall fall**; that is, their hopes will be disappointed, and the fulfillment of vision will not be for many days.

15. **King of the north**—The same Antiochus the Great, whose subsequent fortunes are the main subject as far as verse 19. The exact chronological order of his various campaigns is not clear. **Cast up a mount**—Raised artificial earthworks in front of the besieged city in order to **take** it. The **well-fenced city** (literally, *city of fortifications*) is commonly believed to be Sidon, into which Scopas, Ptolemy's general, took refuge with some ten thousand men, and held out against Antiochus for some time, but was at last compelled by hunger to surrender. As a consequence the **arms of the south**, and the choice armies of three other Egyptian generals, were compelled to retire before the victorious king of the north.

neither shall there be any strength to withstand. 16 But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land, and in his hand shall be destruction. 17 And he shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and equitable conditions with him he will make, and give him the daughter of women

---

16. **He that cometh**—Antiochus the Great. **Against him**—Against the king of the south, Ptolemy Epiphanes. **Glorious land**—Palestine. See on chap. viii, 9. All this land was for a time under the control of Antiochus. **In his hand . . . destruction**—In his hand he held the power to destroy, as some of Ptolemy's forces bitterly realized, but he did not employ his force against the Jewish people, but rewarded them for the favors they showed him.

17. **Set his face to come**—Reference to the purpose of Antiochus to invade Egypt **with the strength of his whole kingdom**, that is, to concentrate his entire military force against Egypt. **And equitable conditions with him he will make**—For the word יְשֵׁרִים read מִיִּשְׁרִים, as in verse 6, and for וְעֵשָׂה read יַעֲשֶׂה. Reference to the treaty between Antiochus and Ptolemy, of which the betrothal next mentioned was one of the equitable considerations. **Daughter of women**—Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus, who was betrothed to the youthful Ptolemy, and married to him some five years later. She is probably called *daughter of women* because of her

to corrupt her; but she shall not stand, neither be for him. 18 After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince shall cause the reproach offered

---

attractiveness and beauty; equivalent to "choice among women," "beautiful of women." **To corrupt her**—Or, *to destroy it*. It is difficult to determine whether the suffix refers to Cleopatra or the kingdom of Ptolemy. The simplest construction is to make the *daughter* the main subject throughout this latter part of the verse. Then the thought is that Antiochus was willing to sacrifice his daughter to accomplish his ambitious designs; but in this he missed his mark, for **she will not stand, neither be for him**. She adhered to the fortunes of her husband and the interests of Egypt, and rendered her father no help in his heartless plans. Those who refer the suffix to the kingdom understand the plan of Antiochus as the subject of these latter verbs, and render, *it shall not avail*, and *it shall not be for him*, that is, not for his advantage.

18. **Unto the isles**—The word is used not only of islands, but also of lands bordering on the sea, coast lands. **Take many**—About B. C. 197 Antiochus the Great made an expedition against the islands and coasts of Asia Minor. He passed the winter at Ephesus, and in the following spring passed over to the coast of Greece and Macedonia, and provoked the Romans to interfere with his projects of conquest. **A prince**—יְצִי, *chieftain, leader*. The reference is to the Roman general Lucius Scipio, called also Asiaticus, on account of his brilliant victory over Antiochus at Magnesia, in Asia Minor. **The reproach offered by him**—Literally, *his reproach*

by him to cease ; yea, moreover, he shall cause his reproach to turn upon him. 19 Then he shall turn his face toward the fortresses of his own land : but he shall stumble and fall, and

---

*to him* ; that is, the reproachful answer of Antiochus to the Roman deputy who demanded why he appeared on the coasts of Europe with such a powerful force. Polybius (Book xvii, 31, 32) informs us that the king Antiochus answered the Romans contemptuously, and said that he desired them to abstain from meddling with the affairs of Asia, and that he himself was competent to manage his own business. This reproach Scipio *caused to cease* by utterly defeating Antiochus and imposing on him most humiliating conditions. **Yea, moreover**—A very doubtful rendering of *לֹא־בְּ*, which is always used with a negative meaning, as *without, except that*. The Greek versions vary here, and there is, perhaps, some corruption in the Hebrew text. Graetz suggests the emendation *בְּכֶסֶף*, *in the cheek*. **Cause his reproach to turn upon him**—By the successive defeats which Antiochus suffered from the Romans, and especially at Magnesia (B. C. 190), where his vast army of seventy thousand foot soldiers and twelve thousand cavalry were completely overthrown, and the king, having barely escaped, sued for peace, and was compelled to surrender all his possessions west of the Taurus.

19. **Toward the fortresses of his own land**—Instead of pursuing ambitious schemes of conquest in the West he now turns in humiliation to intrench himself in his own narrowed Syrian dominions. **Stumble . . . fall . . . not found**—The close of Antiochus's career is left in

shall not be found. 20 Then shall stand up in his place one that shall cause an exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom: but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.

much obscurity, but he is said to have fallen in an attempt to plunder the temple of Bel in Elymais.

20. **One causing an exactor to pass**—This refers to the son and successor of Antiochus the Great, known as Seleucus (IV) Philopator, who was compelled to exact large tribute of money to meet the obligations incurred by his father. The *exactor* was his treasurer, Heliodorus, who is said to have been sent to Jerusalem to seize upon the treasures of the temple. **The glory of the kingdom** has been commonly supposed to refer to Jerusalem, or Judea, but it is better to understand it, more generally, of the most beautiful and productive parts of the kingdom. But in verse 21 the kindred phrase, “honor of the kingdom,” means the royal dignity, and Bevan suggests that the words *exactor* and *causing to pass* (מעביר and נוֹגֵשׁ) be transposed, so as to read *an exactor causing the glory of the kingdom to pass away*. **Not in anger**—Not as did his father, who fell before the infuriated passion of those whose temple he sought to violate. **Nor in battle**—He is believed to have been poisoned by Heliodorus, who wished to usurp his throne.

The rest of this chapter is an apocalyptic portraiture of Antiochus Epiphanes, that “wicked root” (1 Macc. i, 10) of the Diadochi, of whom so much has already been said in chaps. vii and viii. The entire passage (verses 21-45) should be divided into four paragraphs. The first (21-24) gives a general description of the vile king,

21 And in his place shall stand up a contemptible person, to whom they had not given the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in time of security, and shall

---

(*a*) by characterizing him as “contemptible” (נִבְזָה), (*b*) as obtaining the kingdom dishonorably, (*c*) as sweeping his enemies away before him, (*d*) as practicing deceit, (*e*) as securing the friendship of the powerful by lavish distribution of spoils, and (*f*) as forming shrewd devices against the strongholds of the realm which did not surrender to him. Many interpreters understand these verses as referring to Antiochus’s first campaign against Egypt; but as there is no clear reference to Egypt before verse 25, and no clear indication throughout the entire description of an attempt to furnish exact chronological data of Antiochus’s various movements, it seems better to understand this first paragraph (21–24) in a more general way, not excluding, however, references to his earliest dealings with Egypt.

21. **Contemptible person**—Antiochus (IV) Epiphanes, identical with the “little horn” described in chaps. vii and viii. **To whom they gave not the honor of the kingdom**—The subject of the verb *gave* is indefinite, *men gave not*, or there was not given. The thought is that he was not the rightful heir of the kingdom, and came not into honorable possession of the throne. As shown in notes on chap. vii, 24, he pushed aside several others who had a better claim to the throne than he, among them Demetrius, the lawful successor of Seleucus Philopator. **In time of security**—When men were careless, and not expecting change. Comp. the use of the word in Jer. xxii, 21; Ezek. xvi, 49. So the word also carries

obtain the kingdom by flatteries. 22 And arms shall be utterly overwhelmed before him, and shall be broken, and also a covenant-prince. 23 And after the league made

---

with it the idea of *unawares, unexpectedly*. The **flatteries**, or dissimulation, by which he **obtained the kingdom** refer to the artful representations of his claims and plans, by which he induced Eumenes and Attalus, kings of Pergamus, to help him expel Heliodorus and recover the throne for his own family. The same arts of dissimulation, doubtless, served him further in adjusting things at Antioch after the overthrow of the usurper Heliodorus.

22. **Arms shall be utterly overwhelmed before him**—This reading is secured by the simple pointing of *השטה* as Niphal infinitive absolute. It avoids the strange metaphor of the common reading, *arms of the flood*, and seems every way preferable. Then the sense is that the forces arrayed against the king shall be utterly defeated and **broken**, and the *arms* are all the military opposition, whether of Heliodorus or of the Egyptian forces, which Antiochus had to encounter at the beginning of his career. **Covenant-prince**—Most naturally explained of the high priest Onias III, who was deposed and afterward put to death by order of Antiochus.

23. **After the league made with him**—Or, *from the time of the joining unto him*. Many understand here a special reference to the league of friendly relations with Egypt after the capture of Pelusium, but we prefer, as stated above, to understand a more general reference to all the cases of agreements made by Antiochus, whether with the kings of Pergamus, or Jews at Jerusalem, or



with him he shall work deceitfully; and he shall go up and become strong with a few people. 24 In time of security and with the fat ones of the province shall he come; and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them prey, and spoil, and

---

Egyptians, or any others who for any reason saw fit to *join themselves* unto him by a league of friendship. Not only from the time of making such leagues, but also by means of them (the preposition *וְ* may be used in either sense), the crafty Antiochus *worked deceitfully*, and made his alliances subserve the plans of his ambition. **He shall go up**—That is, on various military expeditions. To confine this to “his march up the Nile, as far as Memphis,” is to put upon the words a special meaning which the context does not warrant. **Strong with a few people**—His success was not so much by numbers as by shrewd policy.

24. **In time of security and with the fat ones of the province shall he come**—Not only will he take advantage of the *time of security* (comp. verse 21), but also with the help and fellowship of the influential and wealthy men of the province of Syria, who became his strongest chiefs and warriors, he will accomplish **that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers**. This sense of *משמנים* appears in Isa. x, 16, and Psalm lxxviii, 31, and is more suitable here than the idea of *richest portions of the province*, as most expositors hold; for it would be strange to call whole provinces like Palestine or Egypt portions or “places of a province.” **Scat-**

substance: yea, he shall devise his devices against the strongholds, even for a time.

25 And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a

---

**ter among them**—Among the fat ones of the province, especially such as may be a help to him in time of war. We are informed in 1 Macc. iii, 28, of the habit of Antiochus to open his treasures liberally to his soldiers, and give them a year's pay in advance in order to secure their ready cooperation when he should have need of them. **Devices against the strongholds**—As no particular strongholds are specified, the reference accords with the general character of the whole paragraph (21-24), and is to be understood of any and all strong, fortified places which held out against him.

25-28. In this paragraph we have an account of Antiochus's successful campaigns against Egypt, and the passage seems to summarize all his operations against "the king of the south" up to the time of the invasion mentioned in verses 29 and 30, when the Romans interfered. This view is more in keeping with the language of the writer than that which finds a first invasion of Egypt in verses 23, 24, a second in 25-28, and a third in 29-32. The text gives no sufficient warrant for such a particularizing exposition.

25. **Against the king of the south**—Ptolemy (VI) Philometor, with whom his younger brother (known as Physcon, also as Euergetes II) was also for a time associated in opposition to the attacks of Antiochus. Upon the death of Ptolemy Epiphanes, his wife Cleopatra held the regency for her two sons, Philometor and Euergetes. It was during this time that Antiochus Epiphanes enjoyed

great army; and the king of the south shall war in battle with an exceeding great and mighty army: but he shall not stand, for they shall devise devices against him. 26 And they that eat of his dainties shall break him down, and his army shall be overwhelmed,

---

his greatest triumphs in Egypt. He marched thither **with a great army** and encountered the Egyptian generals, who opposed him **with an exceeding great and mighty army**; but Ptolemy's generals were defeated near Pelusium, and that city and Memphis and most of lower Egypt fell into the hands of Antiochus, and the youthful king Philometor was taken prisoner. During his captivity his younger brother Physcon was declared king, and Antiochus, under the pretext of restoring Philometor to the throne, made war against Physcon in Alexandria, expelled him from his dominion, and reinstated Philometor. Verses 25-27 find their explanation in these facts. **He shall not stand**—The king of the south, Ptolemy Philometor, will not be able to resist the army of Antiochus. **Devise devices against him**—There was treachery in Ptolemy's camp, and the guileful Antiochus was skillful in making the most of such circumstances, and so soon succeeded in getting the person of the young king into his own power.

26. **They that eat his dainties**—The courtiers of Ptolemy, who, after the death of his mother, Cleopatra, took the charge of him and the affairs of his kingdom. **Shall break him down**—Such treachery in his own camp could scarcely fail to break him down, by nullifying the most heroic plans of self-defense. **His army shall**

and many shall fall down slain. 27 And as for both these kings, their hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table: but it shall not prosper; for yet the end shall be at the time appointed. 28 Then shall he return into his land with great substance; and his heart *shall be* against

---

**be overwhelmed**—The context seems to require this reading (פְּתוּחִים, as in verse 22, instead of יִשְׁטוּן); for Ptolemy's forces did not overwhelm, but were overwhelmed.

27. **Both these kings**—Antiochus and Ptolemy Philometor, then a prisoner. **Their hearts to mischief**—In the pretext of restoring the young Ptolemy to his kingdom Antiochus doubtless meditated ulterior plans of mischief; and at the same time Ptolemy was not too young to see that his crafty conqueror was disposed to make him a tool to further his selfish ambition, and he resolved in his own heart to retaliate when the opportunity came. **Lies at one table**—While feasting together in the camp and at the table of Antiochus they both concealed their hostile purposes against each other. **It shall not prosper**—Their duplicity will accomplish nothing permanent for either of them. **End at the appointed time**—The end of all these miserable wars has its appointed time in the counsels of God, and the end of the schemes and rule of both these kings is accordingly determined. So, too, the end of this campaign of Antiochus and his haughty domination of Egypt.

28. **Return with great substance**—That is, after his successful operations in Egypt. **His heart against**

the holy covenant ; and he shall do *his pleasure*, and return to his own land.

29 At the time appointed he shall return, and come into the south ; but it shall not be

---

**the holy covenant**—The covenant of holiness is here put by metonymy for the people of the covenant, the Jews. On his return from Egypt Antiochus heard that a rumor of his death had been reported in Jerusalem, and that the Jews were in rebellion against his dominion. He therefore went up against the Jewish capital, committed great outrages upon the people, desecrated the temple, and carried off with him a vast amount of treasures which he found there. See 1 Macc. i, 20–24. **Return to his own land**—This statement, twice employed in this verse, refers, in the first instance, to his departure from Egypt for his own land, and, in the second, to his departure from Jerusalem for the same destination. So he took Jerusalem on his way from Egypt to Syria.

29–39. In this paragraph we have (*a*) Antiochus's unsuccessful invasion of Egypt, (*b*) his profanation of the Jewish sanctuary, and the Maccabean struggles against him, and (*c*) a description of his desperate character as a lawless man of sin. Observe how each successive paragraph of this section (21–45) is adapted to deepen the impression of the wickedness and daring of the impious Antiochus.

29. **At the time appointed**—These words have the same meaning as in verse 27. The *appointed time* is a definite period seen in prophetic vision, or contemplated in prophecy, as a limit fixed in the purposes of God. The context must in each case determine the time-relation. **Return, and come into the south**—Or, *come again into the south*. After his departure from Egypt the two

in the latter time as it was in the former.  
 30 For ships of Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be dejected, and shall

---

Ptolemy brothers, Philometor and Physcon, united their fortunes to make common defense against the obvious designs of Antiochus, who had left a strong garrison in Pelusium. Hearing of this combination against him, he was filled with madness, and prepared for a new invasion of Egypt, sending a fleet at the same time to Cyprus to take possession of that island. He marched with his army directly against Alexandria, but Philometor had appealed to Rome for help, and Antiochus found, to his bitter chagrin, that he could not accomplish his plans, and it could not be **in the latter time as it was in the former.** These last words (for the idiom comp. Josh. xiv, 11; Ezek. xviii, 4) show that the writer contemplated all the previous assaults of Antiochus on Egypt as one former invasion.

30. **Ships of Kittim**—The Roman fleet under C. Popilius Lænas. The name *Kittim* or *Chittim* was used by Palestinean writers to denote all the islands and northern coast lands of the Mediterranean, from Cyprus on the east to Spain in the west. So it had much the same significance with Eastern people as the term Levant has in the west of these coasts. **He shall be dejected**—The word so rendered conveys the idea of turning pale and fainting. He suddenly became limp. It is said that Popilius met Antiochus as he was advancing upon Alexandria, and in the name of the Roman senate ordered him to make peace with Ptolemy and withdraw from Egypt. While Antiochus hesitated and said that he would consider the matter, the Roman deputy drew a circle about him in the sand and quietly admonished

return, and have indignation against the holy covenant, and shall do *his pleasure*: he shall even return, and have regard unto them that forsake the holy covenant.  
 31 And arms from him shall stand, and

---

him that he must make his answer before he stepped outside that circle. Having no alternative, the Syrian king submitted to the decree of Rome. **Return, and have indignation against the holy covenant**—This may be translated *he will again have indignation*, referring to his former operations mentioned in verse 28. But as the same expression is used again in this verse of his having *regard unto them that forsake the holy covenant* it is probably better to understand the first *return* of his departure back from Egypt, and the second of his return from Jerusalem to Antioch. It is not important to inquire whether Antiochus were personally present at all the violations of the sanctuary here referred to, or with the forces which first and last desolated the holy places. So long as all was done by his command he is properly spoken of as the responsible author of all the evils. Unable to accomplish his purpose in Egypt, he returned and vented his rage on the Jewish people, and the outrages referred to in this and the following verses appear to be identical with those described in 1 Macc. i, 29–64. **Them that forsake the holy covenant**—Apostate Jews, ready to accept such bribes as those indicated in 1 Macc. ii, 18, where it is recorded that the officers of Antiochus offered silver and gold and many rewards to the brave Matthias, who, however, proved incorruptible.

31. **Arms from him**—Armed forces sent forth by

profane the sanctuary, the fortress; and they shall take away the continual *burnt offering*, and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate. 32 And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he profane by flatteries: but the people that

---

him. This implies that the king himself was not with the army that *profaned the sanctuary*. This also is implied in the account of the profanation found in 1 Macc. i, 41-64. **The sanctuary, the fortress**—The latter word is in apposition with *sanctuary*, which the writer thought of as the great fortress of the holy city. The word may refer particularly to a fortress connected with the temple at that time, or, perhaps, to the temple as itself the spiritual fortress of Israel. Comp. Isa. xxv, 4; Psalm xxxi, 3. **Take away the continual**—See on chap. viii, 11. **Set up the abomination that maketh desolate**—The idol altar which was substituted for that of Jehovah, and the other like abominations mentioned 1 Macc. i, 54-59, whereby “the sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness” (1 Macc. i, 39). Comp. notes on chap. viii, 13, and ix, 27.

32. **Such as do wickedly against the covenant**—The same as “those that forsake the holy covenant,” in verse 30, but designating more especially those who went to the extent of sacrificing to idols, profaning the Sabbath, and defiling themselves with heathen practices, and so making themselves a most public spectacle of apostasy from the religion of Israel. **Shall he profane by flatteries**—That is, Antiochus will seduce to idolatry by deceitful promises, like those by which he obtained the



know their God shall be strong, and do *exploits*. 33 And they that be wise among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, *many* days. 34 Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall join themselves unto them with flatteries. 35 And some of them that be wise shall fall, to refine them, and to purify, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for the time

---

kingdom (verse 21). **People that know their God**—Like the Maccabean heroes, who showed such firmness as the brave Matthias and his sons and followers. See in 1 Macc. ii, 1–30. **Shall be strong, and do**—The heroic achievements of the Maccabees are among the most brilliant exploits in the history of the Jewish people.

33. **Wise among the people**—The wise leaders who were competent to **instruct** the people and to inspire them with holy enthusiasm for the Jewish cause. **They shall fall**—Many reverses befell the Maccabean heroes and their adherents, and not a few perished in the manner here specified.

34. **Little help . . . many with flatteries**—Occasionally the Maccabees received small reinforcements and obtained signal victories; but they were also joined by not a few dissemblers, as may be inferred from 1 Macc. vi, 21, 27.

35. **Wise shall fall**—The occasional fall of pious leaders and zealous priests (comp. 1 Macc. v, 67) served to test the rest, who survived such losses and defeats.

appointed. 36 And the king shall do according to his will ; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods : and he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished ; for that which is determined shall be done. 37 And toward the gods of his fathers he will not show regard,

---

36. **Magnify himself**—Comp. chap. vii, 24–26 ; viii, 9–12, and 23–25 ; 1 Macc. ii, 62, and also 2 Thess. ii, 3, 4, which evidently derives its phraseology from these passages in Daniel. Although the Greek and Latin historians speak of the piety of Antiochus Epiphanes and his large gifts to the temples, the Jewish writer sees him in a very different light. The different points of view are like those of Nebuchadnezzar in chap. ii, and Daniel in chap. vii. To one the world empires appear as so many kinds of metal ; to the other they are monstrous beasts. **Speak marvelous things**—Amazing for their daring insolence and presumption. **Till the indignation be accomplished**—The reference is to God's indignation against his people. Comp. chap. viii, 19. **What is determined shall be done**—That determined purpose has been already repeatedly referred to, as in chap. viii, 13–19 ; ix, 24, 26, 27. What God has decreed shall certainly come to pass.

37. **Toward the gods of his fathers he will not show regard**—The expression *עַל אֲבֹתָיו*, *show intelligent respect for*, has here the same significance as in verse 30. The manner in which he showed disrespect for his father's

nor to the desire of women, nor to any god will he show regard, for over all will he magnify himself. 38 But in his place shall he honor the god of fortresses, even a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things. 39 And he will do (his pleasure) to the citadels of fortresses with a strange

---

gods is probably to be gathered from what is said in the next verse. He introduced a new deity. **The desire of women**—The reference is either to some female goddess, as the “queen of heaven” (in Jer. vii, 18), or some deity beloved by women. Probably the Syrian Nanæa, or perhaps Tammuz. Comp. Ezek. viii, 14.

38. **In his place**—In the same meaning as in verses 20 and 21, not “on its pedestal,” as some explain. **God of fortresses**—Probably referring to the Roman deity Jupiter Capitolinus, with whose worship Antiochus became familiar at Rome, and for whom he purposed to erect a costly temple at Antioch. **Even a god whom his fathers knew not**—This seems to refer to the same *god of fortresses* just mentioned, but added for the purpose of fuller description. **Delightful things**—Such as multitudes delight in, as jewels and costly gifts of small size.

39. **And he will do (his pleasure) to the citadels of fortresses with a strange god**—This is an accurate rendering of the Hebrew text, but conveys no clear idea. There is probably a textual error, but no emendation yet proposed seems altogether satisfactory. Hitzig suggested the pointing of  $\text{דִּבְּ}$ , *people*, for  $\text{דִּבְּ}$ , *with*, so

god; whom he has known he will greatly honor, and make them rule over many, and will divide the land for a price.

---

as to read: "he will make (provide) for the citadels of fortresses (or strongest fortresses) the people of a strange god." He supposes a reference to Antiochus settling heathen colonists in the fenced cities of Judea. But this seems like an unnatural way to express such a thought.

**Whom he has known**—Recognized and acknowledged as a favorite. **He will greatly honor, and make them rule over many**—This was the well-known policy of Antiochus. He promoted to positions of honor and authority such as he found willing to cooperate with him in his ambitious schemes. **Divide the land for a price**—According to 1 Macc. iii, 36, Antiochus commissioned Lysias, one of his favorites, to place foreign people in Judah and Jerusalem and divide the land by lot among them.

40-45. This paragraph appears to give the last stage of Antiochus's career, and foretells his sudden fall (verse 45) much after the manner of chap. viii, 25. But as all history (except what is said in Porphyry's comments as quoted by Jerome) is silent touching any such war with the king of the south after the interference of the Romans, various theories have been proposed to explain this part of the prophecy. (1) Not a few eminent interpreters maintain that these verses are not a consecutive and additional account of Antiochus, but a general recapitulation of what has been said in verses 22-39. The great objection to this view is that this paragraph contains a number of new and notable statements not to be found in the preceding description. (2) Zockler is of opinion that this passage

is the original production of the prophet, while the details of the preceding verses 20-39 (or really 5-39) are the work of some pious Jew of the Maccabean period, who interpolated what he thought would make the entire prophecy more marvelous and telling. (3) Those who believe that the book in its present form was written during the lifetime of Antiochus, and before that king had fallen, suppose that the author depicts in these verses his own conception of what the end of Antiochus must be. So this paragraph is ideal and truly predictive, while the preceding details are descriptive of events which had already taken place. (4) Stuart argues strongly that the statements of Porphyry, as reported by Jerome, are as trustworthy as the fragments of Syrian history preserved to us in Greek and Latin writers like Polybius, Appian, Livy, and Justin. In view of the fact that these histories know nothing of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede, we certainly ought not to be governed by their silence on such a matter as that recorded in these verses of Daniel. Here, as in chaps. ii, vii, and viii, we must allow the prophet to explain himself, and interpret his language according to its most obvious import.

We incline to find the true solution of this final picture of the great persecutor in viewing it as the last phase of a fourfold apocalyptic disclosure. We do not look for chronological order in its parts so much as for artistic and symmetrical arrangement. The four paragraphs in verses 21-45 are (1) a general picture of the "contemptible one" (21-24); (2) his successful invasion of Egypt and its consequences (25-28); (3) his unsuccessful invasion of Egypt and its consequences (29-39); and (4) a glowing picture of his last desperate efforts of disappointed ambition, and his fall (40-45). Accordingly, the allusions to Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Egypt appear to be

40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push himself with him; and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass through. 41 He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many *countries* shall be overthrown: but these shall be delivered out of his hand, Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

---

modeled after the manner of Isa. xi, 14, 15, and should be understood symbolically, and not as literal and historical statements.

40. **Time of the end**—That apocalyptic consummation which is the goal of Daniel's visions. Comp. verses 27, 35, and viii, 17, 19. The last manifestation of this man of sin immediately precedes the Messianic triumph. See further on xii, 1. **Shall push himself with him**—That is, wage war with him. Comp. viii, 4. The language implies that the king of the south was this time the aggressor. It is not improbable that Ptolemy, encouraged by help once received from Rome, pushed himself forward into Syrian territory, and so provoked a war. But the absence of historical evidence forbids dogmatic assumptions on either side of such a question.

41. **Glorious land**—Palestine, as in verse 16 and viii, 9. **Edom, . . . Moab, . . . Ammon**—There are no facts on record which illustrate or help to explain these tribal allusions. They were ancient hereditary enemies of

42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. 43 But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. 44 But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: and

---

Israel, and as such (comp. Isa. xi, 14, and Psalm lxxxiii, 6, 7) may be named as escaping the power of Antiochus, and so surviving to add to the troubles of the end (xii, 1).

42. **Egypt shall not escape**—The overflowing advance and conquests mentioned in verse 40 shall affect Egypt, although the three small nations mentioned in verse 41 do escape.

43. **Treasures**—Compare the “substance” which he carried out of Egypt on his successful campaign thither mentioned in verse 28. **Libyans and Ethiopians**—We have no account of any such triumph of Antiochus in Egypt as this verse implies. The picture suggested is that of a triumphant invasion of the land, a capture of treasures of gold and silver, and an obedient following on the part of the *Libyans* on the coast and the *Ethiopians* on the upper Nile.

44. **Tidings east and north**—Rumors of revolt in the far north and east among the Parthians and Armenians. All accounts of Antiochus agree that he came to his end while pursuing conquests in these regions. A vivid description of his last days and death, probably much embellished by the writer, may be seen in 1 Macc. vi, and 2 Macc. ix.

he shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many. 45 And he shall plant the tents of his palace between seas at a mountain of beauty of holiness ;

---

45. **Tents of his palace**—His own palatial tent, surrounded by many other tents of his chief officers. **Between seas**—Notably indefinite expression, as are also the connected words **to** (*h*, *toward*, or *at*) **a mountain of beauty of holiness**. This is usually translated *between the sea and the glorious holy mountain*, and would thus most naturally suggest a position between the Mediterranean and the mountain of Jerusalem, where Antiochus had often encamped on his journeys to and from Egypt. Some have understood the *glorious holy mountain* to refer to some sacred mountain of Persia, near the city and temple which Antiochus sought in vain to plunder ; but after the application of these terms to the Jewish sanctuary and holy mountain, as in chaps. viii, 9 ; ix, 16, 20, and verses 16 and 41 of this chapter, it would be inexplicable for the same writer to use them when speaking of a heathen sanctuary. So, too, it would be unaccountable for a Jewish writer to use the word *seas* in such a connection if he meant to designate thereby the two great rivers Tigris and Euphrates, or the Caspian and Euxine Seas, or the Persian Gulf and the Caspian. It is therefore best to explain the word as a poetical plural referring to the Mediterranean as the vast sea ; or, if two seas are to be understood, the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea, between which the holy mountain of Jerusalem is situated.

While, therefore, Antiochus Epiphanes is obviously the daring and impious enemy of Israel depicted in verses



21-39, the last paragraph (40-45) does not accord with the facts of history, so far as known. His last encampment is here represented as in the holy land, and to say, with Stuart, that his last encampment was thus put opposite the holy city, and his death in the far east "for the purpose of *impression*" is to do violence to the text. It is clearly implied that he comes to his end in his camp.

But a comparison of the great apocalypses shows that they employ in common this concept of a last great war against the "glorious holy mountain." Ezekiel predicts it as a coming of the hosts of Gog out of the uttermost parts of the north, "Persia, Ethiopia, and Put (Septuagint reads Libyans) with them," and they all perish "upon the mountains of Israel" (Ezek. xxxviii and xxxix). So, too, in the Apocalypse of John, Satan stirs up the innumerable hosts of "Gog and Magog" to one last assault upon the mountain of the house of God, "and they went up over the breadth of the land, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them" (Rev. xx, 9). Comp. Joel iii, 9-16.

As with most of the Old Testament prophets there is a common concept of the coming Messiah, so with the apocalypstists there is to be a last great war of the enemies of Israel against the holy city. Verses 40-45 seem to be cast in the mold of that prevailing thought, and the writer, who associates Antiochus with "the time of the end," naturally connects with him his ideal of the last encampment against the holy mountain. The description is accordingly ideal, and colored by its association with the other exploits of the impious persecutor, who was typical of the great enemy of God and Israel.

If one were to regard any portion of the foregoing chapter as an interpolation into the original Book of

and he shall come to his end, and no one helping him.

XII, 1 And at that time shall Michael

---

Daniel, it would seem more rational, as suggested in the notes on chap. ix, 27, to omit all of chaps. x and xi, and connect this twelfth chapter with the close of the ninth. Then these four verses would form a fitting close to the prophecy of the seventy weeks, and state in brief the everlasting issues of that crisis of ages. But as it now stands this passage connects with the fall of the great enemy, as depicted in the last verses of chap. xi, and, taking no note of possible intervening periods of time, speaks directly of the final issue of all these troubles of the people of God.

1. **At that time**—The time of the end referred to in verses 35 and 40 of the preceding chapter. With this time chaps. vii, 26, and viii, 25, also connect the overthrow of the vile persecutor. Let the reader observe how Isaiah connects the glorious Messianic picture of Isa. iv, 2-6, with the fearful ruin of Judah and Jerusalem predicted in the previous chapter. Let him also notice in the same prophet how the magnificent prophecy of the coming of the Messiah out of the stock of Jesse in chap. xi is connected immediately with the overthrow of the Assyrian invader described in the last verses of chap. x. In such visions of the future no note is made of times that may intervene between the catastrophe and the final triumph, but the two opposite pictures are made to stand out so conspicuously in their main features that all else is for the time lost sight of. So here the apocalyptist sets over against each other the two momentous facts of his vision, the fall of the despicable enemy of his people and

stand up, the great prince who standeth over the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one who is found written in the book. 2 And many of them that sleep in the earth-dust shall awake, some to life eternal, and some to reproaches, to contempt

---

the triumph of God's saints in the day of eternal redemption. **Michael the great prince**—The same mentioned in chap. x, 13-21. Comp. what is said of the "prince of the host of Jehovah" in Josh. v, 13-15, and the angel of Exod. xxiii, 20-23. He is the guardian of God's Israel, **who stands** and presides **over the sons of thy people**. This we regard here, as in Rev. xii, 7, as an apocalyptic name and symbol of the Messiah. The name itself signifies "who is like God," and suggests the embodiment of God's power as seen in the uttermost redemption of his people. **Time of trouble**—The "great tribulation" implied in the wars and desolations of the seventieth week (ix, 26, 27), and also to be recognized in the language of Matt. xxiv, 21. **Found written in the book**—This idea of a heavenly registry of those who inherit eternal life appears frequently in the Scriptures. Comp. Exod. xxxii, 32; Psalm lvi, 8; lxix, 28; Isa. iv, 3; Luke x, 20; Phil. iv, 3; Rev. iii, 5; xiii, 8; xxi, 27.

2. **Many of them that sleep**—This does not say "all who sleep," but goes on to say that the *many* constitute two classes, one of which **shall awake unto life**

eternal, the other unto reproaches, unto contempt eternal. The whole verse emphasizes the diverse and eternal issues of the resurrection of that "time of the end." Its somewhat indefinite form of statement accords with the genuine apocalyptic style, which does not assume to clear up all mysteries, but aims rather to create profound impressions. The one great fact indicated is a resurrection of the two classes named.

The extremes of dogmatism to which this text has been pressed may justify some further words of comment. It has been claimed, on the one hand, that this verse teaches the doctrine of a universal resurrection; that is, of all the dead, both the just and the unjust. Rom. v, 15, 19, and John v, 28, 29, are often quoted as parallel Scriptures to show that *many* here is equivalent to *all*. But no writer who wished to be understood would say "many of the sleeping ones" if he meant "all of the sleepers," or "many from the army" if he meant the whole army. The expression *the many* in Rom. v, 15, is qualified by the article, and is in the midst of a hypothetical argument so as not to be parallel with Daniel's use of the word *many* in this verse. Whatever other Scriptures may affirm concerning a universal simultaneous resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked, this text does not make that statement, and we are not at liberty to assume that because Jesus says "all that are in their graves shall come forth," and Daniel says "many of those that sleep in the dust shall awake," therefore *many* means *all*.

Another class of interpreters affirm, on the other hand, that the resurrection of the wicked is not to be found here at all. Observing that Daniel's words, legitimately explained, imply a partial resurrection, they adduce Rev. xx, 4, 5, as a parallel, and maintain the doctrine of two

resurrections separated by a thousand years. They suppose that those who, in Daniel, are “unto eternal contempt” are the same as those whom John designates as “the rest of the dead,” who “lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” This exegesis deserves, if possible, greater condemnation than that which makes our text a strict parallel with John v, 28, 29, and Rom. v, 19. As well might one claim that when, in 2 Sam. ii, 13, it is said that the servants of Ishbosheth and those of David went out to meet at the pool of Gibeon, “and they sat down, these on this side of the pool, and those on that side of the pool,” the first “these” refers to those who went forth, and the second to those who remained behind! When a writer says, “Many of the dwellers of Jerusalem went forth out of the city, these to life and those to death,” he adopts a most extraordinary way of informing us that only those who went forth lived, and those who remained in the city died.

Daniel’s language naturally conveys the idea that “at the time of the end” many from among those sleeping in the dust will awake; these “many” will represent two classes, one destined to eternal life, the other to eternal shame. That these two classes will be raised simultaneously is not explicitly stated, and need not be assumed; nor is it necessary to insist that we have in Daniel the identical teaching of either John v, 28, or Rev. xx, 4, 5. What all “Michael the great prince” may do for his people, or for any selected portion of them, at any time, is a matter of “times and seasons which the father has set in his own authority” (Acts i, 7). On such questions of biblical theology we should recognize the different conceptions and diverse statements of the different writers, and guard ourselves from presumptuous dogmatic assertions.

eternal. 3 And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever. 4 But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run

---

3. **They that be wise**—Like those mentioned in chap. xi, 33, who not only possess wisdom, but impart it unto others. **Turn many to righteousness**—Comp. the work of the righteous servant, Isa. liii, 11. The wise teachers in God's Israel, who by their efficient labor of love turn multitudes from sin and error unto righteousness, share in the glory of their Lord. The comparison of the **brightness of the firmament** and the **stars** is a most appropriate and beautiful turning of one's thoughts to the glory of the heavenly life. And thus the revelation ends with the glimpse of the "immortality and eternal life" which the ever-living God provides for his people.

4. **Shut up the words, seal the book**—This command most naturally refers to the entire book of Daniel's revelations, whether communicated by dream, by vision, or by the word of the angel. It is like chap. viii, 26, and Isa. viii, 16, a solemn charge to preserve the written revelation in security. Daniel wrote his dreams (vii, 1), but he did not, even after the explanations of the angel, fully comprehend them (vii, 28 ; viii, 27). None could clearly understand all their import at that time. They were, accordingly, to be kept in most careful security **unto the time of the end**, when God's own providence would make all plain.

**Many shall run to and fro**—This has been ex-

to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

---

plained by many as a “diligent running to and fro in pursuit of knowledge with reference to the meaning of this book ;” that is, many will search it through and through. Some understand it of a wandering about in perplexity, and unable to find the true meaning of the book. But such a metaphorical meaning of the word has no sufficient warrant elsewhere. It is better to take the word in its ordinary meaning, and connect it closely with what follows, where one result of such running about is told. **Knowledge shall be increased**—This would follow as the result of men’s running to and fro in the world. Intercourse, travel, and commerce ever tend to increase human knowledge. The Alexandrine version here suggests another reading (הרעת instead of הדעת), according to which we have: *and the evils shall multiply*. This emendation has some support in 1 Macc. i, 9, and furnishes a very suitable conclusion to this part of the prophecy.

The rest of this chapter (verses 5–13) forms the conclusion of the Book of Daniel, and records a sublime vision of angels and a number of notable statements touching the time of the end. To these mystic time designations we devote the brief excursus which follows.

## SYMBOLICAL NUMBERS IN DANIEL.

THE designations of time in the Book of Daniel are notable for their variety and indefiniteness. Besides the mystery of the seventy heptades (ix, 24-27), we have the twice written "time, times, and dividing of a time" (vii, 25; xii, 7), the two thousand three hundred "evening-mornings" (viii, 14), the one thousand two hundred and ninety days (xii, 11), and the one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days (xii, 12). There is also the expression "many days" in viii, 26, "the end of years" (xi, 6), and "the end of times, years" (xi, 13). No attempt that has ever been made to explain these numbers literally, or to fit them with mathematical accuracy to known periods of history, has been able to command a general and continuous following.

The phrase "time, times, and dividing of a time" has been very naturally believed to designate so many years, and the statement of Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, Book I, i, 1) that Antiochus "spoiled the temple, and put a stop to the daily offerings for three years and six months" goes far to confirm this belief. Moreover, three and a half years, reduced to days by reckoning twelve months of thirty days each, are twelve hundred and sixty days ( $360 \times 3\frac{1}{2} = 1260$ ). Comp. Rev. xi, 3; xii, 6, 14, which is obviously modeled after Daniel. Comparing this number with the one thousand two hundred and ninety, and one thousand three hundred and thirty-five of chap. xii, 11, 12, and the implied one thousand one hundred and fifty of viii, 14, we observe an approximation



of numbers which seems designed to suggest at once both similarity and difference. The highest number (one thousand three hundred and thirty-five) is seventy-five days more, and the lowest (one thousand one hundred and fifty) is one hundred and ten days less than three years and a half, reckoned in round numbers as above.

In verse 7 of chapter xi we have the solemn oath of the angel that "the end of these wonders" will be "a time (מועד), times, and a half." In vii, 25, the times (זמנין) and laws are given into the hand of the persecutor for "a time (עֵדָה), times, and dividing of a time." Here are three different words for *time*, but there appears no important difference of meaning between them. The period is most satisfactorily explained as identical with the one thousand two hundred and ninety days of xii, 11, during which the daily offering was taken away and heathen abominations substituted by order of Antiochus Epiphanes. A comparison of this statement with those of viii, 11, and xi, 31, leaves no room to doubt that this is the meaning as understood by the author of this book. How notably this agrees with the statement of Josephus, quoted above, must be apparent to all who study this question.

But how to explain the one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days of chap. xii, 12, is not so apparent. The most plausible explanation, perhaps, is the supposition that the one thousand two hundred and ninety days were the exact period during which the profanation of the temple continued, and the one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days extend the period on to the death of Antiochus, which may have happened (?) forty-five days after the sanctuary had been cleansed, and the daily offerings restored. But this attempt to make the prophecy an exact numerical designation of the times must needs be

unsatisfactory for at least two reasons. (1) The absence of sufficient historical data in the life of Antiochus. The precise dates of the defilement and cleansing of the sanctuary are not certainly known, and we have no trustworthy record of the date of Antiochus's death. The literalist interpreters are obliged to confess this, and to base their exposition confessedly on probabilities. Furthermore, it is very questionable whether the *blessedness* pronounced in xii, 12, is properly explained as arising from the fact of the death of Antiochus. (2) Such precise designations of time, understood literally, are not in harmony with apocalyptic prediction. The visional rapture, and the symbolical foreshadowing of great events, do not comport with definite literalism of numbers. Approximate designations may be recognized, as in the seventy years of Jeremiah (xxv, 11), or the sixty-five of Isaiah (vii, 8). But even there a variation of several years would not invalidate the prophecy, for no one can tell with convincing assurance just when those seventy years began and ended. The fact is that between the destruction of city and temple by Nebuchadnezzar, and the decree of Cyrus to return and build again, there elapsed but little more than fifty years. But dates, more or less plausible, may be found by which the period of Babylonian exile may be made to be sixty, seventy, eighty, or even a hundred years. The seventy heptades of Dan. ix, 24-27, cannot be made to fit any dates which furnish exact numerical fulfillment of the several statements.

In view of the endless confusion and difficulties which beset all attempts at a literal exposition of these numbers, we prefer that principle of exegesis which treats all prophetic designations of time as essentially symbolical. The numbers four, seven, and ten are quite generally

allowed to admit of such symbolical meaning, and prophetic usage conforms to this principle. The mystic period of three and one half (time, times, and dividing of time) is best explained as a broken seven, and always represents a period of calamity and distress. Comp. vii, 25; xii, 7, and Rev. xii, 14. It may be approximately three and a half years, but its significance is to be recognized in its being a broken seven rather than in any exact number of days or years intended. And as in Rev. xi, 3; xii, 6, and xii, 14, the phrase is obviously equivalent in meaning to one thousand two hundred and sixty days, we incline to the belief that the number of days given in Dan. xii, 11, 12, and viii, 14, is also designed as a like equivalent. The differences may, perhaps, have related to facts no longer known to us, but the very puzzling differences, one thousand one hundred and fifty, one thousand two hundred and ninety, and one thousand three hundred and thirty-five, may have been designed to suggest that the "time, times, and dividing of a time" could not be reckoned with mathematical accuracy. So Jesus gave his disciples most positive assurance that Jerusalem's desolation would occur in their generation, but that the day and the hour were hidden in the counsels of the Father (Matt. xxiv, 34-36). The approximate time they might infer, but the specific periods they were not permitted to know, because they were matters of mystery "which the Father set in his own authority" (Acts i, 7).

The perplexing uncertainty involved in such diverse designations Daniel himself confesses in viii, 27, and xii, 8, but the additional numbers given in xii, 11, 12, were not adapted to furnish any clearer understanding of the time. Verse 12 at most implied that some special blessedness was in store for those who survived the period of

calamity denoted in verse 11. It was all summed up in the concluding verse of the book: *And do thou go to the end, and thou shalt rest and shalt stand up for thy lot at the end of the days.* The *end* is to be understood, as elsewhere in this book, of that Messianic goal and consummation when God's people were to be vindicated and receive the kingdom. The words *rest* and *stand up* may refer to the *sleep* and the *resurrection* of those in verses 2 and 3 who shall "shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars forever and ever." But all is indefinite. The prophet is simply assured that he will rest and obtain his own proper portion at the last. Just when that *end* should come is not revealed, but those who passed on beyond that limit, even though it be but as the space of forty-five days (1335—1290=45), should attain the blessedness of a glorious resurrection. Comp. the similar hope and suggestions of Rev. xx, 6. This closing assurance implies that Daniel might not expect to know, from the numbers given in verses 11 and 12, those mystic times and seasons which the Most High alone can clearly comprehend, but he might be comforted with the thought that they were all determined by the Holy One of Israel, who would, in his own time, deliver every one of his people who are found written in the book (xii, 1).

# I N D E X .

---

- Abomination of desolation, 62, 63.  
Agathocles, 98, 99.  
Alexander the Great, 57, 66, 90, 98.  
Alexandrian Version, 10, 69.  
Angels, doctrine of, 37, 88, 89.  
Antiochus I, Soter, 92.  
Antiochus II, Theos, 92.  
Antiochus III, the Great, 96-103.  
Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, 48-51, 59, 68-70, 104-123, 130, 132.  
Apocalyptic machinery, 62, 64, 65.  
Artaxerxes, decree of, 79.
- Babylonian empire, 18, 20.  
Bel and the Dragon, 10.  
Belshazzar, 19, 27, 28.  
Berenice, 92, 93.
- Cassander, 67.  
Chittim, 112.  
Cleopatra, 101, 102, 106.  
Cyrus, 34, 56, 78, 79.
- Daniel, common Hebrew name, 9.  
Long life of, 12.  
Literary problems of the Book, 9.  
Greek versions of, 10.  
Haggadic additions, 10.
- Original text lost, 10.  
Influence on later apocalypses, 12.
- Darius Codomannus, 66, 89, 90.  
Darius Hystaspis, 56.  
Darius the Mede, 18, 19, 21.  
Demetrius, 50.  
Diadochi, 23, 45, 58, 67.
- End, the, 87, 120, 123, 124, 134.  
Evening—morning, 63, 64.
- Fourth kingdom, Greece, 43.  
not Rome, 26.
- Gabriel, 72.  
Greece, the fourth kingdom, 22, 34, 44, 66.
- Heliodorus, 50, 104, 106.  
Heptades, 76, 80, 86.  
Horn, the little, 44, 47-51, 59.  
Host, 59, 61, 65.  
Prince of, 60.
- Judgment, symbols of, 36, 52.  
Jupiter Capitolinus, 117.
- Kingdom of Christ consistent with existing evil, 39, 52, 53.  
Kittim (Chittim), 112.

- Lænas, C. Popilius, 112.  
 Lysias, 118.  
 Lysimachus, 67.  
 Lucius Scipio, 102, 103.  
 Maccabees, 115.  
 Median regency at Babylon, 19-21, 31, 32.  
 Medes and Persians, 19, 20, 56, 65.  
 Medo-Persian empire, 19, 20, 33.  
 Messianic prophecy in Daniel, 40, 80-84, 124, 125, 134.  
 Michael, 88, 89, 125.  
 Nebuchadnezzar, 18.  
 Numbers, symbolical, 74, 77, 130-134.  
 Onias III, 106.  
 Originality of Daniel's prophecies, 11.  
 Parsee tradition of four trees, 16.  
 Persia, kings of, 22, 89, 90.  
 Persian empire, 19, 20, 33, 34.  
 Pseudepigraphal apocalypses, 12, 13.  
 Ptolemy I, Soter, 91.  
 Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, 92.  
 Ptolemy III, Euergetes, 94, 95.  
 Ptolemy IV, Philopator, 96-99.  
 Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, 98, 99, 101.  
 Ptolemy VI, Philometor, 50, 108, 110, 112.  
 Ptolemy Physcon, 108, 112.  
 Repetition in apocalypses, 13.  
 Resurrection, 125-127.  
 Roman empire, not fourth kingdom, 26.  
 Romans, 83, 85, 112.  
 Saints reigning, 42.  
 Sanctuary desecrated, 60, 83, 85, 111, 113, 114.  
 Scipio Asiaticus, 102, 103.  
 Seleucidæ, 92.  
 Seleucus I, Nicator, 67, 91.  
 Seleucus II, Callinicus, 93, 95.  
 Seleucus III, Ceraunus, 96.  
 Seleucus IV, Philopator, 50, 104.  
 Seventy weeks, prophecy of, 71-87.  
 Shushan, 54, 55.  
 Son of Man in clouds, 39, 40.  
 Susanna, Book of, 10.  
 Symbolical numbers, 74, 77, 130-134.  
 Symbolism, details of, 25.  
 Temple desecrated, 60, 111, 113, 114.  
 Ten kings, the, 44-47.  
 Theodotion's version of Daniel, 10.  
 Transgression of desolation, 62, 63.  
 Wings as symbols, 30.  
 Zöckler rejects Dan. xi, 5-39, 11.