

**S.J. Poot**

**s3548414**

**Dr. Steve Mason**

**Master thesis for MA *Religion, Conflict and Globalisation***

**Rijksuniversiteit Groningen – Faculty Theology & Religious Studies**

---

**Title:** *'The Prophecies of the Book of Daniel and their Use in Judaeen and Christian Responses to the Destruction of the Temple in AD 70.'*

**Summary:** As long as humanity has existed, it has been flirting with the notion of the end of the world. Both the Jewish and Christian scriptures include apocalyptic texts, which have been interpreted differently in various time periods. The Book of Daniel is one of them and it has been used for predictions since it was finished in the second century BC until the present-day. This thesis investigates how the prophecies of the Book of Daniel were originally meant, but especially how they were applied in Judaeen and Christian responses to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70. The Judaeen side consists of 1 Maccabees, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and *The Antiquities* by Flavius Josephus. The Christian perspective will be shown through the Gospels, Revelation, and some of the Early Church Fathers, such as Irenaeus of Lyon, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Justus Africanus, and Eusebius.

**Keywords:** Book of Daniel, Judaeen, Christian, destruction, Jewish, Temple, AD 70, abomination of desolation, Flavius Josephus, Maccabean, Hippolytus, Early Church Fathers, prophecy, Son of Man, Kingdom of Heaven, Kingdom of God, Reign of God

## Index

Introduction.....	3
Method.....	4
Lay-out of the thesis.....	5
Chapter 1 The Book of Daniel and how it has been used .....	7
Authorship.....	9
Composition - The Identity of the Author .....	9
The Structure of the Book .....	9
Daniel 9.....	11
Chapter 2 – Judaeen responses.....	16
1 Maccabees.....	16
4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.....	18
Antiquities of Flavius Josephus.....	20
Conclusion .....	23
Chapter 3 – Christian responses.....	25
New Testament .....	25
Gospels .....	26
Revelation.....	29
Early Church Fathers.....	31
Irenaeus of Lyon (writing ca. AD 180) .....	33
Clement of Alexandria (writing ca. AD 200) .....	34
Tertullian (writing ca. AD 203).....	34
Hippolytus (writing ca. AD 202-230) .....	35
Julius Africanus (writing after AD 232).....	35
Eusebius (writing ca. 314-318 AD).....	36
Conclusion .....	37
Chapter 4 – Conclusion.....	39
Appendix A – Daniel in context: Prophecy and the divine in the ancient Near East.....	41
Bibliography.....	43

## Introduction

As long as humanity has existed, it has been flirting with the notion of the ‘end of the world’ (Newman 2010). The archetypal story of the flood in Mesopotamia from around 4,000 BC has been known and shared for thousands of years. Through the cyclical patterns people perceived in nature, an equally horrific, future event was expected or at least among the opportunities (Newman 2-3). Throughout the ages the perception of the gods and nature varied, but the stories and ideas of such an end remain even until the present day.

In the past two decades my attention has been drawn to the end-time views or eschatology of Judaism and Christianity. For me as a teenager, the notions of global battlefields, God showing up and fighting for His people, immense armies of angels and demons clashing, and ultimately victory, had an enormous attraction. However, over the years the different opinions concerning the ‘end of ages,’ brought me to an extensive search of what these books were actually speaking of. The biblical Book of Daniel and Revelation were written millennia ago for contexts and cultures very different from that in which I live. Modern authors advocating positions about the world’s end, mostly from a Christian perspective, framed history in a way that would support their view and their interpretation of these canonical texts. The more research I did, the more the question arose how the people in the period when these books were written were reading them. During my research, the destruction of the Jewish<sup>1</sup> Temple in AD 70 was a recurring and important theme in both Jewish and Christian sources, which both used the prophecies of the Book of Daniel to help them understand it.<sup>2</sup> However, during different periods Daniel’s prophecies were interpreted and applied differently. To limit the scope of this thesis, the period to be analysed extends from the completion of the Book of Daniel, via the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70 to a date often taken as the ‘end of Early Christianity’: the First Council of Nicaea in AD 325. During these five centuries or so, life changed significantly for Judaeans, mostly because of the destruction and the birth of Christianity. Whereas Christianity, starting in part as a ‘sect’<sup>3</sup> in an obscure part of the vast Roman Empire established itself as a widespread religion,<sup>4</sup> the Judaeans religion and/or culture<sup>5</sup> bloomed under the Hasmonean/Herodian rule but was significantly changed by the destruction of their religious centre, the Second Temple, in AD 70, an event that paved the way for rabbinic Judaism until the present day (Mason, *Jewish War* 4).<sup>6</sup>

Both Jews and Christ-followers tried to understand that changing world by interpreting their

---

<sup>1</sup> This thesis will use the term ‘Judaeans’ instead of the term ‘Jewish’, because in the period this thesis discusses there is no distinction or even name for the phenomenon we now call ‘religion’ for one was characterized by his ἔθνος – a group of people or a nation. Therefore the term ‘Judaeans’ will be used for descriptions during that period and ‘Jewish’ will be used to refer to a religious concept which is not connected to place or time (for example, the Jewish people over the centuries, or the (longing for a) Jewish Temple). See: Boyarin (Chapter 10), Cohen (105–106), and Mason (*J, J & C Origins* 141- 184).

<sup>2</sup> Despite the destruction being an important part of the research question, this thesis focuses on the application of the prophecies instead of the event itself. For more information about this event, see: Mason’s *History of the Jewish War* and of course Josephus’s *Antiquities* and *Jewish War*.

<sup>3</sup> As e.g. the theologian N.T. Wright (30) says in *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, ‘very early Christianity should itself properly be seen as a sub-branch of first-century Judaism.’

<sup>4</sup> After the Edict of Milan in AD 313 the persecution of Christians stopped and during the Edict of Thessalonica in AD 380, Christianity officially became the state religion of the Roman Empire.

<sup>5</sup> As Mason (*J, J&CO* 159) states: ‘The concept of religion, which is fundamental to our outlook and our historical research, lacked a taxonomical counterpart in antiquity.’ Despite the fact that this category is needed and used in this thesis, it is important to be aware of its absence from antiquity. For more information concerning this subject, see: Mason (*J, J&CO* 159-184).

<sup>6</sup> Cohn (2012) writes extensively on this subject concerning the rabbis and the Temple.

holy scriptures. In their search they created a narrative of a god who is in control and who will do justice to his people.

## Method

This thesis is a historical study. However, the term 'historical' is rather broad. This section is no place for a history of history and I do not possess the background that would be needed to produce it. Nonetheless, the question of which historical method I use for this thesis is important. As Wilhelm Windelband in his rectorial address in Strasbourg in 1894 said: 'the ultimate aim of history is always to extract and reconstruct from the raw material of history the true shape of the past in robust and vital clarity' (179). To pursue this, two major streams have developed, representing the rather rough division of 'knowledge of laws' and the 'knowledge of events' (180). The first approach has traditionally been taken by the Social Sciences, and Windelband labels it 'nomothetic' and others 'positivist' with reference to the work of Auguste Comte, whereas the second approach represents the point of view native to the Humanities.<sup>7</sup> Windelband calls this approach 'idiographic' and it is basically the 'historicist' approach associated with Leopold van Ranke and J.G. Droysen (see Mason, *Orientation* 19-56).<sup>8</sup> The nomothetic approach focuses on the production of general or predictive laws from history, whereas the idiographic approach focuses on the individual or the event, without assuming that it reflects typical behaviour. Although much has changed since Windelband's address, history still hosts the distinct streams of social-scientific, aggregative, or statistical research, in which individual experience is not the focus, and the study of specific actions, texts, and individuals in their contexts. In the latter kind of history, a primary task is the interpretation of texts (and other material) that has survived from the past. Since we must get to know these texts and allow them to challenge our preconceptions, interpretation is a largely inductive method, rather than one that works from a theory or model. The research of this thesis primarily consists of the investigation of the particular. *Historicizing*, or 'looking down from models and typical patterns, irrespective of personal names or specific cases, to the spatially and temporally particular,' will provide the framework to answer the research question (Mason, *Orientation* 41). This question can only be answered with careful attention to what individuals wrote, did, and thought in the ancient world.

It is inherent in the investigation and interpretation of the particular, that 'a text cannot be made to speak to us until what it says has been understood' (E.D. Hirsch, "Objective" 463). In the search of what role the prophecies of Daniel played, we first have to search for the authorial meaning of the book. It is only then the later interpretations of both Judaeans and Christians can be addressed. Thus, as E.D. Hirsch said in *Validity in Interpretation*,<sup>9</sup> it is important 'to decide which author is the one being interpreted when we confront texts that have been spoken and respoken. All valid interpretation of every sort is founded on the recognition of what an author meant' (126). The aim of this thesis is not to find what this text could mean in present-day, but to find the meaning of the author himself and the later interpretations given by other authors. Hirsch states that the textual meaning does not change in the course of time, but its relevance does (Hirsch 255; idem, "Objective" 463-464). He differentiates between *meaning* (Sinn) and *relevance*<sup>10</sup> (Bedeutung).<sup>11</sup> In this theory the authorial meaning is the *meaning* and the later interpretation is called the *relevance*. During this

---

<sup>7</sup> Mason (*Orientation* 19-56) and Windelband (169-185) provide an overview concerning both streams and the history of the natural sciences.

<sup>8</sup> The first view is represented, Mason proposes in *Orientation*, by scholars such as Henry T. Buckle, E.H. Carr, Auguste Comte, and Herbert Spencer, whereas the second view is often represented by Thomas Carlyle, R.G. Collingwood, Benedetto Croce, Johann Gustav Droysen, Michael Oakeshott, and Leopold von Ranke.

<sup>9</sup> This book was a strong reaction to the book *Truth and Method* by Hans-Georg Gadamer, which built on the 'phenomenological hermeneutics' discussed by Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*.

<sup>10</sup> Some translations of the work say 'significance' instead of 'relevance' (see Longxi 141).

<sup>11</sup> This is not an idea from Hirsch, but from Gottlob Frege in 'Über Sinn und Bedeutung' (1892).

research we will analyse the different attempts by Judaeans and Christians to make the Book of Daniel 'relevant' to new times by interpreting the *meaning* and creating a new meaning; the *relevance* of the writer. Therefore, if one wants to understand 'how the changed tradition has altered the relevance of a text, [one] must understand its meaning' (Hirsch, "Objective" 466). Thus, we will search for Daniel's *meaning* after which we will take a look at its *relevance* in the given period.

Any study of Daniel's impact in antiquity must recognise that ancient readers understood the book as a set of prophecies and stories from the sixth century BC, whereas modern scholars all conclude that it was completed in the mid-second century BC. Modern research has explored various relevant questions about, for example: Daniel's use in Jewish reactions to the destruction (e.g. Mason, Stone, Ulrich, Jones), in Christian responses (e.g. Graham, Oegema, Tanner, Vetne), its standing and impact in general (e.g. Beckwith, Froom, Van Kooten), or the long development of the Book of Daniel itself before its completion (see the numerous commentaries). There are also historical, theological, and sociological applications of Daniel (e.g. Ferch, Froom, Koch).<sup>12</sup> For this thesis I have tried to take account of all perspectives that bear on my question, because the research question this thesis seeks to answer, is: 'What role did the prophecies in the Book of Daniel play in Judaeans and Christian responses to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70?'

### Lay-out of the thesis

To answer this question, each chapter takes up a different part. The first chapter discusses the date, authorship, composition, and structure of the Book of Daniel. It is recognised as one of the hardest books of the Old Testament to understand (e.g. Baldwin 163, Driver 143, Leupold 403, Miller 1994:252, Montgomery 400, Steinmann 451, Young 191). Especially Daniel chapters 7-11, containing the main predictions, have been considered a 'swamp' (Ulrich 2). Nonetheless, Daniel has been used to explain or predict many events in human history, including Antiochus IV, Nero, the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, and the rise of the Roman Empire. Still today there are popular theories about its predicting the 'end of time' in relation to the Roman Catholic Church, Adolf Hitler, Barack Obama, and now Donald Trump (McGinn 18-20, 44). It is of crucial importance to this thesis to lay a firm foundation in this first chapter concerning the *meaning*, on which the rest of the analysis, concerning the use and application of the Book of Daniel (its *relevance*), can build. While we are establishing this foundation, one part of Daniel will be examined most carefully, namely Daniel 9:24-27, for this passage would become one of the most frequently cited in later use.

The second chapter discusses the Judaeans perspective and answers the question: 'How did Judaeans use the prophecies of the Book of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?' The research here focuses on several texts that significantly use the Book of Daniel or argue with it. The first is 1 Maccabees, which was written in the late second or early first century BC and, according to the prevailing Maccabean thesis for Daniel's date (see Chapter 1) a few decades after Daniel's completion. In this book parts of Daniel are quoted but also adjusted. What makes 1 Maccabees especially interesting is that it was written two centuries before the fall of the Jewish Temple. Therefore it will be used to make a comparison to books from after the destruction, namely: some of the latest apocalypses from the first age of Jewish apocalypses (third cent. BC – first cent. AD): 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. 'Both emerge from the struggle of their authors to incorporate the destruction into their religious understanding of the world' (Stone and Henze 1). The comparison focuses especially on 4 Ezra 12, which uses the Book of Daniel but 'updates' the meaning of the 'prophecies' (Fraade 374).

A final Judaeans source is *The Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus, in which he describes the history of the Judaeans people up until the Jewish War (or First Jewish-Roman War). We use Josephus not as

---

<sup>12</sup> The scholars named in this enumeration are all mentioned in the bibliography.

the 'peerless authority for first-century Judea' (Mason, *J, J & CO* 7), but to obtain an important context in which we can view the other texts. Josephus quotes passages of the Book of Daniel, and his quotations provide a valuable image of how some Judaeans were using this scripture in the aftermath of the destruction.

The third chapter answers the question 'How did the Christians use the prophecies of the Book of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?' Throughout the New Testament, passages from Daniel are often quoted or referred to. The letters traditionally connected with Paul quote or mention Daniel on several occasions (e.g. 2 Thes. 2:4 – Dan. 11:36, Gal. 4:4 – Dan. 9:25, or 2 Tim. 4:17 – Dan. 6:22), and other epistles do the same (Hebr. 11:33-34– Dan. 3:23-27, 6:1-27), but the references appear mostly in the Gospels and Revelation (Hardy 2010). It is also important to consider some of the Early Church Fathers, to complement the picture of the usage of the Book of Daniel. To create a complete picture, opinions from various schools of Early Christianity are discussed. One of the first is Irenaeus of Lyon talking about the 'antichrist' in his book *Adversus Haereses* (Haer. V:25:1-30:4), referring to Daniel 2 and 7-9 (Oegema 2-3, Tanner 185-186). Other significant views include those of Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian. Most importantly, the first known Christian Bible commentary is the *Commentarium in Danielem* of Hippolytus, which provides a thorough analysis of the Book of Daniel.

In Appendix A some background information is given concerning the role of prophets and prophecies in the ancient Near East, which was not needed for the general argument but helps to contextualise the other material in this thesis.

In conclusion, all these texts combined will give at least representative entrées into the ways the Book of Daniel was used by Christians and Judaeans to answer the research question 'What role did the prophecies in the Book of Daniel play in Judaeans and Christian responses to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70?'

## Chapter 1 The Book of Daniel and how it has been used

There was a scholarly consensus concerning the Book of Daniel until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, after which the way scholars viewed the book changed completely. This change was the result of the shift from the traditional, devotional approach towards the historical-critical method. In much of the twentieth century there was not a lot of scholarly interest, and if there was, Daniel was viewed rather negatively, as strange or even deceiving. Whereas Hanson (58) still dismissed Daniel as ‘escapist – a negative judgment on its mythic character’ and G. von Rad regarded the book as ‘bloodless in its presentation of history’ (2:303-306), the positive academic influence was increasing with contributions from Klaus Koch and J.J. Collins (Willis 108).<sup>13</sup> The *renaissance* of scholarship on Daniel occurred in the 1970s, namely with Klaus Koch and his book *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (1972) (Willis 108). This is because, ‘in Daniel studies, the early 1970s seemed more like a dark age than a time of re-birth! Judging from the relatively small volume of published essays and commentaries, there was little positive academic interest in the book. (...) Nevertheless, Koch’s claim was a harbinger of changing times. (...) Daniel has enjoyed a distinct reversal of fortunes, as indicated by the sheer volume of publications in the last decade alone’ (Willis 108).

The Book of Daniel is the result of centuries of prophetic and eschatological developments (see Appendix A). Therefore it is important to define what we mean in talking about ‘the Book of Daniel.’ There were more stories about the figure of Daniel in circulation since the third century BC than those included in the biblical canon. The Dead Sea Scrolls have provided another story about Daniel, to add to those in the Greek version of the book that are not in the Hebrew/Aramaic book in the Bible, and the deuterocanonical narratives of Susanna, Bel, and The Dragon complete a picture of circulating stories that did not make it into the canon (Himmelfarb 32, Hartman & Di Lella 19-24). However, this thesis is limited to the parts of Daniel which are accepted by both Jews and Christians as canonical. Other stories will be briefly mentioned but the focus will be on the canonical Hebrew and Aramaic Book of Daniel.<sup>14</sup>

Moreover, in the following sections the dating and authorship, and with that the composition and structure, of the book will be discussed to lay the foundation for this thesis. The last paragraph of this chapter discusses Daniel 9:24-27, which, as mentioned in the introduction, proved to be a valid indicator of the different uses of the Book of Daniel.

### Dating

How this thesis uses the Book of Daniel is imperative to describe because, as J.J. Collins said, ‘the composition of the Book of Daniel has given rise to a bewildering range of scholarly opinions’ (J.J. Collins, “Court-Tales” 218, see also pp. 219-234). As mentioned in the introduction, the book of Daniel has already been a scholarly and popular challenge since it was finished in the second century BC (J.J. Collins, Ch. Introduction; Ferch 1983; Hartman & Di Lella 9; Koch *Das Buch* 8-12). What Koch labels the Maccabean thesis, the historical conclusion that the book of Daniel was not written by a wise man in the sixth century BC, but by a Jew during the Maccabean period in their war against the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes, began with the third century Neoplatonist philosopher and critic of Christianity Porphyry, of whom Jerome tells us. Jerome was one of many Christian

---

<sup>13</sup> Koch describes the lack of scholarly work in the precious decades (writing in 1980) but also the renewed interest in the Book of Daniel with the writing of ‘numerous’ Commentaries in the last years, from e.g. Heaton (1964), Porteous (1965), Plöger (1965), Delcor (1971), Lacocque (1979) and Hartman-Di Lella (org. 1977, version used of 2005) (*Das Buch* 8).

<sup>14</sup> H.H. Rowley (234) recommends the work of W. Baumgartner, *Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung*, (59-83, 125-144, 201-228), and Hartman & Di Lella (20-21) recommend Delcor (260-292), for further insights.

apologists who dismissed Porphyry's standpoint, and throughout the fifteen hundred years following Porphyry there seems to be no (serious) position of Christian theologians against the authorship or the sixth century BC dating of the book of Daniel (Froom 326; Koch, "Daniel Among" 117). Most certainly the more devotional approach of the Christian theologians instead of the later developments under historical critical scholars facilitated this long period of consensus. Only in the early sixteenth century was some critical scholarly attention given to Daniel as a result of the first printing of the Rabbinic Bible, in which this Hebrew-Aramaic version showed the book of Daniel not among the *Nevi'im* (Prophets) but among the *Ketuvim* (Writings) (117-118; Heller 73; Lim 35). However, it would take until the eighteenth-century historical criticism of Anthony Collins (153-154; J.J. Collins 25)<sup>15</sup> for this to become a spur to the revival of Porphyry's kind of criticism, declaring Daniel's predictions '*vaticinia ex eventu*, that they were written in the Maccabean era, and that they represented intentional forgeries' (Koch, "Daniel Among" 118).<sup>16</sup> So Koch adds: 'Although this verdict was not accepted by all critical exegetes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the strange position of the book in the Hebrew canon was debated again and again' (118). Nonetheless this Maccabean explanation gained momentum and has become the consensus since 1890 (Koch, *Das Buch* 8-9). Thus modern scholars agree in dating the completion of the Book of Daniel to the time of the Hasmonean/Maccabean revolt. This view will be a guiding principle in the following analysis, though we must remember that before the rise of historical-critical scholarship the text was read as a prophecy from the sixth century BC. In this thesis we will look for the explanation and application of Daniel from Maccabean times onwards.

Also important to note is that although the historical-critical view among scholars is the consensus view among specialists, there is a significant body of popular (Christian) literature based on the traditional, pre-critical view (e.g. *The Late, Great Planet Earth* by Hal Lindsey, or the *Left Behind*-series by Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins). These works were written in recent decades, but their pre-critical approach resembles in some respects views assumed in the ancient period this thesis addresses. So it is important to have some awareness of what not only the historical-critical but also the theological and even devotional approaches say. Ulrich, who writes about the 'seven seventies' of Daniel 9:24-27, describes three major (Christian) theological approaches to Daniel 9, which are useful as a thumbnail sketch. The first, which aligns with the Maccabean thesis on this point, is sometimes called the Antiochene, Greek, or critical view and states that the book of Daniel (more precisely the chapters 7-12) predicts the reign of Antiochus IV and the Maccabean crisis in the second century BC ("How Early" 25). The second approach he calls the Roman, evangelical or conservative approach, which connects the book of Daniel to the life (or 'first coming') of Jesus and the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in the first century AD. The third and last view describes the appearance of an Antichrist and the second coming of Jesus at the end of the present age, which is called the dispensational or parenthesis approach, according to which the end envisaged in Daniel 12 is indefinitely delayed (25).

This thesis will show that these different interpretations began among Judaeans and Christians already in the ancient world.

---

<sup>15</sup> Before Anthony Collins, J.J. Collins (25) mentions Uriel da Costa in 1624 doubting the authorship of the Book of Daniel and ascribing the book to the Pharisees instead of Daniel for its belief in resurrection.

<sup>16</sup> Others, according to Froom (55), in this period are Johann S. Semler (d. 1791) and Wilhelm A. Corrodi (d. 1793). However, the latter has to be H. Corrodi as J.J. Collins (25) points out, with the book *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, 1781-1783, because W.A. Corrodi was an artist from Zurich in the nineteenth century.



## Authorship

The 'bewildering range of scholarly opinions' which historical criticism has produced in regard to the compositional layers of Daniel, compels us to take a closer look at the different views concerning its authorship (J.J. Collins, "Court-Tales" 218). Therefore the person of 'Daniel' will be discussed as will the composition and structure of 'his' book. The Book of Daniel received scrutiny concerning the authenticity of the author and his 'predictions' in ancient times by for example Porphyry. Since the developments of modern historical criticism that discussion became irrelevant. The scholarly focus now is more on the identity of the author and the relationship between the tales (chapters 1-6) and the visions (chapters 7-12) (J.J. Collins 25; Koch, *Das Buch* 55-77; H.H. Rowley 249-260).

### Composition - The Identity of the Author

As Hartman and Di Lella (7) and J.J. Collins (1) state, the name Daniel is found several times in the Bible, describing one of King David's sons (1 Chron. 3:1 or 2 Sam. 3:3) or a Jew returning from the Babylonian exile (Ezra 8:2; Neh. 10:7), but neither of these figures 'can be identified as the protagonist of the Book of Daniel.' In Ezekiel 14:14,20 another Daniel is mentioned together with Noah and Job, and 'All three holy men are not Israelite but belong to foreign nations; and each is an idealized figure belonging to a wider sphere of ancient Near Eastern tradition' (Hartman and Di Lella 7). Besides these, there are mentions of Daniel outside the Bible. For example, W. Eichrodt mentions a king from Ugaritic literature with the name Dnil,<sup>17</sup> who was known for his outstanding righteousness and surpassing wisdom (Hartman and Di Lella 7-8; J.J. Collins 1; Eichrodt 188-189; Himmelfarb 31; Gibson 103-122). So the name Daniel, meaning 'God is my judge,' has a longstanding tradition in the ancient Near Eastern cultures, or at least in Syria-Palestine, attached to men of righteousness and wisdom, but we do not know if there was a sixth century BC wise man to which these stories and visions are attributed (Hartman and Di Lella 8). Hartman and Di Lella conclude that 'whether Daniel in these stories represents a historical figure or a legendary literary creation cannot be determined with certainty.' However, the absence of a genealogy, contrary to Jewish custom, is a firm argument for the latter (8).

The actual writer or editor of the Book of Daniel, who was not named Daniel unless by sheer coincidence, is customarily assigned to the Hasidic or Pious circles in second century BC Judaism (43; Delcor 15-19; Hengel 175-180; Montgomery 87; Pfeiffer 772-871). Montgomery (87) even calls it an 'authentic monument to primitive Chasidism' (87; Hartman and Di Lella 43). J.J. Collins (67-71) disputes this claim by showing the 'paucity of evidence' there is for attributing the Book of Daniel (among other things) to the Hasidic circle in the Maccabean period. Also Lacocque states, opposing Montgomery, that if the Book of Daniel did come from the Hasidic circles there should have been an evolution in their doctrine or there were several parties among them (Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time* 30; J.J. Collins 69). Therefore, as with many other factors concerning the Book of Daniel, there is no scholarly consensus about the real-life author. However, even if the period and circle of the final writer were known, there are other challenges concerning the unity of the Book of Daniel.

### The Structure of the Book

In 1898 George Barton (62) already stated: 'That Daniel is an Apocalypse and not a prophecy, is now so generally accepted as to need no proof. That it is a product of the Maccabean and not of the exilic age has been so abundantly demonstrated by others that it may pass without further discussion. The attempts hitherto made to detect differences of authorship in Daniel have not met with marked success.' More than a century later, although Daniel's completion date is universally accepted in critical scholarship, there is still no consensus as to whether and to what degree Daniel is a unified

---

<sup>17</sup> In 'The Tale of Aqhat' a King Dnil is mentioned, which can be vocalized 'Danel' or 'Daniel'. In 2 Aqhat V:7-8 he is mentioned as wise and just.

composition, and whether compositional layers can be detected. As Rowley (234), who presents the most recent case for the book's unity,<sup>18</sup> allows, there is a *prima facie* case for at least two authors.

The first six chapters consist of court tales written in the third person, whereas chapters 7-12 consist of visions described by Daniel. On the basis of this division one could argue for two authors. That division, however, does not match another, linguistic one. The Book of Daniel consists of both Hebrew and Aramaic sections,<sup>19</sup> but the chapters 1, 8-12 are written in Hebrew and 2-7 in Aramaic. Throughout scholarly history this enigma has given rise to numerous theories, beginning with Spinoza in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (1674). He divided the Book of Daniel in two parts (ch. 1-7 and 8-12) based on the different languages. The author of the latter part was Daniel himself but the origin of the first was unknown. Rowley (249-260), Barton (63-66) and Montgomery (88-96), among others, have summarised the history of research, and there is no need to repeat their summaries. We shall confine ourselves to looking at the division J.J. Collins (12-13) and Montgomery (89-92) make concerning those different theories. Collins identifies four kinds of theory, starting with the claim that a single author wrote the book in two languages. Collins does not find this case convincing (12).<sup>20</sup> The second approach holds that the entire book was composed in Hebrew and the third that it was written in Aramaic,<sup>21</sup> and that some parts were translated into the other language for various reasons. The second theory was defended especially at the end of the nineteenth century by A.A. Bevan (27) and the third since 1679 by P.D. Huetius, revived by F. Buhl in 1898 and Karl Marti in 1901, and maintained until the present-day by influential scholars such as Hartman and Ginsberg (J.J. Collins 12-13; Hartman and Di Lella 14-15; Montgomery 92). The fourth theory started in the same period as the second, but with a totally different outcome. It holds that the 'combination of languages results from the incorporation of older Aramaic material into a work whose final stage was composed in Hebrew' (J.J. Collins 13).

This developmental theory comes in several varieties, which can be simplified if we incorporate the division Hartman and Di Lella (16) make, namely either: A) there was only one author and editor in Maccabean times (incorporating a part of the first theory J.J. Collins describes), or B) there were 'more authors from the third and second centuries BC and probably a final redactor' in Maccabean times (16).<sup>22</sup> The developmental theory will be the basis of this thesis. It entails the idea of one author/editor in Maccabean times who incorporated the old Aramaic tales about Daniel, from multiple authors, into the visions and *ex eventu* prophecies this wise man and seer had. The term 'multiple authors' is a source for debate but will certainly not represent an amount of 'eight to ten authors' as the extreme fragmentation advocated by for example Bertholdt (40-49), Corrodi (240) and J.D. Michaelis (190) does, which fragmentation Montgomery called 'a bankruptcy of criticism' (92).<sup>23</sup>

The court tales described in chapters 1-6 are not from the sixth century BC, but they are from an earlier date than the latter chapters concerning the Maccabean period. The provenance of

---

<sup>18</sup> See Rowley (1950). Before that, Charles (1929), or basing their arguments on his defence, Porteous (1965) and Plöger (1965). It is good to know that 'the unity of authorship has been held by defenders both a sixth-century and of a Maccabean date' (J.J. Collins 12).

<sup>19</sup> This thesis cannot have an in-depth discussion concerning the Aramaic and Hebrew of the Book of Daniel. If the reader wants to have a look into this, I can recommend the summaries Koch (*Das Buch* 34-54) and J.J. Collins (12-24). Hartman and Di Lella (14) recommend Ginsberg (1948).

<sup>20</sup> J.J. Collins (12) attributes these ideas to for example Driver (1900), Behrmann (1894) and Rowley (1950).

<sup>21</sup> Montgomery (92) attributes this second kind to his contemporary scholars such as Lenormant (1875), Bevan (27), von Gall (122) and Barton (65).

<sup>22</sup> Category A) consisting then of scholars like Driver (lxv-lxvii), Frost (764-767), Eissfeldt (527) and Rowley (260-270). And B) consisting of scholars like for instance Montgomery (88-99), Ginsberg (27-40) and Delcor (10-13).

<sup>23</sup> More information about the development of these criticisms, and those of Dalman (11), C.C. Torrey (241-282) and Hölscher (113-138), can be found in J.J. Collins (26-28), Koch (*Das Buch* 55-58) and Montgomery (90-96).

chapters 1-6 may be written or oral stories from the fourth or third century BC,<sup>24</sup> which were selected and edited in the Maccabean period and then added by an editor. The theory of Dalman (11) and later Torrey (241-282), which divides the book in the above-mentioned fashion, argues that the editor translated the Aramaic preface (1:1-2:4) into Hebrew and chapter 7 into Aramaic. Various reasons are offered for this theory, but facilitating the 'recognition of the book as sacred and eligible for the Canon,' which required the writings to be in Hebrew, is a persistent argument among scholars (Montgomery 91). This theory, according to Montgomery, also gives a good explanation for the differences in language of the (in this theory) translated chapters compared to the rest of the book (91). G. Hölscher, one of the most influential German scholars in the early twentieth century on this subject, proposed that the editing was in three stages: chapters 1-6 in the third century BC, the addition of chapter 7 in the second century BC and the completion of the book in the Maccabean period (113-138). I propose blending Hölscher's idea concerning the three stages with Dalman's and Torrey's suggestion concerning the translated preface (chapter 1:1-2:4).

To summarise, then: chapter 7-12 are unified in that their material leads to the Maccabean period, though chapter 7 may be earlier. The literary unity of the first six chapters lies in the fact that they are all court tales, but each could have existed in oral or written form independently as early as the fourth century BC. As J.J. Collins (29) says: 'This view [the chapters circulating independently] receives support from the fact that parallel traditions to some of the tales are extant in other works, for example, the Prayer of Nabonidus from Qumran in the case of Daniel 4 and the Deuterocanonical Bel and the Serpent in the case of the story Daniel in the lions' den.' The translated preface will then be dated around the Maccabean times during the editing of the whole book, but the provenance of these first six chapters will remain uncertain.

## Daniel 9

With the historical context of the Book of Daniel in mind and the boundaries of this thesis set, there is one more clarification to make. The interpretation of Daniel has usually hinged on the interpretation of four verses, namely Daniel 9:24-27. The interpretation of these verses often determines how the rest is read and used. The different views concerning the Book of Daniel among Christians and Jews during the different periods of time reflect different interpretations of these verses. It is therefore important to discuss them before we investigate those applications of Daniel. So this thesis will go into 'the dismal swamp of O.T. criticism,' as some have described the exegesis of these seventy weeks (Montgomery 400; Koch, *Das Buch* 149).<sup>25</sup>

Before the Babylonian captivity God promises Jeremiah that He would return His people to their Promised Land after seventy years (Jer. 25:11-12, 29:10-14),<sup>26</sup> a promise that Daniel discovers at the start of Chapter 9 (Van Kooten 293). Given the fact that each translation is its own interpretation, three translations of Daniel 9:24-27 are given below to show some variation in interpretation in different traditions.<sup>27</sup> Whereas the JPS and NRSV both translate the Hebrew Bible, from Jewish and mainstream Christian perspectives, respectively, the NETS renders the Greek Bible (Septuagint). A significant difference in translation can be found, for example, in verse 26. The NSRV has 'an anointed one' and the JPS uses 'the anointed one,' and the NETS reflects the Greek in speaking rather

<sup>24</sup> As J.J. Collins (14-15) summarises the words of the influential H.H. Schaefer (1930); 'the attempts to date them [the court tales] precisely on linguistic grounds are futile.' However, the period can be roughly determined to be the fourth or third century BC.

<sup>25</sup> In 1883 Franz Fraidl already made a list of over 107 different explanations for the seventy weeks.

<sup>26</sup> In the Book of Henoch, which goes back until the third century BC, one of the first known explanations of the seventy weeks is given, being '70 successive reigns of the 70 angelic patrons of the nations' (Charles 169-175; J.J. Collins, *Apoc. Imag.* 54).

<sup>27</sup> I chose these translations to show just some of the differences, not for being archetypical of all traditions and translations.

of ‘an anointing.’ These different translations then create interpretative possibilities for the Messianic interpretation of this verse.

<i>NRSV Translation, Daniel 9:24-27</i>	<i>NETS Translation, Daniel 9:24-27</i>	<i>Jewish Publication Society Tanakh 1985, Daniel 9:24-27</i>
<p>24 ‘Seventy weeks are decreed for your people and your holy city: to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.</p> <p>25 Know therefore and understand: from the time that the word went out to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the time of an anointed prince, there shall be seven weeks; and for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with streets and moat, but in a troubled time.</p> <p>26 After the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing, and the troops of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war. Desolations are decreed.</p> <p>27 He shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and in their place shall be an abomination that desolates, until the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator.’</p>	<p>24 ‘Seventy weeks have been decided for your people and for the city, Sion: for sin to be consummated and to make iniquities scarce and to blot out iniquities and to comprehend the vision and for everlasting righteousness to be given and for the vision to be consummated and to gladden a holy of holies.</p> <p>25 And you shall understand and will rejoice and will discover ordinances to respond, and you will build Jerusalem as a city for the Lord.</p> <p>26 And after seven and seventy and sixty-two weeks, an anointing will be removed and will not be. And a king of nations will demolish the city and the sanctuary along with the anointed one, and his consummation will come with wrath even until the time of consummation. He will be attacked through war.</p> <p>27 And the covenant will prevail for many, and it will return again and be rebuilt broad and long. And at the consummation of times [even after seven years and seventy times and sixty-two times] [until the time of the consummation of the war even desolation will be removed] [when the covenant prevails for many weeks]. And in half of the week the sacrifice and the libation will cease, and in the temple there will be an abomination of desolations until the consummation of a season, and a consummation will be given for the desolation.’</p>	<p>24 ‘Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city until the measure of transgression is filled and that of sin complete, until iniquity is expiated, and eternal righteousness ushered in; and prophetic vision ratified, and the Holy of Holies anointed.</p> <p>25 You must know and understand: From the issuance of the word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the [time of the] anointed leader is seven weeks; and for sixty-two weeks it will be rebuilt, square and moat, but in a time of distress.</p> <p>26 And after those sixty-two weeks, the anointed one will disappear and vanish. The army of a leader who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary, but its end will come through a flood. Desolation is decreed until the end of war.</p> <p>27 During one week he will make a firm covenant with many. For half a week he will put a stop to the sacrifice and the meal offering. At the corner [of the altar] will be an appalling abomination until the decreed destruction will be poured down upon the appalling thing.’</p>

As J.J. Collins points out, Daniel takes the seventy years as seventy weeks of years or 490 years.<sup>28</sup> Daniel thus creates the notion that the prophecy of Jeremiah was not fulfilled in the Persian period and that the promises are carried into the second century BC (352).<sup>29</sup> These years are then divided in 'seven weeks', 'sixty-two weeks' ('the threescore and two weeks') and 'one week.' In each period certain events have to come to pass, such as the coming of 'the Anointed One' or the desolation. Therefore, by using such terms as 'the Anointed One' or 'the abomination of desolation,' a writer does not only hint to the Book of Daniel, but moreover suggest a specific time indication within the prophecy.<sup>30</sup>

The number of interpretations is enormous, but as we shall see, later interpreters have a strong *terminus ad quem* (in what they consider the fulfilment of the seventy weeks), whereas the *terminus a quo* (the starting point of the 490 years) is unclear. However, as Montgomery points out, any system of interpreting Daniel needs to follow some rules, which we must also look for if we want to analyse these uses of Daniel. For example, the exact quantities for 'weeks' cannot be variable: a seven in the first seven weeks must have the same value as one in the last seven (390-391). Then again, 'we must not expect an exact historical chronology according to the approved data of modern historical investigation; Jewish historiography was affected by a remarkable oblivion as to chronology and sequence of events' (391). Nonetheless, 'we should expect from the circumstances of the chapter, a definite *terminus ad quem*, because the immediate encouragement of the seer and his readers is demanded' (391). Therefore, as we shall see, the devotional application of the texts is mostly contemporary: what does the text mean for me in my present day? This leads to finding a *terminus ad quem* in the time of the interpreter. The historical interpretation, 'What did it mean for the composer and his ancient users?', underlies our research question, but is mostly absent in the devotional approach.

So if the *terminus ad quem* is definite, as Montgomery says, and takes place at the time of Antiochus IV, how does the 'prophecy' start if one takes a literal 490 years? Various explanations have been offered concerning the *terminus a quo* imagined by the author. The 'word that goes out' (vs. 25), some say, was meant to be the divine word and not the command of a Persian ruler (J.J. Collins 354), which then would be the prophecy of Jeremiah dated around 605 BC (based on Jer. 25:1) (J.J. Collins 354; Montgomery 391; Porteous 141; Ulrich 28). Other scholars propose the starting point should be 586 BC<sup>31</sup> for the first seven weeks, or forty-nine years, because that was the year of the temple's destruction and so the first week would correspond exactly to the period until the rebuilding of the Temple from 538 BC (J.J. Collins 355; McComiskey 26). Indeed, the Chronicler in 2 Chronicles 36:20-21 dates the start of the seventy years to 586 BC with the destruction of the Temple. Some suggest that the years of Jeremiah and Daniel overlap, letting the seventy years run from 605-538 BC (almost seventy years),<sup>32</sup> and the start of Daniel's years, then at 586 BC until the

---

<sup>28</sup> Hartman and Di Lella (247-250) state that such biblical (re)interpretations are now known as *pesharim* or *peshet methods*, which were commonly known in the Qumran sect and rabbinical writers, as ascribing a 'new interpretation on a Scripture passage by combining it with some other passages of the Scriptures.'

<sup>29</sup> For more information about these 'seventy weeks of years,' '10 jubilees' or '490 years,' I would recommend the writings of Ulrich (both of 2014), Beckwith (1981) and J.J. Collins (1994).

<sup>30</sup> The notion that the 490 years has to be taken symbolic instead of literally is mostly one which exists in scholarly work of the last century, and which certainly is plausible to have existed in the period this thesis addresses (J.J. Collins 353); however, only the literal interpretation plays a significant role in both the Christian and Judaeon views in the period this thesis discusses.

<sup>31</sup> This thesis will use 586 BC as the date for the destruction of Solomon's Temple (instead of 587 BC). For more information concerning these dates, I refer to Thiele or the *Nebuchadnezzar Chronicle* (Thiele 192).

<sup>32</sup> As Hartman and Di Lella (247) point out, the usage of the 'seventy years' was intended by Jeremiah to tell the exiles that it would be a long period instead of what false prophets would say; however, this number was a genuine prophecy and taking the fall of Nineveh (612-539 BC - 73 years) or the accession of Nebuchadnezzar (605-539 BC - 66 years) as a starting point, his prophecy 'proved to be remarkably close to accuracy.'

forty-nine years have passed until 538 BC. With these dates, the 'anointed ruler' of vs. 25 could be the high priest Joshua or Zerubbabel (both being 'sons of oil' in Zech. 4:14) or the Persian King Cyrus, who is called 'anointed one' in Isaiah 45:1 (J.J. Collins 355; Hartman and Di Lella 251; Koch, *Das Buch* 150; Montgomery 379; Ulrich 29). However, the term 'anointed one' acquired a Messianic interpretation in both Christianity and Judaism. The Judaeen interpretation held this view mainly until the destruction of the temple in AD 70<sup>33</sup> and Christian theological interpretation found the text pointing forward to Christ, until the Maccabean thesis prevailed from the nineteenth century (Beckwith 521; J.J. Collins 355).<sup>34</sup>

The sixty-two weeks are the most difficult to interpret. Scholars who assume a literal (rather than symbolic) meaning conclude that there was 'a chronological miscalculation on the part of the author' and 'in the absence of a known chronology' these years were just 'squeezed in' (Montgomery 393). Hartman & Di Lella state that the first sixty-nine weeks, especially the 'artificial' middle part of sixty-two weeks, 'cannot be taken too seriously' for the writer was 'really only concerned with the last "week" of years' (250).

If the author intended a literal 490 years (from 605 or 586 BC), it seems that he miscalculated, for a completion of that period in 115 or 96 BC would be too late for his purposes. Miscalculation is entirely possible under ancient conditions, or he may have intended the numbers symbolically. In any case, the literal application of the 490 years to later times echoes through the texts this thesis discusses. The later the *terminus ad quem* has to be according to their contemporaries, the *terminus a quo* must likewise move on to a later date. Therefore, for the clarity of this thesis a framework will be used for the different applications.

The theological and devotional outline of Ulrich (25) has already been mentioned, but to create a historical overview I will divide the different applications of the prophecies in the Book of Daniel in a simple but rough distinction:<sup>35</sup> (1) the prophecies are fulfilled in the contemporary, Maccabean period. They are seen as prophecies, but are meant for the Antiochene crisis. An example would be 1 Maccabees 1:54. The Roman option (option 2) places Daniel's fulfilment in the period of the Jewish War. They mostly apply the end of Daniel's 490 years to the destruction of Jerusalem. This is the main Jewish interpretation since Josephus. The third (3) is an apocalyptic interpretation of the prophecies as sometimes seen in the New Testament (see e.g. Matt. 24). Daniel's words are not directly applied to the destruction but have 'a patently apocalyptic use of the Danielic prophecy, which could be made to fit the prospect of any great calamity which should strike at the heart of the Jewish religion' (Montgomery 396). The fourth theory (4) is 'the advent of Christ'-interpretation, in which the prophecies predict events leading up to his second advent. This is a Christian theory that arose only in the late second century AD, alongside the development of the antichrist traditions, contemporary to the works of Irenaeus and Hippolytus. The fifth possibility (5), is Porphyry's interpretation of Daniel's prophecies as *vaticinia ex eventu*.<sup>36</sup> This interpretation is absent from the works of both Judaeans and Christians, but traces of it show sometimes in their vivid arguments against it.

---

<sup>33</sup> The Judaeen Messianic interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel ceased most probably after the destruction of the Temple and most certainly after the Bar Kokhba revolt (Beckwith 522).

<sup>34</sup> The Jewish interpretation and chronology concerning (prophecies of) the destruction are affirmed in *Seder Olam Rabbah*, which provides a chronological record from Adam to the Bar Kokhba revolt in AD 132-135.

<sup>35</sup> Montgomery (394) mentions some 'progressive phases' in which one can view the different theories concerning the application of the prophecies of Daniel. I adjusted this model to account for the different historical applications instead of his 'phases of progression.'

<sup>36</sup> Beckwith makes a distinction in the Jewish interpretation by dividing its outcomes into three categories, namely the Hellenistic, the Pharisees/Zealots and the Essenes (522). The last two try to predict future events (respectively theory 2 and 4), while the first mostly is not (corresponding with theory 1 and 2).

This thesis will show that the various Judaeans and the Christian views interpret events along one of these five lines, which result in different theories altogether. Therefore, the importance of finding the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of every interpretation in regard to the seventy sevens is of significant importance to show the similarities and differences between the both parties in time. Thus, the next chapters examine the ways in which Christians and Judaeans used the Book of Daniel and especially 9:24-27 in their respective periods.

## Chapter 2 – Judaeen responses

History is not the study of one outlook on the past. To think of it this way would be like asking members of one party or perspective their opinion of the current situation in their own country: no single picture can portray the whole truth of the situation, but different views must be taken into account. Josephus describes three parties or schools within Judaeen society, namely the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes (*Jewish War* 2.119, *Ant.* 18.11-22),<sup>37</sup> a claim that already shows major differences of perspective about the correct form of legal interpretation and governance. Moreover, the differences between the Judaeans living in their Holy Land around Jerusalem, and those living in Galilee, Hellenised cities like Caesarea or Scythopolis, or farther afield, are significant. And then there is the difference of social class, power, worship, and other such differences that might affect the place and use of the Book of Daniel. Our aim, therefore, will not be to find the one response of the Judaeans but to combine different sources from different periods of time to recover the different responses of the Judaeans to the challenges of their time and their use of the Book of Daniel.

To answer the question ‘How did Judaeans use the prophecies of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?’, we shall consider a number of texts. The first section will discuss the First Book of Maccabees to paint the only picture of the usage of the Book of Daniel before the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. The second will analyse the usage of the prophecies of Daniel in the apocalypses of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, and *Antiquities* will complete the Judaeen picture.

### 1 Maccabees

The first Judaeen response, is First Maccabees. This narrative covers the whole Maccabean revolt, from the ascension of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 175 BC, through Mattathias' family, particularly his sons Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan Apphus, and Simon Thassi, to the moment in February 135 BC where Simon and his two sons Mattathias and Judah are murdered by Simon's son-in-law Ptolemy, son of Abubus, and his third son John of Hyrcanus takes over the double office of high priest and ethnarch of Israel.

The author of the book remains unknown, but was apparently a Judaeen with knowledge of both Hebrew and Aramaic, and writing the book after John Hyrcanus I became ethnarch (134 BC), but well before Pompey's invasion of 63 BC, for he emphasises the friendly relationship the Judaeans have with the Romans (DeSilva 264-287; Goldstein 63; Mason, “Daniel” 166).

First Maccabees was apparently first written in Hebrew after which it was translated into Greek (Darshan 91; DeSilva 267; Harrison 123; Pfeiffer, *NT Times* 483). There are no manuscripts of the Hebrew version but the Greek style has often been ascribed to a Hebrew origin (Darshan 94-97, DeSilva 267). Besides these linguistic arguments, the Early Church Father Origen mentions the Hebrew/Aramaic name of the book (in: Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.25), as does Jerome (in: *Prologus galeatus*, vol. 28, cols. 593-604 [PL]) (Darshan 92-93; Cotton XXI). Their words do not necessarily mean there was a Hebrew original. However, the common view is that the Hebrew original disappeared at a very early date and only the Greek was used by later readers (93).

The nationalistic style with which the author tells the story of the Maccabees shows his support for, even glorification of the revolt, but he does not hesitate to show the misdeeds that Simon, a founder of the Hasmonean dynasty, committed (Soggin 540). However, the Hasmoneans were not from the line of King David and so the writer has to justify their rule. He does this by stressing throughout the narrative that the Hasmoneans were chosen by God to bring salvation to Israel (Mason, “Daniel” 166-167). One of the ways he accomplishes this is by using the influential

---

<sup>37</sup> Josephus makes a distinction throughout his work of the three schools, but in *Antiquities* 18.11-22 he adds a fourth ‘fraction’. Not that he gives it the same importance or status but he tries to position and reflect on a mentality or frame of mind that has caused trouble for the Judaeans in that period of time.



seer Daniel and the traditions surrounding him (Mason 166-167; Goldstein 42-48). The words of Daniel are mentioned or alluded to several times (e.g., 1 Macc. 7:37 and Dan. 9:18).

The parallels between 1 Maccabees and Daniel are particularly interesting because both show the rise and fall of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, although one uses literary narrative while the latter uses an apocalypse to tell the story (1 Macc. 1:16 and Dan. 11:25-28). Especially two sections in 1 Maccabees are important for they show how the author used the traditions and/or the Book of Daniel, namely the phrase 'abomination of desolation' (Dan. 9:27, 11:31, 12:11) and Mattathias' deathbed speech. The latter speaks of some heroes of Israel: Joshua, Kaleb, David, Elijah, and then Daniel and his preservation from the lions' den, and his three friends (Chanania, Azaria and Misaël) from the fiery furnace (1 Macc. 2:54-60). Their examples show that faithfulness to God and the Law prevail over evil (2:61-64). However, Mattathias then goes beyond the Danielic moral and transforms it into a call to arms (2:65-68) (Mason, "Daniel" 167), thereby effecting a 'double inversion of Daniel's purpose: it dissolves the apocalyptic timetable into a 'realized eschatology,' and it replaces quietistic pacifism with divinely authorised militancy' (166).<sup>38</sup> This 'divinely authorised militancy' can also be seen in the usage of the earlier mentioned phrase 'abomination of desolation' (Hebrew:  $\text{ַיְקִשְׁוֹן ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ ׀ };$  Greek:  $\text{τό βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως}$ ). This phrase is used in 1 Macc. 1:54 to describe the actions of Antiochus IV when he disrupts the Jewish cult and places a structure on the great altar of sacrifice (Ulrich, "How Early" 1066; J.J. Collins 357).<sup>39</sup> However, this term does not stand on its own. It is part of the 490-years or seventy sevens prophecy made by Daniel, which gives us the earliest interpretation of that particular phrase from the Book of Daniel (357). The message is that it is just and even divinely ordered to take a stance against that ruler, for it has been prophesied.

The writer of 1 Maccabees now sees the climax of this prophecy in the Antiochene crisis (Ulrich, "How Early" 1066). The *terminus ad quem* of the seventy sevens becomes 164 BC, the year Judah Maccabee rededicated the Jewish Temple (Ulrich 28). However, the *terminus a quo* for the 490 years is not discussed by the writer, or indeed whether he has made any such calculation. The author of 1 Maccabees points towards the 'abomination of desolation' and this might seem to imply the fulfilment of the 490 years prophecy, but he does not discuss any such scheme. Some scholars refer to 2 Maccabees and offer the murder of the high priest Onias III (2 Macc. 4:30-38) as the 'the anointed one being cut off' in 171 BC (Beckwith 528-529).<sup>40</sup> However, there is no indication the very different writers of 1 or 2 Maccabees had such an application in mind. If one were to take the period 171-164 BC as the seventieth week of seven years, then roughly in the middle would be the desecration of the Jewish Temple by Antiochus IV in 167 BC, and the calculation would begin from 654 BC. But we have no way of knowing whether the author of 1 Maccabees was thinking this way.

In conclusion, 1 Maccabees makes use of the traditions of the seer Daniel and the prophecies of the Book of Daniel mainly to reinforce the status and the divine rule of the Hasmoneans. The use of the specific phrase 'abomination of desolation' shows that the writer had Daniel in mind while writing his book. However, if he was thinking of the seventy years of weeks, his calculation is

---

<sup>38</sup> As Mason states, among others (Farmer 108-110, Mason mentions Hengel 1989:238 and Gaston 1970:458-463 as well), this may have created a precedent for 'later rebels against Rome, who saw themselves both as heirs of the Hasmonean cause and as fulfilling the vision of Daniel' (166). This is also an argument of Koch (*Daniel Among*) concerning the place of the Book of Daniel not among the *Nevi'im* (Prophets) but among the *Ketuvim* (Writings) in the Jewish Canon.

<sup>39</sup> As J.J. Collins (357-358) argues, the nature of this structure was/is disputed, but the view that the abomination was a pagan altar 'fits best with the earliest testimonies and encounters no serious objection' (358).

<sup>40</sup> Another attempt to apply the prophecy to Onias III is by the late third century BC, Hellenistic Jewish historian Demetrius, which words were preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1, xxi, 141). His time schedule applied the prophecy during his time and a later individual adjusted this schedule, we now call Pseudo-Demetrius, for it to apply to Onias III (Beckwith 528-529).

uncertain. If the author is making a seventy-weeks calculation, he sees the 490 years ending in the Maccabean period but gives no indication of his starting point (*terminus a quo*) or the nature of such calculation. Moreover, he leaves the 434, and even the 483 years unspoken of. This leaves us with one of two conclusions, if thinking of the calculation at all: either he silently corrected/interpreted Daniel's time period of sixty-two weeks or he saw the sixty-nine sevens symbolically as being the long period before the 'end of times' for which the Book of Daniel had been sealed (Dan. 12:4).

#### 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

The books of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch,<sup>41</sup> also known as the Apocalypse of Baruch, have usually been regarded as twins, the latter being seen through the eyes of the former (Stone and Henze 1-2). Both are among the latest of the first age of Jewish apocalypses and both use individuals of the Babylonian destruction and exile as their hero figure (1). According to the Bible, Ezra led the Israelites back from Babylon to their home land after the exile and Baruch was the helper and sometimes representative of the prophet Jeremiah, just before and during the first destruction. The chosen heroes are from ancient times, therefore, the writers used their names as pseudonyms to spread their message. Both authors wrote in Hebrew, of which all versions have been lost, but they were translated into Greek. These are also lost,<sup>42</sup> but we have several translations, including Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Arabic for 4 Ezra, and Syriac alone for 2 Baruch (3; Hobbins 47; Stone, *Fourth Ezra* 1-48). Both books are thought to have been written at the end of the first or beginning of the second century in Palestine (Hobbins 48).<sup>43</sup> And, given their presumed dating, provenance, and original languages, but mainly because of the 'centrality of study and observance of the Law' to their outlooks, they 'are often thought to represent a transitional period in the history of ancient Judaism between the end of the Second Temple period and the beginnings of rabbinic Judaism' (Fraade 363).

Granted their many similarities, each book nevertheless has a distinctive outlook and presentation. Whereas 4 Ezra follows an almost rigid literary structure of seven parts, 2 Baruch is more or less divided in two parts between the apocalypse – consisting of revelations, questions the seer asks to God, and prayers (ch. 1-77) – and the 'Letter of Baruch to the Nine and Half Tribes' (ch. 78-87) (Stone and Henze 1-2; Hobbins 47). Another difference is that 4 Ezra describes Ezra's receiving knowledge of God (e.g. 4 Ezra 14:19-26, 37-48) and being assisted by five men to write ninety-four books, of which twenty-four could be read publicly (exoteric works) by 'the worthy and unworthy,' whereas the other seventy should be kept secret for a distinct group (esoteric works). So, whereas 4 Ezra has a preponderance of esoteric material, 2 Baruch is more inclusive and shows great concern for the whole of Israel (Stone and Henze 2).

Thus, these two books were written under the same circumstances but around 200-250 years later than 1 Maccabees and just after the destruction of the Jewish Temple. Coming at the end of the first age of Jewish apocalypses, both apocalypses are 'always conditioned by the historical experiences of the nation' (Charles 170). As Hobbins stated in his analysis of 2 Baruch, the 'metaphysical explanation serves to rationalize the historical process in which Israel found itself'

---

<sup>41</sup> This thesis cannot comprehend all the information available on both books, so for 4 Ezra I would suggest the works of Stone and for 2 Baruch the work of Hobbins (47-48), which give an excellent summary of the available scholarly work.

<sup>42</sup> The complete versions are lost but we have some Greek fragments left (Hobbins 47).

<sup>43</sup> For 4 Ezra, Stone shows different dates of composition between AD 70 and 218 in Hermeneia, but he himself holds a date during the latter part of the rule of the Roman Emperor Domitian (AD 81-96) (Stone and Henze 2-3). For 2 Baruch, Hobbins (48) suggests a date of composition around AD 100. Others, such as Bogaert (270-295) and J.J. Collins (*Apoc. Imag.* 170) date the work more precisely, to about AD 95. Others date it more broadly, such as Henze (Stone and Henze 11) and Jones (87-89) who suggest it had to be written between AD 70 and the Bar Kokhba Revolt in AD 132-135, N. Roddy, a date between AD 70 and 99 (3-14), or Nickelsburg, who suggests a date towards the end of the first century (270-271).

(49).<sup>44</sup> Therefore, one can see in both books the search for an explanation of the destruction (49). Different traditions, both biblical and postbiblical, were blended into a new (metaphysical) response to catastrophic events.<sup>45</sup> Traces of Daniel are found in both books, but they are most evident in 4 Ezra. For example, Ezra is in the same situation as Daniel (e.g. 4 Ezra 3:1 with Dan. 2:29; 4 Ezra 5:14 with Dan. 8:17, 4 Ezra 6:30 with Dan. 10:8, 4 Ezra 10:38 with Dan. 9:22,23) and in both cases it is said that ‘the books will open and then these will be the signs’ (4 Ezra 6:20 with Dan. 7:10). Besides this, both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch show the post-mortem vindication or even resurrection of the dead (4 Ezra 7:32 and 2 Bar. 15:8 with Dan. 12:1-3) and emphasise the reward for the righteous in this life or the next (4 Ezra 7:55 and 2 Bar. 15:8 with Dan. 12:1-3).

The most important usage of Daniel is in 4 Ezra 12:10-13, which reinterprets<sup>46</sup> the vision of Daniel 7. In 2 Baruch 36-40 (especially Ch. 39) we see the same vision being used, but 4 Ezra 12 gives a new interpretation: ‘He [God] said to me [Ezra], "This is the interpretation of this vision which you have seen: ‘The eagle which you saw coming up from the sea is the fourth kingdom which appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel. But it was not explained to him as I now explain or have explained it to you.’” The fourth kingdom, in previous writings symbolising the Hellenistic kingdom, is reinterpreted or ‘re-visited’ by Ezra as the Roman Empire, symbolised by the eagle (Charles 170; Fraade 374). Thus, as the writer of Daniel applied the seventy years of Jeremiah to his own days, so the writer of 4 Ezra applies the prophecy of Daniel to his own time, not changing a textual interpretation but creating a vision or prophecy that supersedes the original Daniel witnessed (Fraade 374). Whereas Daniel saw but did not understand, being ‘*the ignorant messenger*,’ the audience of 4 Ezra receives the explanation because it happened within their days (Fraade 374-375; Furstenberg 299-328).

This application of the Book of Daniel, the reinterpretation of an apocalypse, is unique to 4 Ezra. Both authors interpret Daniel but their interpretations differ significantly. According to Stone (200), many writings of the post-destruction period have at least some indication of the writer’s struggle with God. The question ‘How could God/the gods let this happen to us?!’ has been one of the oldest questions of human kind and both of these books address this. The brief analysis of Jacob Neusner (312–327; Jones 27) of both apocalypses shows, according to him, four messages. First, the destruction of Jerusalem was a just punishment of God of His people. Secondly, their sins were responsible for the destruction. The third message is that at the end of time, God will redeem His people. The fourth and most blatant one: meanwhile the Jews had to wait patiently. However, whereas the writer of 2 Baruch weeps, cries, lament about the faith of Jerusalem and the Temple, he accepts God’s justice in the verdict of not intervening or just allowing it to happen. In sharp contrast stands 4 Ezra, whose writer questions the justice of God in a Job-like way. As Stone puts it, ‘[the author] challenges the very justice and morality of God and evaluates His responsibility for the parlous state of the world’ (200-201). However, both 4 Ezra and the author of 2 Baruch come to the same conclusion: they are shown the ‘heavenly Jerusalem,’ the eschatological reward for the just, and the assurance that God is in control (201; Jones 27-28). The questions, especially those of 4 Ezra, do not get answered but are subordinated to the higher ways of God, which comforts both writers.

Compared to Daniel, both books are introspective: the primary responsibility for the destruction of the Jewish Temple is not the Roman invasion but the sin of Israel, which forced God to

---

<sup>44</sup> The notion of the ‘heavenly Jerusalem’ is an important part of both books as one of those ‘metaphysical explanations,’ however cannot be discussed in depth within the range of this thesis.

<sup>45</sup> Hobbins and A.Y. Collins suggest for example the Book of Jubilees, the Book of Daniel, 4 Ezra, the Sibylline Oracles 3 and 5, and Revelations. The Book of Enoch and the Apocalypse of Abraham, among many others, could be added (49, 77; A.Y. Collins 32-44; 43-44).

<sup>46</sup> Whereas other texts interpret the visions of Daniel differently, 4 Ezra is the only texts which openly states that the interpretation of the vision has to be different than the intention the actual writer/editor seems to have, based on another divine experience. Therefore the term ‘reinterpret’ is used here.

punish His people (Jones 28). Whereas 4 Ezra still shows more of an emphasis on the coming destruction of the Roman Empire, by the hand of the coming Messiah and not the Judaeans, 2 Baruch entirely focuses on the responsibility of the Judaeans themselves (Charlesworth 285–295; Jones 274). F.J. Murphy even calls 2 Baruch ‘a call to pacifism in the wake of the destruction’ (663–669; see also J.E. Wright 81–96). The Danielic pacifism is paired with the promises of glorious restoration. Both apocalypses focus on the coming ‘glory of God,’ the glorious heavenly Jerusalem which is promised and led by the Messiah himself. Especially in 4 Ezra a diptych shows of on the one side the endeavour of managing the grievance of a nation not fighting again but trying to heal, and on the other side the eschatological promise of that God will do justice if the nation returns to Him and His law (Esler 99–123; idem, *Modelling* 239–58).

In conclusion, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch use the pacifistic style of the Book of Daniel. The call for acceptance of both God’s verdict and the rule of the Romans show in both books. The most significant use of the Book of Daniel is their reinterpretation of the prophecies in Daniel 7 by applying them to their times, creating a divine solution for the crisis they are in because of the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple.

### Antiquities of Flavius Josephus

The last Jewish/Judaeen source this thesis discusses is the *Antiquities of the Jews* (traditional Latin: *Antiquitates Judaicae*; Greek: Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία) written by Yosef ben Matityahu (Greek: Ἰώσηπος Ματθίου παῖς) but best known under his later Roman name, Flavius Josephus. Writing both *Antiquities* (completed by AD 94) and the *Judaeen War* (AD 75–79) in the first century AD, Josephus usually has been seen as the authority for first-century Judea (Mason, *J, J & CO* 7; Mason, “Daniel” 190).<sup>47</sup> Whereas the *Judaeen War* hints at his use of the Book of Daniel, by the *Antiquities* he had decided to ‘use Daniel as a basis for his interpretation of world history’ (Mason, “Daniel” 190).<sup>48</sup> *Antiquities* refers to Daniel at least 54 times, especially in books 9 to 11. The goal of this section is to discern why and how Josephus used the Book of Daniel in his *Antiquities*.

First, it is important to have the purpose of the *Antiquities* clear, because the aim of the book will provide an insight into the use of the Book of Daniel. In the two decades after the Jewish War of AD 66–70, anti-Judaeen sentiments were high, given their reputation for revolt, and this fuelled slanders against the Judaeans (Mason, “Daniel” 167; Feldman 645; Whittaker 35–36). Tacitus, for example, writes in his *Histories* about the Judaeans being the ‘basest of people’ whose superstition had to be abolished and who were in need of civilization (*Hist.* 5.1–13, reference from 5.8). Josephus therefore speaks in his preface (*Ant.* 1.1–26 and *JW* 1.1–8) that he already wrote the *Judaeen War* to ‘refute those who in their writings were doing outrage to the truth’ (*Ant.* 1.4). His aim with *Antiquities* then is to ‘present Jewish history, religion and people in a form which would be understood and admired by educated Greeks and Romans’ (Grabbe 71).<sup>49</sup> This should ultimately lead to the understanding that the Judaeans had a ‘noble history, embraced the highest ideals of virtue and were therefore exemplary citizens’ (Mason, “Daniel” 168). To make this point, Josephus describes the God of the Judaeans as one who is omnipresent, overseeing all of humankind and thereby rewarding those who live in accordance to the law and punishing its transgressors (*Ant.* 1.14, 20–21, 45). However, Josephus acknowledges throughout his writing that without assuring the

---

<sup>47</sup> As Mason (*J, J & CO* 7) argues in his book, we should not regard Josephus as an authority. However, this is not on the basis of him being unreliable but mostly because ‘history should have a problem with authority.’ This thesis uses his works, not as the ‘peerless authority for first-century Judea’ (Mason, *J, J & CO* 7), but to obtain an important context in which we can view the other scriptures.

<sup>48</sup> This thesis cannot contain all the in-depth analysis of the relation between Flavius Josephus and Daniel. One of the more thorough analyses concerning this subject can be found in the article ‘Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House’ by Steve Mason.

<sup>49</sup> Whereas Grabbe mentions the ‘Jewish history, religion and people’, this thesis holds the view that such a difference was not applicable in those days, therefore one could replace this phrase with ‘the Judaeen culture’.

Judaeans a firm position in history, their world view will not be seen as noteworthy. Therefore, as Paul did at the Areopagus in Acts 17:16-34, he accommodates his message to his audience. He phrases the Judaeans view of God's nature in the language of contemporary philosophy and history, and lets important events intersect with non-Jewish writers (Grabbe 71; Mason, "Daniel" 168<sup>50</sup>). For Moses, 'their legislator,' showed that God 'possessed the very perfection of virtue' (*Ant.* 1.22) and Abraham before him taught the Egyptians astrology and mathematics (*Ant.* 1.166-168). Therefore, the Judaeans' ancient history preceded not only that of Josephus' Greek and Roman audience but even the ancient empires of the Egyptians and Babylonians (Grabbe 71).<sup>51</sup>

Not only did the Judaeans precede these empires, but even when they were conquered by them, they served the victors well, something which was very important to stress for Josephus. This is noteworthy because one of the slanders in and before Josephus' times was the unduly influential presence of Jews in high places (see e.g. Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28.67 or the *Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs*). Thus, key individuals, such as Joseph or Daniel, in his storyline had to be portrayed as loyal to the rulers of their land (Feldman 648). Therefore, the story of Daniel includes the wisdom, the virtues, and the noble history of the Judaeans, and not unimportantly portrays a seer who actually predicted the subsequent history, which Josephus could use for his *Antiquities*.<sup>52</sup>

As Mason ("Daniel" 167) describes, the overarching theme and main arguments which Josephus utters in his magnum opus find valuable support in the Book of Daniel. Josephus calls him 'one of the greatest prophets' for he not only prophesied future things but he 'also fixed the time on which these would come to pass' (*Ant.* 10.266-267). Whereas Josephus speaks about history in the first nine books and in the beginning of the tenth, from this point on he applies the Book of Daniel to his own time period, and it is in this application that our interest lies.

Firstly, he talks about Nebuchadnezzar's dream and the statue in Daniel 2. Here he adjusts the vision described by the Book of Daniel. The head of gold is not only Nebuchadnezzar himself but also 'the Babylonian kings who were before him' (Dan. 2:38 to *Ant.* 10.208) and the shoulders of silver are not described as 'a kingdom inferior to you,' but thus: 'your empire will be brought to an end by two kings' (Dan. 2:39 to *Ant.* 10.208). This expands the biblical explanation of the dream, which mentions a Median kingdom only, to a Medo-Persian one, and this in turn makes the third kingdom the empire of Alexander the Great instead of the Persian one. Josephus refers to the third ruler as 'another king from the west' (*Ant.* 10.209), adding 'from the west' to the biblical account. This leaves the fourth empire, which would be destroyed by the stone, to be determined.<sup>53</sup> Josephus is not specific here in declaring the fourth empire to be the Roman Empire.<sup>54</sup> However, he will later state that Daniel predicted Roman power (*Ant.* 10.276).<sup>55</sup>

The second main application of the Book of Daniel is the vision of the ram and the goat in Daniel 8, in which Josephus does not adjust the interpretation of the vision because the Book of Daniel already interpreted the vision as being Alexander's conquest of Persia (see Daniel 8:20-21). The 'single great horn' of the goat destroying the ram and eventually it broke off and four smaller

---

<sup>50</sup> Mason refers here to the work of Weiss (421-433) as well.

<sup>51</sup> Josephus ties renowned kings to the Judaeans and their prophecies, with for example Cyrus the Persian reading Isaiah 44:28 (*Ant.* 11.3-5) and Alexander the Great visiting Jerusalem (*Ant.* 11.329-339), but especially letting both kings give praise to his god, to 'show that the prophets in general and Daniel in particular provide the key to understanding world history' (Mason, "Daniel" 174).

<sup>52</sup> For a comparison between Daniel and Josephus' self-understanding as being a prophet I would recommend Mason (*Daniel*, 176-177).

<sup>53</sup> As Marcus (Loeb translator of the *Antiquities* Book 9-11, at page 273) states in his footnotes, the rabbis also identified the third kingdom as the empire of Alexander.

<sup>54</sup> 'And Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be...' (*Ant.* 10.209-210).

<sup>55</sup> Concerning this vagueness a lot has been written, of which I would suggest Mason ("Daniel" 172-173) and e.g. Bruce (160), Bilde (188), or Feldman (649).

ones replaced it, of which one would 'grow and make war on his [God's] nation,' is Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Dan. 8:22-26 to *Ant.* 10.276).

Finally, let us consider Josephus' interpretation of the seventy weeks from Daniel 9:24-27. Josephus' application of the seventy-weeks prophecy has not an unambiguous answer to it. As Beckwith (533) describes it: 'Josephus's chronology is really a study in itself. For his figures, as for his facts, Josephus (writing in the last thirty years of the first century AD) uses a variety of sources, and when they conflict he either chooses between them or harmonizes them.' For example, in *Ant.* 10.276 Josephus states 'In the same manner Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans, and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple desolated.'<sup>56</sup> His use of the same word for 'desolate' as Daniel suggests that he refers to the seventy weeks of Daniel (Beckwith 534). Then the *terminus ad quem* for Josephus would be the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70 but the *terminus a quo* seventy weeks earlier would have no clear marker (421 BC). Counting the other way around, Josephus seems to consider 640 BC the beginning of the Exile (until 570 BC). Adding sixty-nine to seventy weeks to this, leads to 157-150 BC as the *terminus ad quem*, when the desolation and cutting off of the anointed one should take place (Beckwith 534). In 152 BC Jonathan, the first of the Maccabean high priests, did assume this position and was violently cut off, but nowhere does Josephus state that this would be the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy (534). Therefore, it is safe to assume the *terminus a quo* here as well is not determined but the *terminus ad quem* is set by Josephus at AD 70.

Then who would be the 'anointed one' spoken of in Daniel 9:25 according to Josephus between AD 63 and 70? *Antiquities* does not provide us with an answer, but the *Jewish War* does give some possible suggestions. Both Beckwith (535-536) and F.F. Bruce (154-158) give two options of who Josephus would understand to be the 'anointed one.' In *War* 6.312 Josephus cites an ancient oracle that pointed to Vespasian's rise, which could be an allusion of the Son of Man of Dan. 7:13; however, Vespasian was not 'cut off' as Dan. 9:25 says of the 'anointed one,' and he did not rule 'forever' as Dan. 7:14 suggests (Beckwith 535; Bruce 158; Mason, "Daniel" 185). The other option both scholars propose is that Josephus saw the high priest Ananus, who was murdered by the Idumeans in the Temple in AD 66, as the 'anointed one' being 'cut off.' Josephus emphasises the murder of Ananus, after the cessation of the daily sacrifices (Bruce 154; Dan. 9:26 to *JW* 4.316-325, 349; 6.94). Therefore, on the basis of *Antiquities* one cannot draw a conclusion, but combined with his other works it seems plausible that Josephus had a non-Messianic interpretation<sup>57</sup> of the 'anointed one' as the high priest Ananus (Beckwith 536).

Thus, the Book of Daniel is used significantly in the *Antiquities* by Josephus, not only its prophecies but the whole book as a framework. As Mason ("Daniel" 176) states: 'The exilic seer provides the basis for his [Josephus] conception of history as the rise and fall of kingdoms under God's watchful care, an integration point for determinism and deuteronomistic theology, a pacifistic political platform, and specific prophecies that have been strikingly confirmed.' Josephus' goal of showing the 'civilized world' of the Greeks and Romans the immense value of the Judaeans in their history, virtue, and citizenship, echoes through his use of the Book of Daniel. He shows the 'God who is in control of history,' explains that this God punishes His people if they transgress by the means of foreign kingdoms throughout the ages, which is now the Roman empire, and resisting them means resisting God. Promoting Jewish pacifism and rejecting everything that is not according to this 'tradition,' runs deep through the *Antiquities*.

---

<sup>56</sup> This double application, the first reference to Antiochus IV, the second to a later event, is not exclusive to Josephus because succeeding authors, like Hippolytus or Jerome, used a similar explanation in the application of the Book of Daniel (Van Kooten 300; Ulrich, "How Early" 1073).

<sup>57</sup> Non-Messianic in the sense that Josephus does not interpret this verse to mean a (coming) divine ruler or saviour like Christians saw this verse as referring to Jesus.

Besides this, the comparisons and self-identification Josephus makes between Daniel and himself as a seer and a Jewish nobleman serving a foreign king, are striking, both in the *Antiquities* and in his earlier *Jewish War* (“Daniel” 176-177, 190).

In conclusion, the use of the prophecies of Daniel, especially the 490 years, is woven into the overarching theme Josephus gives to *Antiquities*. The *terminus a quo* is uncertain but the *terminus ad quem* of the prophecy is the destruction of the Jewish Temple. However, the ‘eternal kingdom’ (Dan. 2:34,45; 7:14; 8:25; 12:3), which would come after this period is nowhere mentioned. The reason behind this, whether Josephus discarded that idea together with the Messianic interpretation of it, or that given his audience he did not want to address it, or that he did not think altogether it was meant as an eternal kingdom, is not extractable from *Antiquities* and remains unclear.

## Conclusion

To answer our question ‘How did Judaeans use the prophecies of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?’ this thesis discussed the Judaeans works of 1 Maccabees, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch and the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus. The first was used to show the change in usage of the Book of Daniel before the destruction compared to the other three which were written after the event. And whereas 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch gave a more apocalyptic interpretation, the writings of Flavius Josephus completed the spectrum with a more historical application of the Book.

First Maccabees showed the application of the prophecies of Daniel according to the first theory, namely: the contemporary interpretation. The prophecies were about the Maccabean Revolt and Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The Danielic moral of faithfulness to the Law is acknowledged but taken further as well into a call to arms against the regime which is not upholding that same Law (1 Macc. 2:61-68; Mason, “Daniel” 167). It is furthermore used as a legitimization of the Hasmonean regime being placed there by God Himself.

The opposite of this reaction is shown by 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, who, after the destruction of the Temple, mostly apply an introspective solution; the people of Israel are to blame, for they sinned and must now suffer accordingly. The pacifism of Daniel is kept; advocating the just ways of God and that He will redeem His people and punish their oppressor but on His time and terms. The usage of the Book of Daniel is, especially in 4 Ezra, one of an extending interpretation, being superior to the vision of ‘his brother Daniel’ (4 Ezra 12:10-13). Following the second option, the fourth kingdom is reinterpreted to be the Roman Empire, applying said prophecy to the contemporary times of the writer, to show that God is – even in the enormous crisis surrounding them – in control.

Whereas 1 Maccabees had corrected Daniel’s timetable and 4 Ezra reinterprets his visions, Josephus tries to rehabilitate the seer (Mason, “Daniel” 174). The overarching theme of the Judaeans god, who is in control of the rise and fall of empires and who gives knowledge of both history and future through His seers, needs the firm basis of full-filled, detailed predictions by His seer Daniel. As with the other writings, the *terminus ad quem* is made rather clear. Josephus says it to be the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 (the second theory). However, the *terminus a quo* is, as is in the other writings, not determined and left out of the story line.

Since Josephus’ time, the main Jewish interpretation<sup>58</sup> of Daniel is the application of its 490 years to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in 70 AD, in which the ‘cutting off of the anointed one’ should be seen as the murder of the high priest Ananus and not as the coming of an enduring or saving Messiah. However, as Beckwith (522) states: ‘The only known non-Messianic interpretation which dates from pre-Christian times has likewise a single anointed one, end of the 69 weeks. (...) This reaction against the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy seems not to have occurred until after the Jewish rejection of the Messiahship of Jesus and the disappointment of the other Jewish

---

<sup>58</sup> As Koch (*Das Buch* 128) states: ‘The perception that Daniel’s prophecies were being fulfilled was strengthened after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, because along with many Christians nearly all the rabbis saw that terrible catastrophe as the fulfilment of the timetable of Daniel 9:24-27.’

Messianic hopes of the first and second centuries.<sup>59</sup>

Therefore, both the court tales as well as the prophecies and dreams from the Book of Daniel have been used since the even older traditions surrounding Daniel and its usage increased even more after the Book of Daniel was completed and started to circulate. The interpretation of his visions differs but they were mostly applied to the contemporary situation and events the authors of the discussed writings were in.

---

<sup>59</sup> 'On Pharisaic chronology, the 69th of Daniel's seventy weeks ended in 63 A.D. [counted from the start of the exile], so the Messiah was imminently expected between then and A.D. 70. However, the expectation was disappointed. (...) The Essenes very plausibly argued that the starting point for the prophecy was the end of the Exile, and, since the Exile lasted 70 years, this would mean that they ought to be expecting the Messiah between 133 and 140 A.D. instead — the very time when Bar Kokhba rebelled. (...) Not surprisingly, therefore, it is after the time of the suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolt that the Jewish reaction against the Messianic interpretation of Daniel's 70-weeks prophecy seems to have set in' (Beckwith 539).



## Chapter 3 – Christian responses

In the previous chapters the analysis of the Book of Daniel itself and the Judaeen use of the book were addressed. This chapter will discuss the question: ‘How did Christians use the prophecies of the Book of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?’ It is important, as with the Judaeen responses, to have a multifaced answer to this question. However, the use of Christian texts from before the destruction of the Second Temple is a rather contested one in regard to dating. Whereas the dating of the Judaeen texts was not a significant issue, the dating of the books of the New Testament is more complex. ‘Until the eighteenth century almost all New Testament books were dated, in accordance with the authorship attributed to them, within the first Christian generation. Apart from the Johannine writings this usually meant AD 70 or earlier’ (Ellis 38).

Nowadays, the contemporary, majority view is that most of the New Testament books date to the mid- to late first century. The letters of the apostle Paul are the earliest, starting with 1 Thessalonians, and the Johannine writings latest (Brown 456–466; Kim 250; Perkins 19ff). However, some scholars find ‘sound reasons to question the consensus’ and think that for the Synoptic Gospels a ‘pre-war date is more plausible’ (R.T. France 19, Reicke 121). The scholarly majority embraces, for sound reasons as well, the post-70 dates for at least some of the gospels and Acts plus the non-Pauline letters. The point I want to make here, is that this thesis cannot go into detail about whether or not a specific book of the New Testament could be from before or after the destruction of the Temple. Our question is about the use of the Book of Daniel within the New Testament, in which the usage will be more important than whether or not the texts include genuine predictions of Jerusalem’s fall or prophecies *ex eventu*.

However, to answer the question of this chapter, various sources must be analysed. As already stated in the introduction, throughout the New Testament passages from Daniel are quoted or referred to. The letters traditionally connected with Paul quote or mention him on several occasions (2 Thes. 2:4 – Dan. 11:36, Gal. 4:4 – Dan. 9:25, or 2 Tim.4:17 – Dan. 6:22), and other letters do the same (Hebr. 11:33-34– Dan. 3:23-27, 6:1-27) but the references appear mostly in the (Synoptic) Gospels and Revelation (Hardy 2010).<sup>60</sup> Therefore those books will be used to address the New Testament’s usage of the Book of Daniel. The early Church Fathers up until AD 325, and especially the first commentary of Daniel by Hippolytus in AD 202-215, will then complement the picture of the ancient Christian perspective.

### New Testament

The five canonical Bible books this section will address are the four Gospels and the Book of Revelation. Frank W. Hardy (2010) indicates the possible references to the Book of Daniel in the New Testament and orders them according to their likelihood of being such a reference (1). This thesis will only address most of his ‘number ones,’ where there is a ‘relatively strong relationship’ between the two verses.<sup>61</sup> Only the strongly related verses will give an indication how the Book of Daniel was actually used in regard to the destruction of the Temple.

---

<sup>60</sup> In regard of the scope and because these references have already been proven to exist by countless biblical scholars (see Hardy 2010 and biblical commentaries), this thesis does not go into the in-depth discussion of proving each of these references. However, because of that condition, it will only use the strongest references (labelled a number 1 by Hardy 2010).

<sup>61</sup> See Hardy (1), where he used a ‘..scale of 1 to 3, where 1 indicates a relatively strong relationship and 3 a relatively weak one. Let 1 indicate that a New Testament writer probably had the indicated passage from Daniel consciously in mind as he wrote, let 2 indicate a lack of certainty as to whether this was the case, and let 3 indicate that there was in all likelihood no thought of Daniel on the part of the New Testament writer but only a similarity of subject matter.’

## Gospels

The use of Danielic words or ideas is abundant in the four canonical gospels.<sup>62</sup> The Synoptic Gospels have many references, specifically in the parts we now call the Synoptic Apocalypse (Matt. 24:1-25; Mark 13:1-27; Luke 21:5-38) (McGinn 58). In this part, three themes are most important in regard to the research question, namely the references to: 'the Reign of Heaven,' the 'abomination of desolation,' and the 'son of man.' These themes correspond with each other and are mostly used together, so links will occur between the three sections in the following analysis. Nonetheless, it is not the aim of this thesis to have an in-depth discussion concerning many of these terms, for the scope would simply be too broad. However, some of them must be briefly addressed if we are to decide whether or not a passage is a Danielic reference, and further in-depth discussion will be referred to in the footnotes. Besides these three main themes, there are other references to the Book of Daniel. These include, for example, the reference of John 5:29 to the final judgment in Daniel 12:2 and comparable vision scenes, such as one involving the angelic messenger Gabriel (Luke 1:19 and Dan. 8:16, 9:21). However, with regard to the focus of this thesis, the argument will mainly focus on the three main themes.

### *The Reign of Heaven*

The phrase 'the reign of heaven' (Greek: ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν)<sup>63</sup> is primarily used in the Gospel of Matthew and finds its equivalent in the other Synoptic Gospels as 'the reign of God' (Greek: ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ).<sup>64</sup> Combined with references such as 'His reign' or 'Your reign,' it occurs over seventy times (excluding the parables) in the three Synoptic Gospels, of which twenty-nine times<sup>65</sup> the term occurs in Matthew (Clarke 32; France, "Kingdom" 420).

The 'reign of God' or that 'God is the (almighty) ruler' was not a new concept introduced by Jesus or his followers, because the Old Testament is filled with such descriptions. Yahweh is referred to as king (מלך) forty-one times throughout the Old Testament (Eissfeldt, "Jahwe" 89). We often find such expressions as 'God reigns' and 'His reign,'<sup>66</sup> and the Sinaitic Covenant is written down as a royal covenant between a king and his people (Mendenhall 1955; Vetne 222). Besides this, there are two lines of divine kingship portrayed, or a 'twofold vision,' in both the Old- and New Testament, namely: that God already is king and sits on the throne, and secondly that a kingdom (or 'reign') has yet to come, when God will show His power and might to all (Dyrness 227-228; France, "Kingdom" 421; Vetne 223-224).

Nonetheless, although 'His reign' occurs in many parts of the Old Testament, 'the theme that is central to Daniel as it is to no other book in the OT is the kingdom [reign] of God' (Goldingay 330).<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> The idea that the narratives of the Book of Daniel have contributed to the Gospels is not new and has been covered significantly by for example: Dalman (*Words* 136), Evans (2:490-527), Pennington (279-330), and Wenham (132-134).

<sup>63</sup> It is important to keep in mind that the Greek βασιλεία and the Hebrew: מַלְכוּת – 'malkuth,' do not only translate to 'kingdom' but mainly to 'reign.' G.W. Buchanan frames this debate and says that there are many scholars who avoid the 'obvious political connotation' of 'kingdom' and chose 'reign' (117). However, G.E. Ladd (230-238) provides us with a list of different explanations for the use of 'reign.' Also others make a case for 'reign,' e.g. N. Perrin (*Rediscovering* 74), Koch ("Offenbaren" 158-160), or Geza Vermes in *Jesus the Jew* and *Jesus in his Jewish Context*.

<sup>64</sup> Most scholars say these phrases have an identical meaning. Foster (2002) states there is a difference within Matthew because he uses 'reign of God' as well. Matthew keeps Mark's phrase ('reign of God') four times, but usually changes it to 'reign of heaven.'

<sup>65</sup> The Accordance Bible Software even shows a total of thirty-one times.

<sup>66</sup> Examples Vetne (222) and France ("Kingdom" 420) provide are inter alia 1 Chr. 29:11, Ps. 22:29, 47:8, 93:1, 96:10, 103:19, 145:11-13 and Dan. 3:33, 4:31.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Clarke (31) calls the concept of the 'kingdom [reign] of God' 'almost completely absent from Hebrew Scripture.' Clarke added no arguments for his claim but I can imagine that compared to the significant emphasis of the New Testament, the Old Testament does not discuss this concept to a great extent.

Moreover, in the Book of Daniel a whole other application of expanding this reign is given. Whereas throughout the Old Testament the nation of Israel is used to execute God's will and show 'His reign,' the Book of Daniel shows more the individuality of faithful followers, but most importantly a God who will intervene through 'the rock which will be cut out but not by human hands' (Dan. 2:45). As Vente (230-231) states: 'All power and earthly Kingdoms are portrayed as temporary, manmade, and very often evil and abusive. God is portrayed as the one who possesses the real but unrecognized power. The recognized and exercised power belongs to humans, and it is consistently used for oppression and war [Dan. 2:37, 4:17, Dan. 5:18-26, 6:12, 7:21-25, 9:26-27, 11:33-36]. (...) God is the one who has the power but does not want to use it—until the very end of the age.'

This Danielic pacifism has already been spoken of in the earlier chapters of this thesis, but here as well it indicates a clear connection with the Synoptic Gospels, where Jesus connects the 'reign of heaven' to a divine judgment and restoration. Despite the use of the phrase 'the reign of God' in the Old Testament, these terms are not known to be widely used before Jesus, and as France (*Kingdom* 421) states, 'the phrase "the kingdom [reign] of God" may not yet have been widely used, but all the raw materials were there.' Thus, when Jesus said '*The reign of God has come near*' (e.g. Mat. 3:2, 4:17; Mark 1:15 and Luke 4:43), he builds on a tradition known from Daniel (e.g. 2:44). It entailed that the Judaeian sovereign God would intervene and that the 'king de jure' would become the 'king de facto' (*Kingdom* 421). God is shown to have the 'real and unrecognized power' and He will use it at 'the end of age' for 'The kingship and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them' (Dan. 7:27 NRSV), which is possibly echoed by Luke in 1:33-34, 12:32 and 22:29-30 (Hardy 2010). The 'kingdom or reign of God,' which was predicted in Daniel 2 and 7, is applied to the ministry of Jesus and his followers. However, the concept itself was also explained differently and the 'reign of God' became internalized<sup>68</sup> and allegorized as well, for example in Luke 17:21 '...the reign of God is within you,' or John 18:36 which states 'My reign is not of this world' (Clarke 33).

#### *Abomination of desolation*

Whereas the 'reign of God' is an indication that God would intervene or was intervening, the time indication is somewhat ambiguous for 'it had come near' according to the Gospel writers, but the divine intervention was not yet. However, the Danielic term 'abomination of desolation,' as shown in Chapter 2, is connected to the 490 years prophecy, which implies a definite *terminus ad quem*. This term is used in both Matthew and Mark, which recall Daniel 9:27, 11:31 and 12:11 in, respectively, Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 (Taylor 292).<sup>69</sup> In both cases the 'abomination of desolation' is connected with the Son of Man, which will be discussed in the next section, and the notions of a 'tribulation'<sup>70</sup> and the notice that it all 'must take place' (δεῖ γενέσθαι).<sup>71</sup> The meaning of the Son of

<sup>68</sup> In my opinion, this process can also be seen in Pauline theology where Paul combined the Jewish important triad of the Shabbat, Temple and Torah, with the Christian concept of grace (so not the Jewish law about the Shabbat and Torah) by transforming the physical Jewish Temple to the body of the believer, as being the 'Temple of the Holy Spirit' (1 Cor. 6:19).

<sup>69</sup> Mark 13:14 uses the words of Daniel with the phrase 'the abomination of desolation' (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως), whereas Matthew 24:15 states it even clearer with 'the abomination of desolation which is spoken by Daniel the prophet.' (Τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου,). There is universal agreement that these two texts quote the Book of Daniel (for all references, see Vetne 178-179).

<sup>70</sup> The tribulation (θλίψις) is a term from Daniel 12:1, which is referred to by both Matthew (24:20-21) and Mark (13:18,19). Again this thesis cannot do justice to all texts, therefore for further reference, see inter alia: Beasley-Murray (418-419), Hartman (150-151) and Vetne (209). Vetne (210 – footnote 108) made a list with many references if one wants to research this in-depth.

<sup>71</sup> The term 'δεῖ γενέσθαι' is a reference to Dan. 2:28-29 and Dan. 12, found in Matt. 25:15 and Mark 13:14, which is used by both writers but cannot be studied in-depth here. See A.Y. Collins (105-106) for more information concerning this phrase.

Man has been extensively debated and so has the usage of the term 'abomination of desolation' by both authors.

Here the dating of both works is of importance. Whether they were both written before the destruction of the Temple or at least the Gospel of Matthew was written after the event, makes a difference to their interpretation. That the Gospel of Mark was written shortly before the destruction is generally accepted, but because of that, in his use of the term 'abomination of desolation,' some scholars see the possibility it was describing not the Jewish War (AD 66-70) but the statue which Gaius Caligula wanted to place in the Jewish Temple in AD 40<sup>72</sup> (Bodenmann 125; A.Y. Collins 110; Hartman 162; McGinn 61).<sup>73</sup> Nonetheless, if this text was written in regard to the Jewish War, a position generally accepted for Matthew, there is no consensus among scholars as to whether the prophecy was an *ex eventu* reference to the pollution of the temple by Caligula or an actual prophecy concerning the Jewish War (Bodenmann 126-127; A.Y. Collins 110).<sup>74</sup>

Whether or not the prophecies described in the Gospels are *ex eventu*, they use Daniel in similar ways. The aforementioned option 2 or the Roman option, '...was current among Jews and Christians at least since the first century A.D., (...). It was not intended as a reinterpretation. Given the Roman control over Palestine and most of its surroundings, it appeared obvious that it was the empire of the Caesars and no other which had to be the kingdom made of iron and clay (Dan. 2:33) or the monster, terrible and dreadful and exceedingly strong [Dan. 7],...' (Koch, "Daniel Among" 127). The Gospel of Mark, for example, shows no attempt to reinterpret or adapt the 490 years prophecy; it only borrows the powerful image from the Book of Daniel to explain the current events (Bodenmann 121-134). A.Y. Collins even states that the phrase was borrowed 'without concern for the periodization of history present in the context of the first occurrence of the image in Dan. 9:24-27' (110).

Both Gospels use the phrase the 'abomination of desolation' as a prophecy in which Jesus describes the moment he will return and when the Temple would be destroyed (option 3). The Roman option (option 2) was the customary explanation during that time. However, neither of these gospels ascribes the prophecies and their *terminus ad quem*<sup>75</sup> directly to the events of AD 70.<sup>76</sup>

### *Son of Man*

As described above, the term 'the Son of Man' (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου/אֲנֹכִי בֶר) is much debated and even called 'one of the most controversial topics in New Testament studies in this century' (A.Y. Collins 90; Vetne 139).<sup>77</sup> This has two important consequences. Firstly, the scholarly debate is too extensive to fully discuss; only the most important conclusions will be summarized, whereas the footnotes refer to the larger discussion. Secondly, to answer the question of how the Gospels use the Book of Daniel in regard to the destruction of the Temple, the term Son of Man is, in most of the apocalyptic passages of the synoptics, combined with the phrase 'abomination of desolation.'<sup>78</sup> In

---

<sup>72</sup> Bilde (67-93) wrote a good article about this. The event itself is described by Josephus in *The Jewish War* II:184-203, the *Antiquities* 18.261-309, and Philo in *The Embassy of Gaius* 199-338.

<sup>73</sup> Bodenmann (125, 344) cited even more literature concerning this theory.

<sup>74</sup> For Matthew the majority of scholars believes it would be *ex eventu*, whereas for Mark there is no clear consensus.

<sup>75</sup> The lack of a definite *terminus ad quem* in these texts combined with apocalypses like Revelation, gave rise, until this day, to end-time theories concerning the contemporary destruction of the world.

<sup>76</sup> The absence of the destruction of the Temple in the New Testament, which was an event of enormous proportions for the region, is one of the main arguments of Robinson (1976) to state that the whole NT was written before AD 70.

<sup>77</sup> Other sources would be, besides and among the extensive body of references by A.Y. Collins (90-105), inter alia: Colpe (400-477), Hare (1-27), Higgins (13-25), Lindars (1-28), and Owen and Hurtado (1-27).

<sup>78</sup> The connection between the Son of Man and the destruction of the Temple is mostly symbolized by the phrase 'the Son of Man is coming on the clouds.' This phrase 'coming on the clouds' could be discussed in a

light of the research question about the use of Daniel, it is significant that the Gospels combine Son of Man and the 'abomination of desolation' (A.Y. Collins 97, 111).

Since the literary criticism of the nineteenth century, the old Christian theological consensus about the Son of Man being an actual person or Messiah has shifted into a mosaic of opinions concerning its origin and meaning. For example: some argue that the phrase was not used by Jesus but attributed to him by the early church (e.g. Perrin 10-18; idem, *Rediscovering* 176-181), others that it was an Aramaic idiom for speaking about oneself or a human being and had nothing to do with the apocalyptic tradition (A.Y. Collins 91).<sup>79</sup> Despite these views, the hypothesis that Jesus represented himself as a special figure called the Son of Man is generally thought to explain more evidence than other proposals (A.Y. Collins 92). Thus, the influence of Daniel 7:13 on the Synoptic Gospels in this matter is still determined to be one of a high probability. A.Y. Collins (90) states: 'Most scholars categorize the Son of Man sayings in the Synoptic Gospels into three groups: (1) sayings dealing with the future, apocalyptic role of the Son of Man; (2) sayings referring to the suffering, death, and resurrection of the Son of Man; and (3) sayings expressing the authority of the Son of Man in the present (i.e., during the public life of Jesus).'<sup>80</sup>

For this thesis the importance of the phrase lies especially with the first group because the most evident application of this phrase from the Book of Daniel is in the context of eschatological judgment (97).<sup>81</sup> The link between the 'abomination of desolation,' the 'tribulation,' and the Son of Man appears in many of these instances (97).

In conclusion, the use of Daniel in the (Synoptic) Gospels centres around the use of eschatological terms in which the prophecies are applied to Jesus, being the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13).<sup>82</sup> He makes way for the 'kingdom/reign of heaven' (Dan. 2:44), which would come soon after a great 'tribulation' (Dan. 12:1-2) of the faithful ones, and an 'abomination of desolation' (Dan. 9:27, 11:31, 12:11) in the Temple/Jerusalem. Nowhere is the Roman option (option 2 – the destruction of the Temple in AD 70) explicitly ascribed, so we mainly see option 3: the 'patently apocalyptic use of the Danielic prophecy, which could be made to fit the prospect of any great calamity which should strike at the heart of the Jewish religion' (Montgomery 396). This future eschatological use of the prophecies of Daniel pragmatically blends with option 2 during the turmoil of the following decades, for both options were applicable to the crisis of the destruction (Koch, "Daniel Among" 127).

## Revelation

Revelation is the only apocalyptic work as such in the New Testament, although there are passages in other texts, such as the Synoptic Apocalypse. Revelation and Daniel are the only two canonical apocalypses (Himmelfarb 2). The use of Daniel in Revelation is significant,<sup>83</sup> but to answer the question how the Christians used the *prophecies* of the Book of Daniel, we shall focus on the dream of Daniel 2, and the visions in the latter part of the book.

Revelation never explicitly quotes the Old Testament, but the language and ideas of the prophets

---

thesis of its own. Once again, however, this thesis has to focus on selected elements, of which the term Son of Man must suffice. Interesting, however, is that in Dan. 7:13 the Son of Man uses the clouds to reach the Ancient of Days (God) (from earth to heaven), but in the Gospels the clouds are used to come from heaven to earth.

<sup>79</sup> For an in-depth discussion, see A.Y. Collins (90-92) and for the history of the terminology this thesis refers to Hartman & Di Lella (85-102).

<sup>80</sup> The different Bible passages and where they belong in this threefold division can be found in A.Y. Collins (96-97).

<sup>81</sup> Being Luke 12:40/Matt. 24:44; Luke 17:24/Matt. 24:27; Luke 17:26/Matt. 24:37; Luke 17:30/Matt. 24:39; Luke 6:22, 11:30, 12:8-9.

<sup>82</sup> The *Parousia* of Jesus, the triumphant return of him in all his power, was believed to be predicted in inter alia the Book of Daniel which led to the Christian antichrist tradition, through Revelation and epistles such as 2 Thess 2:3-4 (see McGinn 52).

<sup>83</sup> For an extensive overview, this thesis suggests Beale (154-305) or the earlier mentioned document of Hardy (2010).

permeates the entire document (A.Y. Collins 102). When Revelation 1:7a says ‘Look, he is coming with the clouds,’ the reference is to Daniel 7:13 (NRSV),<sup>84</sup> ‘As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being [son of man], coming with the clouds of heaven,’ but not with the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as for example in Matthew 24:30. Revelation radically interprets the concept of the Son of Man and creates an identifiable and specific identity out of the tradition of Daniel 7; the risen Jesus (A.Y. Collins 105; Towner 105). Whereas it does identify Jesus as the ‘one like a son of man’ (Rev. 1:13), it uses a broader Jewish apocalyptic tradition describing the divine attributes of this man.<sup>85</sup>

However, whereas the Son of Man occurs both in the Synoptic Gospels and in Revelation, the phrase ‘abomination of desolation’ does not appear (A.Y. Collins 112). Thus, there are some differences between the Gospels and Revelation in their use of Daniel.

The statue of Daniel 2 is only once referred to in regard to the conclusion of the vision, because according to Dan. 2:35 (Theodotion’s Greek) the remains of the statue are carried away by the wind ‘and no place was found for them’ (καὶ τόπος οὐχ εὐρέθη αὐτοῖς). This exact phrase is used in Revelation 20:11 to describe the ‘heaven and earth fleeing for the son of man, καὶ τόπος οὐχ εὐρέθη αὐτοῖς.’ This shows the definitive end of the world and the start of something new under the eternal rule of God.<sup>86</sup>

However, the centre of gravity in regard to the usage of the Book of Daniel by Revelation is the vision of Daniel 7 and 8 in Revelation 13 (Himmelfarb 71; McGinn 73). The verses 1-2a describe the scene: ‘And I saw a beast rising out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads; and on its horns were ten diadems, and on its heads were blasphemous names. And the beast that I saw was like a leopard, its feet were like a bear’s, and its mouth was like a lion’s mouth’ (NRSV). This one beast coming out of the sea combines ‘salient characteristics of each of the four beasts of Daniel 7:2-7’ (A.Y. Collins 107).<sup>87</sup> Revelation does not attempt to interpret the vision of Daniel, but it adapts the images of Daniel in ‘an analogously historical and political way’ (108). The act of rebellion of the beast(s) described by Daniel (7:8, 11, 20, 25) is used as well by Revelation 13:5, where ‘The beast was given a mouth uttering haughty and blasphemous words’ (NRSV) (Beale 232). This act also occurs in the vision of Daniel 8, which interpretation (verses 10-14) Revelation 13:5b-6 summarizes, showing four common elements: ‘...to exercise its authority for forty-two months [1. Dan. 8:14]. It opened its mouth to blaspheme God [2. Dan. 8:11], and to slander his name and his dwelling place [3. Dan. 8:11] and those who live in heaven [4. Dan. 8:10].’ This indicates how long the crisis would continue (see 1), that there would be rebellion and attacks against God and His heavenly beings (see 2 and 4), and that there would be an attack on the temple (see 3) (A.Y. Collins, *The Combat Myth* 163). During this period the saints, as in Dan. 7:21, are not safe and Rev. 13:3 predicts a time of tribulation and persecution (A.Y. Collins 108).

---

<sup>84</sup> Referring as well to Zechariah 12:10-12.

<sup>85</sup> Rev. 1:12-16 describes the ‘one like a son of man’ inter alia as ‘The hair on his head was white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes were like blazing fire. His feet were like bronze glowing in a furnace’ (vs. 14-15a), which not only shows a reference to Daniel 7:9 and 10:5-6, but also to other writings. 1 Enoch 46:1 speaks of a ‘head of days’ and ‘his head was white like wool,’ or the Apocalypse of Abraham 11:2 speaks of snow-like hair on the head of Iaoel (see A.Y. Collins 103, especially footnote 72, 73 for further references).

<sup>86</sup> The personal afterlife was known in the Judean worldview (see e.g. 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-82, or much later Josephus accounts on the Pharisees) but the Book of Daniel is the first who writes about the ‘resurrection of the dead’ (Dan. 12:2). Whereas Daniel describes the notion of ‘many rising,’ Revelation extends this notion into a general resurrection and on this exact phrase (Dan. 12:2) the ‘notion of distinct eternal destinies for good and wicked people may be dependent’ (A.Y. Collins 111).

<sup>87</sup> More information in regard to content and wording between these two visions, see Charles (*Revelation* 1.344-357).



The fourth beast of Daniel 7 represents the Greek empire of Alexander the Great, and the 'little horn' the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Revelation, again, copies the symbols but not what they symbolize. Therefore, we must look to the book itself to understand its references. As in most apocalypses the symbolisms avoid the explicit mention of the ones intended, but the scholarly consensus is that John refers to the Roman Empire when talking about the 'beast coming out of the sea' (A.Y. Collins 108; Himmelfarb 171; McGinn 74). The most explicit mention is verse 18: 'This calls for wisdom: let anyone with understanding calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a person. Its number is six hundred sixty-six' (NRSV). The number '666' has been mainly understood as gematria, according to which the Hebrew writing of Nero Caesar (נרון קסר, *NRON QSR*) and its letter values (50 200 6 50 100 60 200) add up to 666 (A.Y. Collins, *The Combat Myth* 174-175; McGinn 75).<sup>88</sup>

Another element of Daniel's use in Revelation, which will appear in the Early Church Fathers as well, is the indication of how long the crisis would last (A.Y. Collins 109). Daniel 8:14 speaks of 'two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings,' some say an equivalent to 1,150 days or three and a half years, which Rev. 13:5 uses by mentioning that it would last 'forty-two months.' Such cryptic time formulations appear throughout Daniel, such as: 'a time, two times, and half a time' in 7:25, the 'half a week' in 9:27, and in Rev. 13 'two more-or-less equivalent periods are mentioned later in the chapter: 1,290 days (v 11) and 1,335 days (v 12)' (109). Here it symbolizes the persecution of Antiochus IV (7:25) and the desecration of the Temple (8:13-14, 9:27, 12:11). The forty-two months of Revelation 11:2 are connected to the desecration of the Temple, after which the 'two witnesses will prophecy' (1,260 days, 11:3) but also the amount of time the 'woman is to be taken care of' (12:6), or 'a time, and times, and half a time' (12:4). However, here again, the prophecies of Daniel are not interpreted but the symbols are being used to create a whole new message.

The last distinctive element is the contrasting parallel found in Rev. 22:10-11, which alludes to Dan. 12:9-10. Whereas Daniel is commanded by the angel 'to seal the words,' John is told not to 'seal the words.' This difference mainly occurs because whereas John writes under his own name, the Book of Daniel is pseudonymous and back-dated, and so the 'sealing of the words' explains why the book remained unknown until the actual time of composition (A.Y. Collins 111).

In conclusion, Revelation does not interpret Daniel but uses the traditions and symbols of the book to establish a new vision, contemporary to its writer, concerning the Roman Empire and the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70.

### Early Church Fathers<sup>89</sup>

Until Irenaeus in the late second century, the application of the Book of Daniel, or eschatological related sources such as Revelation, is scarce within surviving Christian literature. The period of the

---

<sup>88</sup> The legend surrounding Nero is a complicated one (McGinn 66-76). The calculation of 666 has shown different results since the second century AD, for does one take 666 just as symbolizing the pure evil in contrast to 888 (meaning of Jesus), or is it gematria (*Sibylline Oracles* 1:324-330; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.15.2). Further, some documents show '616' instead of '666' but this can be easily explained because the Latin versions say *NRO QSR* (without the final 'n', thus in Hebrew: נרו קסר), which leads to '616' (McGinn 75; Oberweis 226-236; *Against Heresies* 5.30.3).

<sup>89</sup> When referring to the documents of the Early Church Fathers, the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* Vol. I-X (1885) are mostly used.

Apostolic Fathers,<sup>90</sup> from the time of the apostles until Justin Martyr<sup>91</sup> (died around AD 165), is called by some the ‘twilight period’ between the ‘authoritative teachings of the disciples and the development of the literature of the early church philosophers. Their first writings were not so much history, expositions, or apologies, as simply letters’ (Froom 205). Therefore, in many of them a coherent eschatology still had to be developed, which led to a blend of apocalyptic visions and texts concerning not only the Book of Daniel and Revelation, but also the Christian Antichrist-concept (see 1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7:2; 2 Thess. 2:3-12).<sup>92</sup> The development of this concept entailed not only the term ‘antichrist’ used in the Johannine epistles, but during this period it started to include the ‘little horn’ of Daniel 7-8 and the ‘lawless one’ of 2 Thess. 2 (referring to Dan. 7:25, 9:27) as well.

The last chapter of the *Didache*, for example,<sup>93</sup> is an apocalypse with strong similarities to the Synoptic Apocalypse and the Book of Daniel. The ‘world deceiver’ (16:8 – Mark 13:22; 2 Thess. 2:4, 9) would come, the ‘earth will be delivered into his hands’ (16:9 – Dan. 7:21; Rev. 13:7) and he will commit ‘abominations’<sup>94</sup> (16:10 – Dan. 12:1; Mark 13:19; 2 John 7; Rev. 12:9, 13:2, 19:20), but the people who will ‘endure in their faith will be saved’ (16:12 – Mark 13:13). Then a ‘trumpet shall sound’ (16:14 – Matt. 24:31a; 1 Thess. 4:13-18) and ‘some of the dead will be resurrected’ (16:14 – Dan. 12:2; Matt. 24:31b), and the ‘Lord will come upon the clouds of heaven’ (16:17 – Dan. 7:13; Mark 13:26; Rev. 1:7a).<sup>95</sup>

The *Epistle of Barnabas* uses the Book of Daniel in regard to the destruction of the Jewish Temple, describing the fourth beast of Daniel as the Roman Empire (4:4-5) and taking the *terminus ad quem* of the seventy weeks to be the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 (16:6). However, apparently there is an effort to rebuild the temple in his days (16:3-5), but the author sees the only valid temple to be a spiritual one, for ‘God dwells truly in our habitation within us’ (16:9) and thus, ‘This is the spiritual temple built up to the Lord’ (16:10).

The process of the blending of different antichrist and apocalyptic traditions into one more or less coherent story can be seen in the works of Irenaeus and Hippolytus in the late second and early third century AD (McGinn 81). However, because of the merging of these different apocalyptic traditions, as shown above in the *Didache* and *Epistle of Barnabas*, one of the clearest references to analyse in the work of the Early Church Fathers will be the seventy week’s prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27. Other imagery from Daniel, for example the beasts, could blend with later visions, but this prophecy could not. For this reason, this prophecy will provide the reference point for our

---

<sup>90</sup> The term only exists since the late seventeenth century. First used by J.B. Cotelier in his book *Patres, qui temporibus Apostolicis floruerunt* (Paris, 1672) and later by the book ‘The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers S. Barnabas, S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. The Shepherd of Hermas, And the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp, [. . .]. Translated and Publish’d, with a large Preliminary Discourse [. . .]’ by William Wake (1657-1737) (De Jonge 504).

<sup>91</sup> Justin Martyr made fourteen references to the Book of Daniel in his work *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (ca. AD 153–165) but strangely none to Dan. 9:24-27 (Tanner 185). And in *First Apology* he wrote chapter 47 concerning the foretold prophecies to the desolation of Judaea.

<sup>92</sup> The name ‘antichrist’ is a Christian concept, however, the concept or image of an anti-divine ruler is not. Already in the Old Testament and the later Jewish apocalypses of the Second Temple Period this concept is used. See besides Daniel 7 and 9:11, for example: 4 Ezra 11-12; 2 Baruch 39; the Assumption of Moses 8; Baruch 4:1-5; Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah 4; Sibylline Oracles 8.88f and 139-159; as well as Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* 31:2-32:4 and 110:2 (Oegema 3-4).

<sup>93</sup> Another reference is the letter to the Philippians by Polycarp (inter alia chapter 7, 23-26, 34,45).

<sup>94</sup> It is the same word ‘abomination.’ However, the term ‘abomination of desolation’ is a distinct one, which is not used here.

<sup>95</sup> The biblical references shown here are not all the possible links, however, it is useful to give some indication of the combination and blending of the aforementioned traditions concerning Christian eschatology in this period.



interpretation of several Early Church Fathers, in relation to the destruction of the Jewish Temple.<sup>96</sup>

However, there is one theory which was held by many of the following Early Church Fathers, which is important to keep in mind, namely: the Millennial Day Theory.<sup>97</sup> This theory states that for every day of the six-day Creation story in Genesis, the world would exist for a thousand years, and after those 6,000 years Jesus would return and reign 1,000 years: the Sabbath Millennium.<sup>98</sup> This theory was based on Psalm 90:4 and 2 Peter 3:8 ('With the Lord a day is like a thousand years, and a thousand years are like a day'), in keeping with which the Millennial Reign of Christ of Rev. 20:1-6 could be understood as the Sabbath Millennium. The birth of Jesus occurred around 5,500 years after creation, on this view, and therefore the *Parousia* or return of Christ would happen around 500 AD.<sup>99</sup> Because of this theory, many of the apocalyptic scriptures were explained by Christian writers within this timeframe, and so they interpreted the Book of Daniel's relevance to the destruction of the Temple and to their own times in this light.

Irenaeus of Lyon (writing ca. AD 180)

The magnum opus of Irenaeus is his five-volume *Against Heresies*, which addresses eschatology in book 5. However, Beckwith (539) still includes its eschatological views in the 'somewhat uncertain second-century beginning,' for he states that 'The Christian exegesis begins in earnest at the outset of the third century to expound the seventy weeks as weeks of years leading up to the coming of the Messiah Jesus and the destruction of Jerusalem which followed.' Arguably this conclusion is justified, for Irenaeus' application of the Book of Daniel differs from that of the other Early Church Fathers. Irenaeus especially uses the visions of Daniel 2 and 7, and the seventy weeks prophecy of Daniel 9, in *Against Heresies* 5.26-28. He does not give a *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* is an unknown event in the future. However, the fourth kingdom (Dan. 7) and the legs (Dan. 2) are the Roman Empire which has to end in a tenfold partition (*Against Heresies* 5.25,26). The tenfold partition arises from the ten horns (Dan. 7 and Rev. 17) and the ten toes (Dan. 2), which then, after the partition, will be smashed by the rock (Dan. 2:44-45), which is the second coming of Jesus Christ. The second coming will be preceded by the three-and-a-half-year reign of the Antichrist after which the Temple will see the foretold 'abomination of desolation' (5.25.4 – Dan. 9:27),<sup>100</sup> and then 'they shall be destroyed by the coming of the Lord' (5.26.1). There is no mention of the other three and a half years, or the preceding sixty-nine weeks. Irenaeus does not state anything about the sixty-nine weeks, its *terminus a quo*, or whether there is a gap between the sixty-ninth and seventieth week. Moreover, there is no application to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. He does develop the idea of the antichrist by combining the 'little horn' of Dan. 7:8, the 'son of perdition' of 2 Thess. 2:3-4 and the 'beast out of the sea' of Revelation, which will rule as the 'eighth king' of Revelation 17

---

<sup>96</sup> Here as well, because of the length restriction, the Early Church Fathers will be addressed briefly, with the aid of research by Beckwith (1981), Fromm (1946), Graham (2015), Van Kooten (2009), Oegema (2006), and Tanner (2009).

<sup>97</sup> As Beckwith (537) states: 'The week of millennia, though there is one baraita in the Babylonian Talmud which speaks of it (Sanhedrin 97a), is on the whole a Christian conception rather than a Jewish, and is based by Christians on a non-Pharisaic chronology.'

<sup>98</sup> In regard to the Early Church Fathers, see: *the Epistle of Barnabas* 15:4, Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* 80-81, Irenaeus's *Against Heresies* 5.38.3, Hippolytus's *Commentary On Daniel* 4.23.3-6 and Julius Africanus' *Chronography* 18:4.

<sup>99</sup> Ofcourse, this did not occur. However, this did not create a significant problem because before 500 AD the LXX timeframe (creation at 5500 BC) fell into abeyance, through inter alia the acceptance of the Vulgate as the preferred translation, and the timeframe of the Masoretic Text (creation around 4000 BC) became accepted. This could have resulted in the expectation that Christ would return in the twenty-first century, but because they were expecting Christ's return fairly soon, the whole theory fell into abeyance as well.

<sup>100</sup> This connection will become common practice. However, as Van Kooten (298-299) states, it may go against the original meaning of Matthew 24 or Mark 13, where it is applied to the destruction of AD 70.

(Froom 245-250). Most scholars therefore state that Irenaeus does not supply a complete coverage (252; Tanner 186).

#### Clement of Alexandria (writing ca. AD 200)

In Clement's *Stromata* the use of prophecies is not significant, but there are two places where he refers to the Book of Daniel. He is the first to apply the seventy weeks of Daniel to events in the past – option 4 (Froom 265). In chapter 21 he quotes Daniel 9:24-27, ascribing the first seven sevens to the building of the Temple ('for it was written in Edras') in the second year of Darius I in 520 BC. The last seven was fulfilled by Jesus Christ and the sixty-two sevens accounted for the period in-between, for 'the whole of Judaea was quiet, and without wars.' (*Stromata* 21). However, the last week encompasses not only the advent of Jesus but also the reign of Nero and the destruction of the Temple.<sup>101</sup> Thus, including both Jesus' advent and the destruction of AD 70 makes his interpretation messianic-historical, but 'he is the first to posit what becomes conventional in later interpretations: a presumed hiatus between the first 69 weeks, and the final week' (Adler 225).

Later in the chapter, Clement adds other time-related prophecies from Revelation to the last week, the 1290 (Rev. 13:11), 1335 (Rev. 13:12), and 2300 (twist on Dan. 8:14) days, which he combines with the rules of Nero, Otho, Galba, Vitellius, and Vespasian. This attempt is inter alia called 'very imperfect' and an 'obvious discrepancy' (Froom 266; Jerome 105; Tanner 186).

Nonetheless, the *terminus a quo* of the 490-years is given at the resumption of the rebuilding of the Second Temple in the second year of Darius I (ca. 520 BC)<sup>102</sup> and the *terminus ad quem* is the destruction of the same Temple under Vespasian, a period of about 590 years (Beckwith 539-540).

#### Tertullian (writing ca. AD 203)

The application of the seventy weeks by Tertullian of Carthage<sup>103</sup> has its *terminus a quo* with the first year of Darius the Mede,<sup>104</sup> the supposed year of Daniel's prophecy, and its *terminus ad quem* in the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian by Titus<sup>105</sup> (Beckwith 539). However, the seventy weeks are not divided in 'seven – sixty-two – one' but in two periods of sixty-two-and-a-half-hebdomads<sup>106</sup> and seven-and-a-half-hebdomads: 'And thou shalt know, and thoroughly see, and understand, from the going forth of a word for restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem unto the Christ, the Leader, hebdomads (seven and a half, and) LXII and an half' (*Contra Judaeos* Chapter 8). The reasons why he does this is unclear. He then supplies a list of all the rulers from Darius plus their ruling years until the birth of Jesus (sixty-two and a half hebdomads) and then a list of rulers from that period until the first year of Vespasian when the Temple was destroyed (seven and a half hebdomads). Needless to say there were some errors in his calculations.

---

<sup>101</sup> *Stromata* Chapter 21 states: 'The half of the week Nero held sway, and in the holy city Jerusalem placed the abomination; and in the half of the week he was taken away, and Otho, and Galba, and Vitellius. And Vespasian rose to the supreme power, and destroyed Jerusalem, and desolated the holy place.'

<sup>102</sup> How Clement here handles the discrepancy of more than a 100 years in this period is unknown (Beckwith 540).

<sup>103</sup> For more information concerning the relationship between Tertullian and the Book of Daniel, see: Dunn (330-344) and idem, 2004.

<sup>104</sup> The debate whether or not Darius the Mede is fictional, is, in regard to Tertullian's argument, irrelevant, because the time indication was placed by him as Darius being a contemporary of Cyrus the Great (ca. 539 BC). However, Tertullian confuses Darius the Mede with Darius II Nothus, who lived over a century later and ascended the throne in 423 BC (Beckwith 539).

<sup>105</sup> Tertullian states: 'He [Jesus] had to suffer, and the holy city had to be exterminated after one and an half hebdomad—whereby namely, the seven and an half hebdomads have been completed' (*Contra Judaeos* Chapter 8).

<sup>106</sup> As Tanner (187) states: 'The term "hebdomad" is taken from the Greek term used by Theodotion, namely, ἑβδομάδες from the root ἑβδομάς ("week"). This term was used in the Septuagint of Leviticus 25:8 to indicate a seven-year period. The Hebrew has "seven sabbaths of years," meaning forty-nine years.'

Hippolytus (writing ca. AD 202-230)

The *Commentary on Daniel* is the oldest Christian commentary known and consists of in-depth analyses and insights of the application of the prophecies of Daniel by the Early Church. The immense work deserves more than one chapter section, but for the purpose of surveying applications of the Book of Daniel by the Early Church in regard of the destruction of Jerusalem, we must be brief. Even with this significant work, our focus must remain on Daniel 2, 7-9.

Whereas some Christian interpreters applied the prophecies of Daniel concerning the 'abomination of desolation' to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, most applied his visions since the third century to a premillennialist, future coming of the antichrist (Van Kooten 298). Hippolytus is one of the few<sup>107</sup> who still applies this prediction, at least partly, to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Hippolytus states: 'Daniel has spoken, therefore, of two abominations; the one of destruction, and the other of desolation. What is that of destruction, but that which Antiochus established there at the time? And what is that of desolation, but that which shall be universal when Antichrist comes?' (*Comm. Dan.* 4.25-28, 53.1). Thus, Daniel 9 has seen its partial fulfilment with Antiochus IV but a future event will complete the prophecy.

The *terminus a quo* of the 490 years corresponds with Tertullian's ('Darius the Mede,' but meaning ca. 530 BC),<sup>108</sup> but Hippolytus ends the sixty-ninth week at the birth of Christ (Beckwith 540).<sup>109</sup> The length of the time gap between the sixty-ninth and seventieth week depends on the Millennial Day theory (*Comm. Dan.* 4.23) and the fulfilment depends on the visions of Daniel 2, 7-8. Both the statue and beasts are explained as being the Roman Empire, out of which the tenfold partition will give rise to the antichrist (*Comm. Dan.* 2.12-13, 4.14). Thus: 'The "legs of iron" are the "dreadful and terrible beast," by which the Romans who hold the empire now are meant. The "toes of clay and iron" are the "ten horns" which are to be. The "one other little horn springing up in their midst" is the "antichrist." The stone that "smites the image and breaks it in pieces," and that filled the whole earth, is Christ, who comes from heaven and brings judgment on the world' (*Comm. Dan.* 2.13). However, Hippolytus' last week entails some details which did not occur with his predecessors nor contemporaries. The first three and a half years of the last week will be the 1,260 day (Rev. 11:3) period in which then Enoch and Elijah (4.35.3) show as the two witnesses, after which the antichrist will bring the abomination of desolation and the 1,290 (Rev. 13:11) days of his reign start (*Comm. Dan.* 4.50.2). And then, 'To those who survive the forty-five days beyond the 1290, completing 1335 days, the kingdom [reign] of heaven comes' (Froom 276; McGinn 86; *Comm. Dan.* 4.54.1). Especially this last phase is significantly more influenced by the Book of Revelation than the Book of Daniel.

Compared to the other Early Church Fathers, Hippolytus's predictions of Christ's return are unusually specific and clear, for which he uses the Millennial Day theory to determine the return (*Comm. Dan.* 4.23-24). Based on Christ's birth (on 25 December in Augustus' forty-second year), the second coming should be within the next 500 years to fulfil the 6,000 years of history, after which the Millennial reign of Jesus would start.

Thus, in contrast to Clement, Hippolytus advocates a messianic-eschatological interpretation, whereas Clement argues for a messianic-historical view, seeing the seventy weeks as completely fulfilled in the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70 (Tanner 189).

Julius Africanus (writing after AD 232)

The application of the seventy-weeks prophecy is what sets Julius Africanus apart from the others on both his *terminus a quo* and his *terminus ad quem* (Tanner 192). He rejects the *terminus a quo* of, for

---

<sup>107</sup> Others are inter alia Jerome and Cassian in the fourth and fifth century AD.

<sup>108</sup> Origen's *terminus a quo* corresponds with them as well, but his *terminus ad quem* is the advent of Jesus (*De Principiis* 4.1.5).

<sup>109</sup> It's here Daniel 9:24 is said to be fulfilled, namely: 'The "anointing of the most holy" in Daniel 9:24 refers to the anointing of Christ in His first coming (a view common among the early church fathers)' (Tanner 189).

example Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Origen, and he starts his calculations with the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes (ca. 444 BC) (*On the Seventy Weeks of Daniel* 16.1).<sup>110</sup> This new date then brings his *terminus ad quem* to the fifteenth year of Tiberius, which according to Luke 3:1 was the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. However, this is the only application Julius makes according to the seventy-weeks prophecy. He does not relate it to the destruction of Jerusalem of AD 70<sup>111</sup> nor suggest how Daniel 9:27 corresponds to his messianic-historical view (Tanner 192).

Eusebius (writing ca. 314-318 AD)

The last of the Ante-Nicene Fathers this thesis analyses is Eusebius, for he supplies two theories on the 490-years. The first application starts by counting the first sixty-nine weeks from the reign of Cyrus to the invasion of the Roman general Pompey, which Eusebius dates between July 64 BC and June 63 BC.<sup>112</sup> The period between the ascension of Cyrus, not 539 BC when he conquered Babylon but counting from 559 BC when he became king of Anshan, until the sixth year of the reign of Darius represent the first seven sevens (*Demonstratio Evangelica* 8.2.392-395; Tanner 194).<sup>113</sup> The sixty-two weeks, consisting of 434 years, are then reckoned from the sixth year of the Persian king to the moment Judaea was conquered by Pompey. The death of 'the anointed one' (Dan. 9:26) was not a messianic reference, because every high priest was reckoned to be an anointed one. Alexander Jannaeus (high priest from 103-76 BC)<sup>114</sup> was the last 'anointed one' and when he died, according to Eusebius, 'the sixty-two weeks of years came to their conclusion in the aftermath of Alexander Jannaeus when Pompey seized Judea for Rome' (Tanner 195).

The second view Eusebius offers, assigns the *terminus a quo* to the completion of the Temple during the reign of Darius in ca. 515 BC, after which sixty-nine weeks of years are counted until the days of the Roman emperor Augustus and King Herod, the 'first king of foreign stock' (*DE* 8.2.395). Moreover, in the last phase of the sixty-two weeks of years, Jesus was born (*DE* 8.2.396). The 'anointed one being cut off' (Dan. 9:26) would then apply to the murder of John Hyrcanus II by Herod in 30 BC, which did not merely cut off an anointed one but cut off the ancient, ancestral order of the Mosaic High-Priesthood (8.2.394-397).<sup>115</sup> Then Eusebius assumes a gap in the prophecy for both theories, stating: 'And afterwards comes the one remaining week, separated from them and divided by a long interval, during which occurred all the other events that are predicted in between' (*DE* 8.2.396). Eusebius saw Daniel 9:26b<sup>116</sup> as metaphorically fulfilled when Herod the Great came to power and then literally by the Romans in AD 70 (Tanner 196). In this period the last seven unfolded: the first three and a half years symbolized Jesus' public ministry and the New Covenant he 'made

---

<sup>110</sup> As 16.1 states: 'And the beginning of the numbers, that is, of the seventy weeks which make up 490 years, the angel instructs us to take from the going forth of the commandment to answer and to build Jerusalem. And this happened in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia.' His exact calculations to his *terminus ad quem* are described in 16.2-3, and quoted by Eusebius in *Demonstratio Evangelica* 8.2.389. For the commandment of Artaxerxes, see Nehemia 2 or Josephus *Antiquities* 9.159-167.

<sup>111</sup> The fact that he does not apply his theory to the destruction, would suggest to leave him out of this analysis, but this is a good example of a Christian work which used the Book of Daniel in an argument against applying the seventy weeks to the destruction of AD 70.

<sup>112</sup> Eusebius dates this invasion in the 179<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, according to Finegan (96) this means from July 1, 64 BC – June 30, 63 BC.

<sup>113</sup> This constitutes only for forty-six years, Eusebius apparently based this period on John 2:20 (which is an error for it refers not to this Temple but to Herod's), and then refers to Josephus who stated 'three more years were spent completing the surrounding outside buildings,' resulting in the needed forty-nine years (*DE* 8.2.392).

<sup>114</sup> These calculations are close because the period between the sixth year of Darius and the death of Alexander Jannaeus is about 440 years (compared to the 434 years of the sixty-two weeks).

<sup>115</sup> Compared to other Early Church Fathers it is surprising that in both Eusebius' views the 'anointed one' (Dan. 9:26) has not gotten a messianic historical reference, but the following verse is explained in such manner.

<sup>116</sup> '...and the troops of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary' (NRSV).

with many' (Dan. 9:27), his death tore the veil of the Holy of Holiest (Matt. 27:51), and put an end to sacrifice and offering. The second three and a half years was his post-resurrection period (*DE* 8.2.400-401).<sup>117</sup> Then Eusebius has an interesting use of Dan. 9:27, because the veil was torn and therefore 'the abomination of desolation stood in the holy place, inasmuch as the Being had left them desolate, (...) and when it [the veil] was removed, the abomination of desolation, as the prophecy before us says, appeared in its place' (*DE* 8.2.401). As Eusebius stated through Daniel 9:26c,<sup>118</sup> during this period the Temple was desolate, being in itself already an abomination of desolation.<sup>119</sup>

Thus, the *terminus a quo* of both views differs, however, the *terminus ad quem* is for both views the period between the public ministry of Jesus and the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70.

## Conclusion

To answer the question 'How did Christians use the prophecies of the Book of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple?', this thesis analyzed the Gospels, the Book of Revelation, and the works of the Early Church Fathers.

In the Gospels, especially the Synoptic Gospels, the prophecies of the Book of Daniel are applied to the contemporary world of the writers, which assigns new *relevance* to the visions of Daniel 2, 7-9. The interpretation was mostly not an intentional act but only seemed the logical and obvious explanation of the prophecies in that period of time (Koch, "Daniel Among" 127). The fourth beast and the 'iron kingdom' become the Roman Empire and through *inter alia* the Epistles of the New Testament, a new, Christian tradition of an anti-Christ is born.

The Book of Revelation does not interpret the visions of Daniel in relation to Daniel's meaning, but uses the symbols and traditions of the book to create a new, powerful image in regard to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70. As Mason (*Jewish War* 4) states: 'Most consequentially, early Christian groups quickly assimilated Jerusalem's fall into their self-understanding and self-representation.'

The non-canonical sources of the Early Church Fathers, consisting of the works of the Apostolic Fathers and the Anti-Nicene Fathers until AD 325, show a proverbially imagery like a high school prom, where all the different participants of all the different parts of the school try to assimilate, move and argue in such a manner that it seems that they all know the dance or what they are doing. However, as with most high school proms, the order and maturity needed is the ingredient which always arrives late at the party. Thus, it is only in the late second or early third century, that the application of the Book of Daniel in the eschatological fragmentation of the Early Church becomes fitted in an overarching idea (option 4) (McGinn 81). Whereas the *Epistle of Barnabas* applies the prophecies of Daniel to the destruction of the Jewish Temple, already Irenaeus and Hippolytus combine the new antichrist tradition with the new imagery of the Book of Revelation and the Millennial Day Theory in a premillennialist notion. Nonetheless, some other Early Church Fathers, such as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius, do see the fulfilment of the 490 years in the

---

<sup>117</sup> Nowadays, some state that these last three and a half years ended with the stoning of Stephan in AD 34 (Acts 8), closing the window for the Judeans to accept Jesus as their Messiah as a nation, after which the 'tribulation' (Acts 8) started for the Christians until the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 (e.g. Welton 379-380).

<sup>118</sup> '...and to the end there shall be war. Desolations are decreed' (NRSV).

<sup>119</sup> However, Eusebius tells as well that the abomination of Daniel 9:27 was fulfilled when, quoting Josephus and Philo, 'Pilate smuggled the imperial emblems into the Temple by night' (*DE* 8.2.402-403; *Ant.* 18.3, and *B.J.* 2.9.2).

AD 70 destruction.<sup>120</sup>

In conclusion, Christian use of Daniel in response to the destruction of the Temple by the Romans helped to create meaning and understanding previous to, and in the aftermath of, the crisis of the Jewish War. Using the Book of Daniel and its visions/prophecies assured Christian believers that God had a plan and would turn this crisis into something much better. However, the connection to the crisis of the destruction fades in the succeeding centuries and the visions become attached to more contemporary crises. So, in the second and third centuries the images and visions blend in with other apocalyptic sceneries of the Early Church, adjusting to their current time periods and creating whole new eschatological concepts, which exist until the present day.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Nonetheless, this is based on the Book of Daniel. The mainstream-eschatology of the following centuries had a more premillennialist character based on the antichrist tradition and the Book of Revelation, which became increasingly friendlier towards the Roman Empire during and after the Christianisation process of Constantine the Great in the fourth century (McGinn 87; Oegema 11).

<sup>121</sup> See e.g. the Christian, eschatological concepts of premillennialism, postmillennialism and amillennialism.



## Chapter 4 – Conclusion

The research question of this thesis was ‘What role did the prophecies in the Book of Daniel play in Judaeen and Christian responses to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70?’ To answer this question, first, the dating and authorship of the Book of Daniel had to be defined.

The common critical conclusion that Daniel was completed in the time of Antiochus IV was used as a basis. The unity of the first six chapters consists in the fact that they are all court tales, which could have existed in oral or written forms independently as early as the fourth century BC. Chapters 7-12 have their context in the Maccabean period, with the possibility of an earlier date of chapter 7. The translated preface is dated to Maccabean times, to accompany the editing of the final book, but the provenance of the first six chapters remains uncertain.

An important step was to use the 490-years prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27 to categorize the different theories and analyse the different usage of the prophecies of the Book of Daniel. The *terminus a quo*, being the starting point of the 490 years, and the *terminus ad quem*, the conclusion of the 70 year weeks, would eventually determine the category. To create some order among the different theories applying Daniel’s 490-years scheme to events, I placed them in five categories. The first group of authors thought the prophecies were fulfilled in the Maccabean period; (2) some later authors found the conclusion years in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem of AD 70; (3) others used it as an apocalyptic scheme for an unknown event in the future; (4) and still others made the advent of Christ the conclusion, in which the prophecies predict his first or second advent. Finally, (5) some later Christian writers who reacted to Porphyry’s claim, stating all prophecies were *vaticinia ex eventu*. Porphyry’s view would become standard in modern scholarship, though that development goes beyond the scope of this thesis.

On the Judaeen side, 1 Maccabees first applied Daniel’s fulfillment to near-contemporary events. Its prophecies were applied to the Maccabean Revolt and Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The books of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, written after the destruction of the Temple, apply Daniel’s predictions to Jerusalem’s destruction. However, they blame not the Roman Empire but the people of Israel, who sinned and must now suffer accordingly. 4 Ezra adapts Daniel most strikingly. The author’s new vision is superior to the vision of ‘his brother Daniel’ (4 Ezra 12:10-13). Following the second option, the fourth kingdom is reinterpreted to be the Roman Empire, applying said prophecy to the contemporary times of the writer, to show that God is – even in the enormous crisis surrounding them – in control. Whereas 1 Maccabees corrects Daniel’s timetable and 4 Ezra reinterprets his visions, Josephus tries to rehabilitate the seer (Mason, “Daniel” 174). For Josephus, the *terminus ad quem* of Daniel’s prediction is clearly the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. However, the *terminus a quo* is, as is in the other writings, not specified.

The Judaeen Messianic interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel ceased after the Bar Kokhba revolt (Beckwith 522).

The Christian side proved less straightforward. The Gospels, especially the Synoptics, appear to connect Daniel’s ‘abomination of desolation’ and Son of Man language with the crisis of the temple’s destruction in AD 70. However, nowhere do the Synoptic Gospels explicitly link Daniel’s prophecies to these events. As Koch (“Daniel Among” 128) states: ‘The perception that Daniel’s prophecies were being fulfilled was strengthened after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, because along with many Christians nearly all the rabbis saw that terrible catastrophe as the fulfillment of the timetable of Daniel 9:24-27.’

In the light of the rest of the New Testament and especially the Book of Revelation, the fourth beast and the ‘iron kingdom’ become the Roman Empire and a new, Christian tradition of an anti-Christ is born. The Book of Revelation does not interpret the visions of Daniel as such, but uses the symbols and traditions of the book to create a new, powerful image in regard to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70.

The writings of the Early Church Fathers give a wide range of different theories and opinions representing the first four categories above. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius could all fit in the second category, were it not that the last three also see the advent of Christ as a fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel. Irenaeus does not supply a *terminus ad quem* but with Hippolytus he takes a premillennialist view, of the third kind above. Then again, Hippolytus states that the prophecies are fulfilled *both* in the Maccabean period and as a future fulfillment during the second advent of Jesus Christ around AD 500. We can readily see that ‘they could only make the figures fit, according to their own standards of precision, either by arbitrary interpretation of the prophecy or by arbitrary manipulation of history. It is as if the prophecy and its interpreters belonged to two different ages or environments’ (Beckwith 541). This would be equally true for Judaeans interpreters since the second century BC (541). The one thing most Early Church Fathers had a consensus in, was the fact that the Danielic 490 years-prophecy held a generally messianic interpretation (option 4), despite the fact that ‘they varied greatly in how they understood the details and how they based their calculations’ (Tanner 200).

In conclusion, investigating the question ‘What role did the prophecies in the Book of Daniel play in Judaeans and Christian responses to the destruction of the Temple in AD 70?’, leads us to conclude that the prophecies of the Book of Daniel did play a significant role in both the Judaeans and Christian responses at the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70. The application of these prophecies differed greatly, however, from one author to the next. This investigation has allowed us to observe a fascinating characteristic of an apocalypse, which is the flexibility of its interpretation in the ever-changing environments and periods of human history.



## Appendix A – Daniel in context: Prophecy and the divine in the ancient Near East

*'L'Shana Haba'ah B'Yerushalayim,*<sup>122</sup> *Next year in Jerusalem!* The longing of the Jewish people to return from exile and to return to their nation has already been written down since their Babylonian captivity over 2,500 year ago. The belief that the Promised Land was given by YHWH<sup>123</sup> and will not be taken from the Judaeen people if they honour the commandments He<sup>124</sup> gave to them, is a strong one and is remembered every year at the end of the Jewish feasts of both Seder and Yom Kippur. The biblical story of the 'return' of the Judaeen people under Moses from Egypt inspired this exile-culture but the return of the captives out of Babylon in the sixth century<sup>125</sup> established this pattern as a significant part of the Judaeen (and later Jewish) religion (Neusner, *Self-fulfilling* 2-4ff). This exile-culture was reinforced or even carried by the role of prophets in the time of the Old Testament. That the ancient Near East has a long history concerning 'prophets' needs no proof,<sup>126</sup> however the form of prophecy of the Israelites needs some attention to create the context of prophecy during that period.<sup>127</sup> Coming from the Greek word *prophètès*, the Septuagint (LXX) translation of the Hebrew word *nābī'*, a prophet is someone who delivers a divine message (Kratz 343–344; De Villiers 1) and prophecy or prophetism concerns the interpretation of this message (De Villiers 1).<sup>128</sup>

In our contemporary world there is a strong division between 'secular' and 'sacred,' between 'church' and 'state,' something that was foreign to the ancient Near East where the divine pervaded every aspect of life (Walton 239). However, the concept of what we now would call 'religion' was apparent as well, in which temples and prophets played a huge role. Within these, there were 'divine' practices for prophets to use, in which earlier scholars made a sharp distinction between deductive divination, invoking a message from a deity, and inspired divination, the spontaneous reception of such a sign in the form of a dream, an audible word or a vision (De Villiers 2).<sup>129</sup> However, more recent scholarly opinion calls them 'branches of the same tree and stand in a complementary relationship to each other, rather than being in conflict' (2; De Jong 313; Nissinen, "Prophecy" 21). That is because these practices were done from the same ideological basis: 'All divine action causes material reaction' (Kitz 24). Nonetheless, a distinction was made between prophecy found in the Old Testament and prophecy in the surrounding cultures. This distinction was first made on the basis of their different characteristics: the prophecies of the ancient Near East concerned mostly the king's activities, matters of state, and especially legitimation of the ruling dynasty (Kratz 344; De Villiers 2), the so-called *Heilsprophetie*. However, more than fifty percent of

---

<sup>122</sup> Hebrew: לשנה הבאה בירושלים

<sup>123</sup> See Knight and Levine (2011).

<sup>124</sup> The consistent use throughout this thesis to address the Judaic/Christian deity with a capital letter is mostly for the reason of clarity, which proves certainly useful when analysing the prophecies of the Book of Daniel.

<sup>125</sup> Solomon's Temple, or First Temple, was destroyed by the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar II during the Siege of Jerusalem in 589-586 BC. Under the Persian king Cyrus the Great the exiled Judaeans were allowed to return in 539 BC.

<sup>126</sup> 'Prophetic' documents have been found all over the region of the Middle East (Nissinen, "Spoken" 237), but the largest corpus of records comes from mainly two areas: Mari, from the eighteenth century BC, and Nineveh, from the first half of the seventh century BC (Cancik-Kirschbaum 37; De Jong 171; Nissinen 25–26; De Villiers 1).

<sup>127</sup> The role of prophecy in the ancient Near East is far beyond the scope of this thesis, but scholars whom addressed this subject magnificently are for example: Cancik-Korchbaum (2003), De Jong (2007), Kratz (2006), and Nissinen (inter alia those already mentioned).

<sup>128</sup> A very simplified account because the definition of 'prophecy' still remains under dispute among scholars, but for the aim of the thesis this will be enough (De Jong 244-246; De Villiers 1).

<sup>129</sup> Bottéro (170-171) introduced the categories 'inspired' and 'deductive', however Nissinen uses 'noninductive' instead of 'inspired' and 'inductive' instead of 'deductive' (Walton 240).

biblical prophecy comprises a judgmental element (Walton 252) and therefore called *Unheilsprophetie* (Nissinen 1–2).

Nonetheless, dividing this via these lines is rather difficult, for the Mari- and Nineveh-documents<sup>130</sup> also speak of obligations a king had to the gods or the maintenance for its cult, and the divine criticism he got when he neglected this (Nissinen 4-6). Moreover, it was divinely expected of the king to be a just ruler and take care of the widows and orphans (De Jong 238, 309; Nissinen 14). Despite these similarities between the Old Testament- and ancient Near Eastern prophecies, there are significant differences concerning the intentions of the prophets. Whereas the prophets of the ancient Near Eastern oracles were ‘ritual enforcers’ and aimed at the ‘support of the divine,’ the divine indictment the Israelite prophets spoke of, arose mostly for the neglect of the covenant, sometimes even speaking against the religious establishment consisting of the priests and their rituals (Walton 252).<sup>131</sup> However, the most significant difference between the two is the offering of hope, namely: ‘Ancient Near Eastern prophecies functioned in a context of immediacy and urgency and had no long-term value. In contrast, the hope that is offered in Israelite prophecy is presented as part of a divine plan that is eschatological and covenant based’ (252; deJong Ellis 171, 180-186). Therefore, the hope was mostly offered by Israelite prophecies for *after the judgment had come*, the long-term, whereas the ancient Near Eastern prophecies were about the near-term victory (Walton 252).

This idea of a divine plan with the Judaeans developed throughout the Second Temple-period and when through Alexander the Great the Hellenising influences mixed with and in some ways threatened these traditions, the traditional Judaeans worldview was challenged, which led to the birth of the apocalyptic eschatology (McGinn 24). The ‘apocalypses,’ or translated ‘revelations,’ kept the deterministic view of history, but added a three-way pattern of crisis-judgment-reward (28). This pattern and the exile-culture blended into the notion of an almighty God who would see the crisis His people were in, and would intervene by first sending His prophets to tell the people to repent. In neglecting those warnings the ‘wicked’ suffered His wrath but the ‘righteous’ would be rewarded in the end. This reward could, but did not always, coexist with the arrival or establishment of a ‘ideal kingdom’ or a ‘ideal ruler,’ a messiah (29). The hope of the reward itself developed as well, giving rise to the hope of life after death or even the belief in resurrection of the death, which we see for the first time in the Book of Daniel (12:2) (29-30; J.J. Collins, “Apocalyptic” 21-34). Giving the apocalypse its context, the evil of the present-day is ascribed as ‘a sign of the end of time,’ which can be seen in many of the Judaeans apocalypses which were written during the period of 250 BC – AD 150, but foremost in the Book of Daniel in the chapters 7-12, which is the only apocalypse incorporated into the biblical canon of the Old Testament (McGinn 26, 28).

It is at this point this thesis starts the research whether or not these (apocalyptic) prophecies of the Book of Daniel were actually used, and if so how, in the period between its writing until around AD 325, in regard to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in AD 70.

---

<sup>130</sup> As referred to in footnote 124, these were the two places where large collections of prophetic sources were found: Mari (from the eighteenth century BC) and Nineveh (from the first half of the seventh century BC) (Nissinen, “Spoken” 237; Sandy and O’Hare 33; De Villiers 1)

<sup>131</sup> This difference arises from the fact that the Israelites believed to be a chosen people by the ‘One God’ and were connected to Him by a covenant, which was opposite of what the polytheistic cultures in the ancient Near East believed (Eban 46). However, prophets served both at the temple or as individuals, creating sometimes the notion of prophets being part of the godless (religious) establishment, giving rise to others not calling themselves ‘prophets’ to show they were not part of it (see for example Amos 7:14-17, or Jeremiah 26:7-16 (De Jong 247-249)).

## Bibliography

- Adler, William. "The Apocalyptic Survey of History Adapted by Christians: Daniel's Prophecy of 70 Weeks". *The Apocalyptic Survey of History Adapted by Christians: Daniel's Prophecy of 70 Weeks*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1996, pp. 201-238, doi.org/10.1163/9789004275171\_006.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. "Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary." *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*, InterVarsity, 1978.
- Barton, George A. "The Composition of the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1898, pp. 62–86, doi:10.2307/3268806.
- Baumgartner, Walter. "Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung." *Theologische Rundschau*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1939, pp. 59–83. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/26150832.
- Beale, G.K. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. University Press of America, 1984.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *Jesus and the Last Days: the Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse*. Regent College Publishing, 2005.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "Daniel 9 and The Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation." *Revue De Qumran*, vol. 10, no. 4 (40), Dec. 1981, pp. 521–542. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24607004.
- Behrmann, Georg. *Das Buch Daniel*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894.
- Bertholdt, Leonhard. *Daniel*. J.J. Palm, 1806.
- Bevan, Anthony Ashley. *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, for the Use of Students*. Cambridge University Press, 1892.
- Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance*. Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Bodenmann, Reinhard. "Naissance d'une exégèse. Daniel dans l'Eglise ancienne des trois premiers siècles." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese*, 28. J.C.B. Mohr, 1986.
- Bogaert, Pierre Maurice. *L'Apocalypse syriaque de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. Sources Chrétiennes 144–45. Cerf, 1969.
- Bottéro, J. *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*. University of Chicago Press, 2001. doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X03210065
- Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. University of California Press, 1994.
- Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Yale University Press, 1997.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. "Josephus and Daniel." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, Jan. 1965, pp. 148–162.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Vol. 1, Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.
- Buhl, Frants. "Daniel, Der Prophet." *RE*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1898, pp. 445–457.

- Cancik-Korchbaum, E. "Prophetismus und Divination – Ein Blick Auf Die Keilschriften Quellen" [Prophetism and Divination – A View on the Cuneiform Sources]. *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel*, edited by: in M. Köchert and M. Nissinen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003, pp. 33-53.
- Carson, D. A. *New Testament Commentary Survey*. 6th ed., Baker Academic, 2007.
- Charles, Robert Henry. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Clarendon, 1929.
- Charles, Robert Henry. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*. 1 of 2 vol. T & T Clark, 1920. [In text: *Revelation*]
- Charles, Robert Henry. "Apocalyptic Literature." *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 2, Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1911, pp. 169–175.
- Charlesworth, J.H. "'The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a Dwindled Minority: The Outsider According to the Insider of the Jewish Apocalypses, 70–130.'" *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, edited by Jacob Neusner et al., Scholars Press, 1985, pp. 285–315.
- Clarke, Howard W. *The Gospel of Matthew and its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel*. Indiana University Press, 2003.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohn, N.S. *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Scholars Press, 1976. [In text: *The Combat Myth*]
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament." *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. , by John J. Collins and Adela Yarbro Collins, Fortress Press, 1993, pp. 90–112.
- Collins, Anthony. *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered*. T.J., 1726.
- Collins, John J. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Fortress Press, 1993. [In text just referred to as Collins]
- Collins, John J. "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death" *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 36, 1974, pp. 21-43. [In text: "Apocalyptic"]
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed., Eerdmans, 1998. [In text: *Apoc. Imag.*]
- Collins, John J. "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 94, no. 2, 1975, pp. 218–236, doi:10.2307/3265731. [In text: "Court-Tales"]
- Colpe, C. "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 8, 1972, pp. 400-477
- Corrodi, Heinrich. *Kritische Geschichte Des Chiliasmus*. Orell, Geßner, Füllli Und Company, 1781.
- Cotton, Henry. *The Five Books of Maccabees in English*. Oxford University Press, 1832.
- Dalman, Gustav. *Die Worte Jesus*. Hinrichs, 1898.

- Dalman, Gustav. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by: David Miller Kay, T & T Clark, 1909. [In text: *Words*]
- Darshan, Guy. "The Original Language of 1 Maccabees: A Reexamination." *BN NF*, 182, 2019, pp. 91–110.
- deJong Ellis, Maria. "Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts: Literary and Historiographic Considerations." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, vol. 41, no. 2, autumn 1989, pp. 127-186.
- Delcor, M. *Le Livre de Daniel*. Gabalda, 1971.
- DeSilva, David Arthur. *Introducing the Apocrypha Message, Context, and Significance*. 2nd ed., Baker Publishing Group, 2018.
- Driver, S.R. *The Book of Daniel with Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge University Press, 1900.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. *Tertullian*. Routledge, 2004. [In text: *Tertullian*]
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. "Tertullian and Daniel 9:24–27: A Patristic Interpretation of a Prophetic Time-frame." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 6, 2002, pp. 330–344.
- Dyrness, William. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- Eban, Abba Solomon. *My People, The Story of the Jews*. Random House, 1968.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary. The Old Testament Library*. Translated by: Cosslett Quinn, Westminster John Knox Press, 1970.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "Jahwe als König," *ZAW* 5, 1928. [In text: "Jahwe"]
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Harper and Row, 1965.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*. Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Esler, P.F. "God's Honour and Rome's Triumph: Responses to the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE in Three Jewish Apocalypses." *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*, edited by P.F. Esler, Routledge, 1995, pp. 239–258. [In text: *Modelling*]
- Esler, Philip F. "The Social Function of 4 Ezra." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, vol. 16, no. 53, Apr. 1994, pp. 99–123, doi:10.1177/0142064X9401605306.
- Evans, Craig A. "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom." *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, edited by J.J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 2 vols, Brill, 2002.
- Evanson, Edward. *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists*. Ipswich, 1792.
- Farmer, William Reuben. *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus*. Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. University of California Press, 1998.
- Ferch, A. J. "The book of Daniel and the 'Maccabean Thesis'". *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1983, pp. 129-141.
- Finegan, Jack. *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*. Princeton University Press, 1964.

- Foster, Robert. "Why on Earth Use 'Kingdom of Heaven'?: Matthew's Terminology Revisited". *New Testament Studies*. 48 (04), Oct. 2002, doi:10.1017/S0028688502000292.
- Fraade, Steven D. "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch with the (Dis-)Advantage of Rabbinic Hindsight." *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch*, edited by Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, Brill, 2013, p.p. 363-380.
- Fraidl, Franz. *Die Exegese Der Siebzig Wochen Daniels in Der Alten Und Mittleren Zeit*. Verlag Von Leuschner & Lubensky, 1883.
- France, R.T. "Kingdom of God." *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, by Kevin J. Vanhoozer et al., Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2006, pp. 420–422. [In text: "Kingdom"]
- France, Richard T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Eerdmans, 2007.
- Frege, Gottlob . "Über Sinn und Bedeutung," *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Philosophische Kritik*, NF 100, 1892, pp. 25-50.
- Froom, Le Roy Edwin. *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: the Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation*. Review and Herald, 1946.
- Frost, Stanley B. "Daniel" *IDB*, vol. 1, 1962, pp. 761-769.
- Furstenberg, Yair. "The Agon with Moses and Homer: Rabbinic Midrash and the Second Sophistic," *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, 2012, pp. 299-328.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, 2nd rev. ed., Crossroad, 1989.
- Gall, A. von. *Die Einheitlichkeit des Buches Daniel*. Giessen, 1895.
- Gibson, J.C.L. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Clark, 1977.
- Ginsberg, H. Louis. *Studies in Daniel*. Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948.
- Goldingay, John. *Daniel*. Word Books, 1989.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees*. Yale University Press, 1976.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. vol. 2, T & T Clark, A Continuum Imprint, 2004, *A history of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period (4 volumes)*.
- Graham, Daryn. "Early Christian Understandings of the 'Abomination That Causes Desolation.'" *The Reformed Theological Review*, vol. 74, no. 3, Dec. 2015, pp. 162–175.
- Hanson, P.D. "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Near Eastern Environment." *Revue Biblique* 78, 1971, pp. 31-58.
- Hardy, Frank W. "New Testament References to Daniel." 2010. Reprint of an article in the *Historicism* print publication of 2006. PDF.
- Hare, D.R.A. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Fortress Press, 1990.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Eerdmans, 1999.

- Harris, Horton. *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F.C. Baur*. Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* Gleerup, 1966.
- Hartman, Louis Francis, and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel: a New Translation with Notes and Commentary*. Yale University Press, 2005.
- Heaton, Eric W. *The Book of Daniel: Introduction and Commentary*. SCM Press, 1964.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, SCM Press, 1962.
- Heller, Marvin J. "Earliest Printings of the Talmud." *Printing the Talmud: From Bomberg to Schottenstein*, edited by Gabriel Goldstein and Sharon Liberman Mintz, Yeshiva Univ Museum, 2006, pp. 61–79.
- Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2nd ed., vol. 1, Fortress Press, 1974.
- Higgins, A.J.B. *Jesus and the Son of Man*. Lutherworth, 1964.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *The Apocalypse: a Brief History*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Hirsch, E. D. "Objective Interpretation." *PMLA*, vol. 75, no. 4, 1960, pp. 463–479. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/460609](http://www.jstor.org/stable/460609).
- Hirsch, E.D. *Validity in Interpretation*. Yale University Press, 1967.
- Hobbins, John F. "The Summing up of History in 2 Baruch." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. 89, no. ½, Jul.-Oct. 1998, pp. 45-79.
- Hölscher, Gustav. "Die Entstehung Des Buches Daniel." *Theologische Studien Und Kritiken*, vol. 92, 1919, pp. 113–138.
- Huet, Pierre Daniel. *Demonstratio Evangelica*. 3rd ed., Daniele Horemels, 1690. [Originally published in 1679]
- Jerome. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*. Translated by Gleason Leonard Archer, Baker Book House, 1958.
- Jones, Kenneth R. *Jewish Reactions to the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70: Apocalypses and Related Pseudepigrapha*. Brill, 2011.
- Jong, M.J. de. *Isaiah among the Ancient Near Eastern prophets. A comparative study of the Isaiah tradition and the Neo-Assyrian prophecies*. Brill, 2007.
- Jonge, H.J. de. "On the Origin of the Term 'Apostolic Fathers.'" *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. XXIX, Issue 2, October 1978, pp. 503–505, doi.org/10.1093/jts/XXIX.2.503.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Josephus / Books IX-XI / with an English Transl. by Ralph Marcus*. Translated by Ralph Marcus, vol. 6 of 9, Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Kim, P.J. "Letters of John". *Westminster Dictionary of the New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, edited by David Aune, Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Kitz, A.M. "Prophecy as Divination." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 65, 2003, pp. 22-42.

- Knight, Douglas A. and Amy-Jill Levine. *The Meaning of the Bible: What the Jewish Scriptures and Christian Old Testament Can Teach Us*. HarperOne, 2011.
- Koch, Klaus. *Das Buch Daniel*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980. [In text: *Das Buch*]
- Koch, Klaus. "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" *Union Seminary Review*, vol. 39, no. 2, Apr. 1985, pp. 117–130, doi:10.1177/002096438503900202. [In text: "Daniel Among"]
- Koch, Klaus. "Offenbaren Wird Sich Das Reich Gottes." *New Testament Studies*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1979, pp. 158–165., doi:10.1017/s0028688500004252. [In text: "Offenbaren"]
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: a Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. A.R. Allenson, 1972.
- Kooten, George H. Van. "The Desecration Of 'The Most Holy Temple Of All The World' In The 'Holy Land': Early Jewish And Early Christian Recollections Of Antiochus' 'Abomination Of Desolation.'" *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology*, 2009, pp. 291–316, doi:10.1163/ej.9789004175150.i-474.113.
- Kratz, R.G. "Prophet." *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe zum Alten und Neuen Testament*, edited by: A. Berlejung and C. Frevel, 2006, pp. 343–345.
- Lacocque, André. *Daniel in His Time*. University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Translated by David Pellauer, SPCK, 1979.
- Ladd, George Eldon. "The Kingdom of God: Reign or Realm?" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 81, no. 3, 1962, pp. 230–238., doi:10.2307/3264420.
- Lenormant François. *Les Sciences Occultes En Asie: La Divination Et La Science Des présages Chez Les Chaldéens*. Maisonneuve Et Cie, 1875.
- Leupold, H.C. *Exposition of Daniel*. Baker Book House, 1969.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon*. Yale University Press, 2013.
- Lindars, B. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man sayings in the Gospels*. Eerdmans, 1983.
- Longxi, Zhang. "Understanding, Misunderstanding, and the Critical Function of Hermeneutics in Cross-Cultural Studies." *The Agon of Interpretations: towards a Critical Intercultural Hermeneutics*, by Ming Xie, University of Toronto Press, 2014, pp. 140–155.
- Marti, Karl. "Das Buch Daniel." *Kurzer Hand-Commentar Zum Alten Testament*, by Karl Marti, XVIII, J.C.B. Mohr, 1901.
- Mason, Steve. *A History of the Jewish War*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge University Press, 2017. [In text: *Jewish War*]
- Mason, Steve. "Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House." *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman period: essays in memory of Morton Smith*, edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers, E.J. Brill, 1994, pp. 161-191. [In text: "Daniel"]
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Baker Academic, 2010. [In text: *J, J&CO*]



- Mason, Steve. *Orientation to the History of Roman Judaea*. Cascade Books, 2016. [In text: *Orientation*]
- McComiskey, Thomas E. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel Against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Literature." *WTJ* 47, 1985, pp. 18-45.
- McGinn, Bernard. *De Antichrist: de geschiedenis van tweeduizend jaar aardse verdorvenheid: oorsprong, betekenis, doel*. Translated by: B. van Rijswijk, Uitgeversmaatschappij Tirion, 1996.
- Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Michaelis, J.D. *Orientalische Und Exegetische Bibliothek*. I, Garbe, 1771.
- Miller, Steven R. *Daniel*. *New American Commentary*, 18. Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary Series. T. & T. Clark, 1927.
- Murphy, F.J. "2 Baruch and the Romans." *JBL* no. 104, 1985, pp. 663-669.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple." *Judaism* 21, 1972, pp. 312-327.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Self-fulfilling Prophecy: Exile and Return in the History of Judaism*. Beacon Press, 1987. [In text: *Self-fulfilling*]
- Newman, Sharan. *The Real History of the End of the World*. Penguin Group Inc., 2010.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: a Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed., Fortress Press, 2005.
- Nissinen, M. "Das kritische Potential in der altorientalischen Propheti." [The Critical Potential in Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy]. *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel*, edited by: M. Köckert and M. Nissinen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003, pp. 1-32.
- Nissinen, M. "Spoken, Written, Quoted and Invented: Orality and Writtenness in Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy." *Writings and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, edited by: Ehud Ben Zvi and Michael H. Floyd, 2000, pp. 235-271. [In text: "Spoken"]
- Nissinen, M. "What is prophecy? An Ancient Near Eastern perspective." *Inspired speech. Prophecy in the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of Herbert B. Huffmon*, edited by: J. Kaltner and L. Stulman, 2004, pp. 17-37. [In text: "Prophecy"]
- Nissinen, M. *Prophets and prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. Series: Writings from the Ancient World (vol. 12). Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. [In text: *Prophets*]
- Oberweis, Michael. "Die Bedeutung der Neutestamentliche "Rätselzahlen" 666 (Openb. 16:18) und 153 (Joh. 12:11)." *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77, 1986, pp. 226-241.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. "The Reception of the Book of Daniel (and Danielic Literature) in the Early Church." Society of Biblical Literature - McGill University, 18 Nov. 2006.
- Owen, P. and L.W. Hurtado. *'Who is This Son of Man?': The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*. T&T Clark, 2011.

- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha*. Harper & Row, 1949. [In text: *NT Times*]
- Pennington, Jonathan T. "Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew." *Novum Testamentum Supplements* 126, Brill, 2007.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Reading the New Testament: An Introduction*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Paulist Press, 2012.
- Perrin, Norman. *A Modern Pilgrimage*. Fortress Press, 1974.
- Perrin, Norman. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. Harper & Row, 1976. [In text: *Rediscovering*]
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. International Academic Pub., 1979.
- Plöger, Otto. *Das Buch Daniel. Kommentar Zum Alten Testament 18*. Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1965.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: The Old Testament Library*. Westminster John Knox Press, 1965.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Oliver & Boyd, 1965.
- Reicke, Bo. "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem." *Studies in New Testament and in Early Christian Literature Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by David Edward Aune and Allen Paul Wikgren, E.J. Brill, 1972, pp. 121–134.
- Roberts, Alexander, et al. *Ante-Nicene Fathers. the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Hendrickson Publishers, 1999, [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org), [www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.html](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.html).
- Robinson, John A. *Redating the New Testament*. S.C.M. Press, 1976.
- Roddy, Nicolae. "'Two Parts: Weeks of Seven Weeks': the End of the Age as Terminus Ad Q Uem for 2 Baruch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 7, no. 14, 1996, pp. 3–14, doi:10.1177/095182079600001401.
- Rowley, H.H. "The Unity of the Book of Daniel." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1950, pp. 233–273., <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23614786>.
- Sandy, D. Brent, and Daniel M. O'Hare. *Prophecy and Apocalyptic: an Annotated Bibliography*. Baker Academic, 2007.
- Schader, H.H. "Iranische Beiträge 1." *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, geistwiss. Kl.*, 6/5, 1930, pp. 199-296.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed., Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. Trübner & Co., 1862. Originally published in 1674.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. *Daniel*. Concordia Commentary. Concordia, 2008.
- Stone, Michael Edward, and Matthias Henze. *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes*. Fortress Press, 2013.
- Stone, Michael Edward. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Fortress Press, 1990. [In text: *Fourth Ezra*]
- Stone, Michael Edward. "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple." *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1981, pp. 195–204, doi:10.1163/157006381x00126.

- Tanner, J. Paul. "Is Daniel's Seventy-Weeks Prophecy Messianic? Part 1." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. 166, Apr. 2009, pp. 181–200.
- Taylor, N.H. "The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Transmission of the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse." *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2003, pp. 283–311, doi:10.4102/hts.v59i2.656.
- Thiele, Edwin R. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Kregel Academic, 1983.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. "Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel." *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. 15, 1909, pp. 241-282.
- Towner, Wayne Sibley. *Daniel*. John Knox Press, 1984.
- Toy, Crawford Howell, et al. "The Books of Maccabees." *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls, 1906, jewishencyclopedia.com.
- Ulrich, Dean Richard. "From Judgment to Jubilee: a Redemptive-Historical Approach to Daniel's Seventy Sevens." *North-West University*, North-West University, 2014. [In text just referred to as Ulrich]
- Ulrich, Dean Richard. "How Early Judaism Read Daniel 9:24-27." *Old Testament Essays*, vol. 27, no. 3, 22 Sept. 2014, pp. 1062–1083. [In text: "How Early"]
- Vermès, Géza. *Jesus the Jew: a Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. SCM, 2001.
- Vermès Géza. *Jesus in His Jewish Context*. Fortress Press, 2007.
- Vetne, Reimar. *The Influence and Use of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels*. Andrews University, 2011.
- Villiers, Gerda De. "The Origin of Prophetism in the Ancient Near East." *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, vol. 66, no. 1, 8 Oct. 2010, doi:10.4102/hts.v66i1.795. Note: page numbers were not for citation purposes in the digital file, so just pp. 1-6.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Baker Academic, 2006.
- Weiss, H. "Pharisäismus und Hellenismus: Zur Darstellung des Judentums in Geschichtswerk des Jüdischen Historikers Flavius Josephus," *OL* 74, 1979, 421-33.
- Welton, Jonathan. *Understanding the Whole Bible*. Welton Academy, 2015.
- Wenham, David. "The Kingdom of God and Daniel." *Expository Times* 98, 1987.
- Whittaker, Molly. *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Willis, Amy C. Merrill. "A Reversal of Fortunes: Daniel among the Scholars." *Currents in Biblical Research*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2018, pp. 107–130, doi:10.1177/1476993x17711665.
- Windelband, Wilhelm. "Rectorial Address, Strasbourg, 1894." *History and Theory*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1980, pp. 169–185. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2504798. Accessed 7 Feb. 2020.
- Wright, J. Edward. "The Social Setting of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 8, no. 16, July 1997, pp. 81–96, doi:10.1177/095182079700001605.
- Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Fortress Press, 2003.
- Young, Edward J. *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary*. Eerdmans, 1949.