

Week 28, Lecture 80.¹ The Persians and the Greeks, Daniel 11:2-4

Review. The Book of Daniel has **two main sections**: Folk Tales & Apocalyptic Visions. These main sections are divided into 10 sub-sections, marked with Roman Numerals below. The Folk Tales date from approximately 250 B.C.; the visions from approximately 170 B.C. Jewish & Protestant Bibles include only chapters 1-12, the Hebrew & Aramaic portions. Catholic & Orthodox Bibles contain **additional materials** written in Greek in a style close to the folk tales of ch. 1-6.

Outline of Daniel (from the Anchor Bible Commentary)

Folk Tales

I.	The Food Test	chapter 1
II.	Nebuchadnezzar's Dream	chapter 2
III.	The Fiery Furnace	chapter 3
IV.	Nebuchadnezzar's Madness	chapter 4
V.	The Writing on the Wall	chapter 5
VI.	Daniel in the Lion's Den	chapter 6

Apocalyptic Visions

VII.	The Four Beasts and the Man	chapter 7
VIII.	The Ram & the He-Goat	chapter 8
IX.	The Seventy Weeks of Years	chapter 9
X.	The Final Revelation	chapters 10-12

Greek Additions to Daniel

Prayer of Azariah		3:26-45, 52-90
Susanna		chapter 13
Bel & The Dragon		chapter 14

Anchor Bible's Outline: **The Final Revelation, 10:1 - 12:13**²

X¹ The Prologue (10:1-11:1)

X² The Revelation of the Future (11:2-12:4)

- A. Persian age (11:2).
- B. Alexander the Great (336–323 B.C.) and the breakup of his empire (11:3–4).
- C. The battles and fortunes of the earlier Seleucids and Ptolemies (322-175 B.C.) (11:5–20).
- D. Infamous reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164) and his bitter persecution of the Jews (11:21–45).
- E. Final victory of God's chosen ones (12:1–4).

X³ The Epilogue (12:5-13)

Comment. The Anchor Bible breaks up the final vision, Part X, into three main sections, X¹.

The attached appendix contains a detailed outline of the 3 sections. The previous lecture concluded section X¹.

This lecture begins the second section, X², specifically sub-sections A & B, the Persian Age & Alexander the Great.

Time not "Equally Allocated"

No. of Years	Era	No. of Verses	Verse(s)	Years per Verse
203	Persian Age (539-336 B.C.)	1	11:2	203
13	Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.)	2	11:3-4	6.5
147	Seleucids & Ptolemies (322-175 B.C.)	15	11:5-20	9.8
11	Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.)	24	11:21-45	2.2

¹ Lectures are numbered consecutively. Although this is this week's first lecture, its number reflects its place in the **total** sequence.

² Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, vol. 23, AB, 286–287.

Obviously our **Writer's Main Concern** is with the era of Antiochus to whom he gives 24 verses.

Equal Treatment for the other eras would require:

About **66** verses for the Seleucids & Ptolemies, instead of only **15**.

About **6** verses for Alexander, instead of only **2**.

About **100** verses for the Persian Era, instead of only **1**.

Translation

And now, I will speak truth to you; Behold! another three kings are about **to stand** for Persia. And the fourth will-become-rich with greater riches than all; and in his becoming strong through his riches he will stir up everyone, **i.e.**, the kingdom of Greece.³ And there will **stand** a **mighty king**, and he will-have-dominion-over a great dominion, and he will **act according to his own pleasure**.⁴ And, and as he **stands** his kingdom will be shattered and it will be scattered to the four winds of the heavens, and not to his descendants; and not like his dominion over which he-had-dominion, for his kingdom will be uprooted, and for others besides these.

"To Stand" = "To Arise." This is not the normal Hebrew word for "arise." It generally means simply "stand." According to the AB -- following the Jewish scholar Ginzberg -- Daniel was originally written in Aramaic.

Then parts of it (chapters 1, 7-12) were translated into Hebrew.

In this theory, the underlying Aramaic word can mean either "rise" or "stand" and the Hebrew translator of Daniel often chooses the wrong word.

I translate "to stand" just to let my readers know it **sounds strange** in Hebrew, **whatever** the explanation.

NET Bible Note to v. 2

... **'et** the marker of a definite direct object. [normally untranslated -- I translated it by "**i.e.**" PJM]. . . , would suggest the meaning "he will arouse everyone, that is, the kingdom of Greece." The context, however, seems to suggest the idea that this Persian king will arouse in hostility against Greece the constituent elements of his own empire. This requires supplying the word "against,"

The problem with this theory is that the normal word for "against" is *'al*, which does not sound or look like *'et*.

JSB Note to vv. 2-4

The *warrior king* [I translated "**mighty king**," PJM] is Alexander the Great. It is unclear what Persian kings are intended; the *fourth* may be the last Persian King Darius III (336-331).

V. 3, Act according to his own pleasure

This phrase occurs often in Daniel. It is how he designates the arrogance of human rulers.

I will not pause to suggest contemporary ecclesiastical or civil analogies!

V. 4, And not to his descendants, etc.

The empire of Alexander was ruled by four of his generals after his death, not by any of his children.

It was "not like his dominion" because they were not nearly as powerful as Alexander had been.

Week 28, Lecture 81. Trials of a Translator, Daniel 11:5-7 -- Part 1³

Lecture Goal. Help people who do not read Hebrew understand some of the difficulties that Bible translators face. In the next lecture I will try to give the "big picture" of this part of the chapter.

Literal Translation of the Hebrew, 11:5

The King of the south will be strong and from his princes; and he will be strong against him, and he will have-dominion a great dominion his dominion.

³ This lecture went longer than I had planned, so I have divided it for online purposes.

KJV does a pretty good job with this. Using my words I will give the KJV syntax and punctuation.

The King of the south will be strong, and **one** from his princes; and he will be strong against him and he will have dominion; a great dominion **will be** his dominion.

In fact, this is exactly how the Masoretes want the verse to be read.

The two semicolons correspond to Hebrew punctuation of the Masoretes.

Inserting "will be." This is perfectly acceptable. Hebrew has many "nominal sentences."

A "nominal sentence" contains only nouns, no verbs. They are rare in English. "All hands on deck!"

However, there are other possibilities

Step 1: Change the punctuation. *BHS* Note: (more on what *BHS* is later in lecture)

Move the *athnach* (= semicolon) from after "of his princes;" to "will be strong;"

(Since the Hebrew word order is different, this is an oversimplification, but this is where it ends up in English)

The Masoretes – the guys who put in the vowels and punctuation in the Hebrew text – did a great job!

Post-lecture note: They did this job centuries **after** Jesus. At the time of Jesus, no vowels were written in the OT!

However, occasionally they got it wrong. Most translations think this is one of those places.

Now we have:

The King of the south will be strong; and from his princes and he will be strong against him, and he will have-dominion a great dominion his dominion.

Step 2: Remove a Word that does not belong. This word is the second "and" in the verse."

Take a look at this Hebrew phrase: ומן־שריו ויחזק .

Even though you don't read Hebrew, you can see that one letter occurs twice, the letter I have put in a **red font**.

The name of this letter is **vav** (in modern Israeli pronunciation); sometimes you will hear its name as **waw**.

The letter **vav** means "**his**" when it comes at the end of a word ("one of **his** princes")

The letter **vav** means "**and / but**" when it comes at the beginning of a word ("**and** he will be strong")

Many scholars think that a scribe mistakenly wrote the letter twice. This error is called "dittography."

Here is what he should have written. ומן־שריו יחזק Notice there is only one **vav**.

Now this is what it literally says:

The King of the south will be strong, and from **his** princes; ~~and~~ he will be strong against him and he will have dominion a great dominion his dominion.

Before proceeding, I have few thoughts on dittography.

Thoughts on Dittography

Dittography means "twice-writing," i.e., writing something twice that should have been written only once.

In this case it was a single letter that was written twice.

Sometime dittography involves an entire word, phrase, line, or even a paragraph being written twice.

Dittography is not just a concern of biblical scholars. It is a problem for **anyone** who deals with ancient manuscripts.

Furthermore, it is an ongoing problem. It occurs in documents produced on word-processors.

Modern spell-checkers which automatically "flag" the second example of a word in a row reduce the problem.

The fact that this is programmed into software shows it is a common **human** problem.

When the "Word of God" is expressed in human language, it becomes subject to all of the confusion and ambiguity of which human language is capable.

Step 3. Get some help from the Greek.

By putting **one** in italics, KJV is alerting readers that it is not in the Hebrew text.

In fact both of the Greek translations (Septuagint and Theodotion) contain the word "**one**."

So it is entirely possible that the word "one" was originally in the Hebrew, and accidentally dropped out.

Most modern translations that add the word do not bother to mention that they are getting it from the Greek.

The King of the south will be strong, and **one** from his princes; and he will be strong against him and he will have dominion a great dominion his dominion.

Further Possibilities. Haplography.

The opposite of dittography is haplography, leaving out a letter (word, phrase, line, or paragraph).

The final words in their Hebrew order are: "a dominion great his dominion."

Here is "his dominion" in Hebrew: ממשלתו *memšalto*. But before we get into this, a few words about *BHS*.

BHS is the abbreviation for *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, *The Stuttgart Hebrew Bible*.

This is a "critical edition" of the OT. It is published by the United Bible Societies.

It is **the text** used by scholars of all denominations when translating the OT.

BHS alerts scholars to textual problems:

- 1) when different Hebrew manuscripts have different readings
- 2) when ancient translations (Greek, Latin, Syriac, others) presuppose a different Hebrew text
- 3) when different vowels also make good (or better) sense with the Hebrew consonants
(A concrete example will occur in the second half of the lecture).
- 4) when a word might have been misspelled, added, or left out -- even if there is no textual evidence
Such modifications with no evidence from ancient manuscripts are called "conjectural emendations."

BHS Suggestion

Instead of reading *memšaltô* ממשלתו his kingdom.

read *mimemšaltô* מממשלתו **from** his kingdom.

The letter in red is called *mem* in Hebrew.

According to this theory, the scribe should have written 3 of them. However, he wrote only two.

A string of three *mems* is very unusual in Hebrew, so this would be an easy mistake to make.

A Bit of Grammar. There is no "comparative form" in Hebrew, no word for "greater."

Rather you say "great **from** this" or "great **from** that," or in good English "greater **than** this or that."

The translation would then be

The King of the south will be strong, and **one** from his princes; he will be strong against him, and he will have dominion **over** a greater dominion **than** his dominion.

In fact, "greater **than** his . . ." is the translation of: NAB, NRSV, and NET.

This are the "tweaks" they have to perform to get this reading out of the Hebrew.

Putting in over is not "cheating"

The Hebrew verb can be either intransitive (have dominion) or transitive (have dominion over someone/something).

It is English that requires the extra preposition for the transitive verb, not Hebrew.

The lecture went longer than anticipated, so I am dividing it here. (16 m, 20 sec -- before editing, 15m 28s after edit)

Week 28, Lecture 81. Trials of a Translator, Daniel 11:5-7 -- Part 2

Translation 11:6. Intrigues of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246) and Antiochus II Theos (261–246) (11:6).

And at the end of years they-shall-join-themselves-together, and the daughter of the king of the south will go to the king of the north to make smooth-ways but she will not retain **her power** and **her offspring** will not stand [= survive]; and she will be given up and the ones that brought her, and her **child** and he who strengthened her **-at times**.

"Her power." AB Note to v. 6

MT reads כוח הזרוע *kôah ha-zērôa'* "power of the arm . . ." Read instead כוחה "her power", dropping the other letters. The other letters זרוע "arm" of MT is [misspelled] dittography of the following זרעו *ûzēro'ô* "and his offspring." [which is going to be changed in the next note -- from "his" to "her"!]

"Her offspring."

The Hebrew says "his offspring." But the AB argues that the correct reading is "her offspring." The difference in Hebrew is only one letter, a final ם *vav* instead of a final ה *heh*. Moreover, in Aramaic "his offspring" cannot be distinguished from "her offspring" in a text without vowels. [Post-lecture note: **written vowels would not be invented until almost 1000 years into the future from when Daniel was written.**] The only difference is that "his offspring" ends in *eh* and "her" offspring ends in *-ah* -- a distinction you cannot make in a text without vowels! Their theory is that it was originally written in Aramaic, and the Hebrew translator made a mistake.

[not for the lecture] -- also you have to take the initial *vav* of זרעו as going with the previous עמד *BHS* offers other suggested emendations, but this one seems best to me.

Her child. NET Bible Note to v. 6

Read *wēhayyaldâ* והילדה "and her child," for

MT *wēhayyôlēdāh* והילדה "the one who begot her". Cf. Theodotion, Syriac, & Vulgate.

Note that the Hebrew consonants are exactly the same. It is simply a question of putting in different vowels.

NET is noting that three ancient versions -- translated before written vowels were invented -- assumed different vowels.

This is the most conservative type of textual emendation.

Oxford Study Bible Note on v. 6

[*mahāziqāh* may be translated] "He who got possession of her" OR "he who supported her."

My literal translation is "he who strengthened her." This would be her father who gave her in marriage.

"He who got possession of her" would be her husband.

Verse division between 6 and 7.

"At times" is the last Hebrew phrase of v. 6. *BHS* & Anchor Bible say it goes with verse 7.

Translation of Verse 7.

In those times there will arise from the shoot of her roots in his place and he will bring his army and he will go into the fortification of the king of the north and he will act against them and he will prevail.

"Those times." AB Note to V. 7. There is no word "those" in the Hebrew of verse 7.

Add *hāhēm* "those" to "at times" = "at those times" (cf. Dan 11:14; 2 Chron 15:5), and join the 2 words to vs. 7.

"There will arise." This is a suggestion from *BHS*. The Hebrew literally says "and he will arise."

The difference is only in the first letter: ועמד vs. יעמד. These letters are often confused in handwriting.

From the shoot of her roots.

BHS suggests moving one letter so that this phrase will read "a shoot from her roots."

That would make better sense, and this is in fact what KJV and RSV do.

[not for lecture: "in" his place could be an adverbial accusative. See the *BHS3* note.

Also, the identical phrase occurs in 11:20 & 21, and the word "in" על- is in fact in those verses].

He will **bring his** army. **AB Note.** The Hebrew says: He will **come to the** army.
The difference between "will come" and "will bring" is **vowels only** -- which were not written until centuries after Jesus!
The difference between "**his** army" and "**the** army" comes from a confusion between Aramaic & Hebrew.

[Technical explanation, "gory details" -- not for lecture]

AB וַיָּבֹא חֵיָלוֹ *vəyābō' hēlō* He will bring his army. MT, אֶל-הַחַיִּיל וַיָּבֹא *vəyābō' 'el-haḥayil* "he will go to the army"

1) **AB** reads the hiphil rather than the qal of the MT;

2a) Original Aramaic: לְחֵיָלוֹ. Hebrew translator mistook Aramaic לְ, marker of direct obj. as preposition "to," hence Hebrew לָ, "to";

2b) and the final ה of the Aramaic personal pronoun suffix ["his"] (*l'ḥēlēh*) as the sign of the emphatic state ["the"] (*l'ḥēlēh*), hence Hebrew לְחֵיָלוֹ.

Week 28, Lecture 82. The Ptolemies & the Seleucids, Early Conflicts Daniel 11:5-9

Detailed Outline of this Section (from the Anchor Bible)

C. The battles and fortunes of the earlier Seleucids and Ptolemies (11:5–20).

1. Ptolemy I Soter (323–285) and Seleucus I Nicator (312/11–280) (11:5).
2. Intrigues of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246) and Antiochus II Theos (261–246) (11:6).
3. Revenge of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221) for the death of his sister Berenice; his overrunning the kingdom of Seleucus II Callinicus (246–226) (11:7–9).
4. Long and eventful reign of Antiochus III the Great (223–187) (11:10–19).
5. Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175) (11:20).

Translation of 11:5. Ptolemy I Soter (323–285) and Seleucus I Nicator (312/11–280) (11:5).

The King of the south will be strong, and one from his princes; he will be strong against him, and he will have dominion over a greater dominion than his dominion.

JSB Note to v. 5. The king of the south, Ptolemy I Soter, (323-285) who established the Ptolemaic kingdom of Egypt. This helps a bit to know about whom we are talking, but the Hebrew is still far from clear.

Ambiguous – to us! he will be strong against him. Most translate "he will prevail over him."

(I use the word "be strong" because it is exactly the same word used earlier in the same verse.)

Who is prevailing over whom?

A modern analogy: "The Americans battled the Germans on D-Day and they defeated them."

To us the sentence is reasonably clear, though a good teacher of English composition would "fuss."

1,000 years from now, some poor historian will ask, "Who defeated whom?"

With the help of some ancient historians we know that the meaning is:

he [i.e., one of his princes] will be strong prevail over him [i.e., over the king of south.]

i.e., the Ptolemaic king was overthrown by one of his generals.

Purposeful Unclarity? (Collins)

The main reason for the lack of specific names is that the chapter is affecting an oracular style. Since all these things are being foretold centuries in advance, they must not be stated too explicitly. Further, the lack of names adds a sense of mystery to the account and permits the reader the pleasure of decoding the mystery.⁴

Of course, the "decoding" would have been much easier for a 2nd century reader!

⁴ John Collins, *Daniel, 1-2 Maccabees*, Old Testament Message, Vol. 15 (Michael Glazier, 1981) 104-105.

The "greater dominion" is the Seleucid Kingdom in the north.

Translation 11:6. Intrigues of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246) and Antiochus II Theos (261–246) (11:6).

And at the end of years they-shall-join-themselves-together, and the daughter of the king of the south will go to the king of the north to make smooth-ways but she will not retain her power and her offspring will not stand [= survive]; and she will be given up and the ones that brought her, and her child and he who strengthened her --at times.

Notes on Verse 6.

JSB. An alliance based on marriage was effected between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. The daughter of Ptolemy II and others were murdered.

NET Bible. Antiochus II eventually divorced Berenice & remarried his former wife Laodice; she then poisoned him, had Berenice put to death, and installed her own son, Seleucus II Callinicus (ca. 246–227), as Seleucid king.

Ptolemies Make a Comeback, Translation, 11:7-9

7. In those times there will arise from the shoot of her roots in his place and he will bring his army and he will go into the fortification of the king of the north and he will act against them and he will prevail. 8. And he will also bring to Egypt their gods, together-with their cast-images, along-with their precious vessels, silver and gold; and he years will stand from the king of the north. 9. And he will come into the kingdom of the king of the south, and he will return to his (own) land.

7. "The shoot of her roots."

Her brother, Ptolemy III (246-221), a shoot from her stock, retaliated against the king of the north. (note from JSB)
The Ptolemaic king in Egypt (the south) is prevailing over the Seleucid ruler in Syria (the north).

7. "In his place" i.e., King Ptolemy III arises in the place of King Ptolemy II.

8. "Cast Images"

KJV reads "their princes." This requires changing the Hebrew letter samek ם to sin ש
NET "their cast images;" NABRE & RSV "their molten images;" NRSV "their idols"
I like "cast" images because "molten" makes it sound like they are still "hot"

8. And he, years, will stand from the king of the north. My literal translation of a difficult phrase

The Greek Septuagint translated: "and the king of the north will have a year" (NETS)

The Greek Theodotion translated: "and he himself will rise above the king of the north" (NETS)

Jerome did it this way: "he shall prevail against the king of the north" (Douay)

Various English translations

and he shall continue more years than the king of the north (KJV) ("more" is not in the Hebrew)⁵

and for some years he shall refrain from attacking the king of the north (RSV)

For some years he shall refrain from attacking the king of the north (NRSV)

For years he shall have nothing to do with the king of the north (NABRE)

Then he will withdraw for some years from the king of the north. (NET)

NET note to verse 8

The Hebrew preposition *min* [which usually means "from" -- it can mean "than" in comparisons PJM] is used here with the verb *amad*, "to stand". It probably has a sense of separation ("stand away from"), although it may also be understood in an adversative sense ("stand against").

⁵ KJV routinely uses *italics* to designate words that are not in the original language.

9, Beginning of Seleucid Comeback

And he will come, i.e., **the king of the north** (vv. 7 & 8).

JSB Note to v. 9

Seleucus II, the **King of the north** (v. 7), invaded Egypt, *the realm of the king of the south*, but returned North.

More on this in the next lecture.

Week 28, Lecture 83. The Ptolemies & the Seleucids, Later Conflicts Daniel 11:10-20

Detailed Outline of this Section (from the Anchor Bible)

- C. The battles and fortunes of the earlier Seleucids and Ptolemies (11:5–20).
1. Ptolemy I Soter (323–285) and Seleucus I Nicator (312/11–280) (11:5).
 2. Intrigues of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246) and Antiochus II Theos (261–246) (11:6).
 3. Revenge of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221) for the death of his sister Berenice; his overrunning the kingdom of Seleucus II Callinicus (246–226) (11:7–9).
 4. Long and eventful reign of Antiochus III the Great (223–187) (11:10–19).
 5. Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175) (11:20).

Translation, 11:10-14. The Long and Event Reign of Antiochus III the Great (223-187)

10. **And his sons** will wage war, and they will gather a multitude, many troops, and it will indeed come and flood, and pass-through, and it will return and it will wage war up to **his fortress**. 11. And the king of the south will become embittered and he will go forth and he will fight with him, with the king of the north, and he will raise up a great multitude, and the multitude will be given into his hand. 12. And the multitude **will be removed** and he will lift up his heart; and **he will cause many to fall**, but he will not **prevail**. 13. And the king of the north will return, and he will raise up a multitude, greater than the first, and at the end of times, years, he will indeed come with a great army and with much equipment. 14. And in those days many will stand against the king of the south and the sons of violence of your people will lift themselves up to establish a vision, but they shall stumble.

RSV Translation -- I ran out of time!

¹⁵ Then the king of the north shall come and throw up siegeworks, and take **a well-fortified city**. And the forces of the south shall not stand, or even his picked troops, for there shall be no strength to stand. ¹⁶ But he who comes against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him; and he shall stand in the glorious land, and **all of it** shall be in his power. ¹⁷ He shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and he shall bring terms of peace **and perform them**. He shall give him the daughter of women to destroy the kingdom; but it shall not stand or be to his advantage. ¹⁸ Afterward he shall turn his face to the coastlands, and shall take many of them; but a **commander** shall put an end to his insolence; indeed he shall turn his insolence back upon him. ¹⁹ Then he shall turn his face back toward the fortresses of his own land; but he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found. (Dan 11:15-19 RSV)

10, Seleucids Back in Force

10. His "son" or his "sons"? בְּנֵי bēnô vs. בָּנָו banaw

This is what scholars call a *qere-ktiv*, Aramaic for: **what is to be read** (vs.) **what is written**

If there is a "slight correction" the Massorettes want to make (e.g., a spelling error or something that is "indicate")

ktiv, what is written

He stepped into a pile of *shut

marginal note

*dng

qere, what is read

He stepped into a pile of dung

1) That is the lector realizes "pile of shut" does not make since.

2) He sees the asterisk, and looks to the margin, where he sees the consonants "dng"

3) He then takes the vowel from the text and inserts it into these consonants

4) He then reads out loud "dung" instead of some other word with a different vowel that would go with "sht."

The English equivalent would be to put "**what is to be read**" into the text, and put "**what is written**" into a footnote.

Generally the *qere*, what is to be read is considered more normative. In this case, it is "**sons**."

My Problem. My problem with "going fast" is that I am fascinated by these sort of things.

And I want my students to realize that such problems exist for translators.

Do I translate "**what is actually written**" or do I translate the marginal note of the Masorettes, i.e. **what is to be read**?

These are more common than most people realize.

There is another one for "his fortress." What was written is "**her** fortress."

Most translations don't even bother to mention these things.

I think these mistakes corrected (?) by the Masorettes have implications for the "verbal dictation" model of inspiration.

I put the (?) after "corrected" because sometimes exegetes think "what was originally written" is better than the correction.

Even ancient translators disagreed: *BHS3*. Theodotion, Vulgate, Syriac follow **qere**; LXX follows **ktiv** "his son"

10. "**and his sons**" = the sons of the king of the north (v. 8).

JSB note to 10-13. The **sons of Seleucus II** grew in strength and attacked Egypt. One of them, Antiochus III the Great (223-187) finally defeated Ptolemy V.

10, **His Fortress** / **Stronghold**. AB Note. "his" stronghold, i.e., the stronghold of the king of Egypt.

11-12, A Temporary Victory for Egypt, "The South"

12. **Will be removed**. This is the Masoretic pointing, which makes the verb passive. Some translations make it active.

12, "**He will cause many to fall**." AB Notes.

"and he will lay low," i.e., the **King of the South** is the subject of this verb. Similarly, "**into his hand**" refers to the hand of the King of the South. The subject of the active verbs continues to be the King of the South.

12. Various translations of **יָאֵזְרוּ** **yā'ôz:** "prevail" (RSV); "triumph" (NAB); "continue to prevail" (NET); "gain territory" (AB).

13, "The North" (Syria, the Seleucid King) Is Back on Top Again

14. AB Note. "**in fulfillment of vision**,"

literally "to make vision stand." But the allusion is very obscure. Montgomery (ICC, p. 439) calls attention to Ezek 13:6 *lêqayyem dābār* "to confirm their word" (KJV); "to fulfill their word" (RSV).

14. "**Sons of Violence**" -- RSV "**Men of violence**" A reference to the Maccabees, who are resisting militarily?

15. NET Bible Note

This *well-fortified city* is apparently Sidon. Its capture from the Ptolemies by Antiochus the Great was a strategic victory for the Seleucid kingdom.

15-16. The Battle of Paneas in 200 BCE gave Antiochus III control of the *beautiful land*, Judea.

16. "**All of it**." The RSV, like the Anchor Bible reads *wēkullāh*, "**and all of it**" shall be in his power.

The MT reads *wēkālā* in place of MT "and **destruction**" shall be in his hand (= power)

According to BHS, Theodotion, LXX, Symmachus, Vulgate read *wēkullā*, "it will be destroyed" by his hand.

Post-lecture note: However, the Greek can also be translated "everything will be completed" by his hand.

The Hebrew consonants for all of these possible readings are exactly the same: **וְכָלָה**

17. Another *marriage* is arranged to normalize relations, but it did not achieve its end.

17, **And perform them** (RSV). Hebrew says literally: "**And he will do**." [There is no "**them**" in the Hebrew]

Anchor Bible translates: "**As he passes through**," and gives this note.

The Hebrew translator misread, or had a faulty copy that read, Aramaic **ויעבר** as **ויעבד**; hence **his nonsensical** *wē'āsā*, "and he will do." [OR, to use the RSV's words: "and he will perform."

Notes to verses 18-19.

JSB. Antiochus III turns his attentions elsewhere but is unsuccessful and ultimately dies. *Oxford RSV* **Hebrew obscure**.

18. **A Commander**

AB. *a magistrate*. ..., *qāṣīn* (related to Arabic *qaḍī*, "judge"), ... an archaic and poetic synonym for *šōpēt*, "judge," as a military leader ..., is well chosen here to designate a Roman "consul";⁶ ... evidently Lucius Cornelius Scipio who ruined Antiochus at Magnesia, thus earning for himself the title Asiaticus.⁷

18. OMIT from lecture to save time.

The MT says: **לו בלתי** *lō biltī*, which is gibberish. The RSV just leaves it out.

The KJV gives a good try: "without his own reproach he shall cause *it* to turn upon him."

The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament says to read **לבלתו** *lēbalōtō* "to destroy him."

That is: "he shall cause *it* to turn upon him to destroy him."

RSV Translation, 11:20. Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175)

"Then shall arise in his place one who shall send an exactor of tribute through the glory of the kingdom; but within a few days he shall be broken, **neither in anger nor in battle**. (RSV)

JSB. Seleucus IV Philopator, who succeeded Antiochus III, sent Heliodorus to rob the Jerusalem treasury. According to 2 Macc 3, this attempt was unsuccessful because H. was chastised by a divine apparition, i.e., **not by wrath or by war**.

Anchor Bible Note to v. 20

literally, "**one sending over an exactor [slave driver] of splendor of kingdom**," "sheer gibberish," from mistranslation of underlying Aramaic. ... the Hebrew translator misunderstood Aramaic *mh'dy šltn yqr wmlkw* **one suffering a loss of dominion, glory, and sovereignty**. ... [he] mistook *mh'dy* for **active ("one sending")** instead of **passive ("one suffering a loss")** . . . , and *šltn* **šiltan "slave driver"** instead of *šolṭan* "dominion."

Week 28, Lecture 84. Antiochus IV Seizes Power, Daniel 11:21-24.

Daniel's final vision Daniel 10-12 [From Anchor Bible outline]

I. The Prologue (10:1-11:1) Daniel's Encounters a Revealing Angel

II. The Revelation of the Future (11:2-12:4)

- A. Persian age (11:2).
- B. 336-323 B.C. Alexander the Great and the breakup of his empire (11:3–4).
- C. 325-175 B.C. The battles and fortunes of the earlier Seleucids and Ptolemies (11:5–20).
- D. 175-164 B.C. Infamous reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; his bitter persecution of the Jews (11:21–45).

1. Antiochus IV's Usurpation of Throne & Early Reign (11:21-24c) **Lecture 85**

2. Antiochus' 1st War with Egypt & Its Aftermath (11:24d-28) **Lecture 86**

3. Antiochus' 2nd War with Egypt & Its Aftermath (11:29-35) **Lecture 87**

4. Antiochus' Blasphemous Behavior (11:36-39) **Lecture 88**

5. Imaginative Prediction of Antiochus' Death (11:40-45)

- E. Final victory of God's chosen ones (12:1–4).

III. The Epilogue (12:5-13)

⁶ Ibid., 268.

⁷ Ibid., 293.

Lecture Plan

I plan to treat the historical parts of the reign of Antiochus in Lectures 85-88.

These events were actually **history** for the author of Daniel 10-12, although he wrote them as "predictions"

I had hoped to do all of this material today, but it looks like I'll only be able to do **the first part**.

11:40-45 is an **actual (incorrect) prediction** of the death of Antiochus IV.

I plan to treat it together with the materials of chapter 12, also **really in the future** for the author.

Translation: Antiochus Begins His Reign, 11:21-24c

²¹ And there will stand in **his place** one-despised, and they will not confer on him honor of a kingdom, and he will come **suddenly** and will seize a kingdom by deceit. ²² and **the forces of the flood will-be-swept-away** before him, and they will be broken, and a **covenant leader** too. ²³ And after **making-a-covenant** with him, he will perform treachery, and he will go up and will be strong **in a little of a nation**. ²⁴ **Suddenly** and with the **rich-things** of the province he will come, and he will do what neither his fathers, nor his father's fathers had done; he will-will-spread-around plunder and booty and wealth **to them**.

JSB Note, 21-22.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164). Under his rule the *covenant leader*, the high priest Onias III, was murdered. [More on this murder shortly]

Verse 21, . . . in **"his" place**, i.e., the place of the Seleucid King Antiochus III

Family Tree

Antiochus III (the Great)
Seleucus IV (older son) **Antiochus IV** (younger son)
Demetrius (older son) **younger son**

Background

After the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C. **Antiochus IV**, the younger son of defeated **Antiochus the Great**, was taken as hostage to Rome where he lived for fourteen years in royal splendor rather than as a prisoner. Then . . . , his brother **Seleucus IV** . . . sent his own elder son **Demetrius** to replace Antiochus in Rome. On the way home Antiochus lived in Athens for a while and got himself elected to the chief magistracy of that still famous city, so great was his charm and the political acumen he had acquired while in Rome. When news of the murder of Seleucus IV reached him in Athens he left immediately for Antioch. **Demetrius**, now hostage in Rome, was of course the **legitimate heir** to his murdered father's throne; but Heliodorus, chief of the conspirators responsible for the death of Seleucus, was busy at another conspiracy to seize power under the pretext of acting as regent of the **younger son** of Seleucus. But . . . Antiochus was able to move swiftly to nullify the conspiracy. Heliodorus fled; Antiochus "who had been spurned and upon whom the royal insignia had not been conferred" (11:21) usurped the throne and murdered his **young nephew** the puppet king. So cunning and thorough had Antiochus been that he was able to gain control of the kingdom almost immediately.⁸

21, "suddenly." The expression *bēšalwā* gives translators trouble.⁹

Greek Septuagint	He will come without warning	NETS	followed by RSV, NRSV; AB is close to this
Greek Theodotion	He will come in prosperity	NETS	KJV is close to this
Jerome	He will come privately	Douay	NABRE is pretty close to this
KJV	He will come peaceably		
NABRE	He shall enter by stealth		
AB	He will slip in suddenly		

⁸ Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary on Chapters 1-9*, vol. 23, Anchor Yale Bible (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), 294.

⁹ The same expression occurred in Dan 8:25 and occurs again in 11:24

AB Note. "If *b^ešabweh* is taken as an Aramaism, it has the meaning of "quietly, unexpectedly, suddenly, immediately."
[but *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* gives it as "security, ease," PJM]

AB renders the expression "**without warning**" in verse 24. I render it the same way both times to show the Hebrew is identical.

22, the forces of the flood will-be-swept-away? So the MT.

Even more literally: "the forces of the **flood** will-be-**flooded** away."

BHS3 and AB suggest changing *haššetep* (the flood) to *hiššātep* (being flooded) – a change that affects **vowels only**.

Then it would say literally: and forces, being flooded will be flooded away.

Or more idiomatically: and forces will be utterly flooded away.

Or even more idiomatically: and forces will be utterly swept away before him.

Anchor Bible Note

The first half of the verse implies that Antiochus had to put down armed opposition to his takeover of the Seleucid throne. He was able, however, to undo any attempts on his power¹⁰

22. A Covenant Leader, AB "prince of the covenant"

Antiochus had some "inside help" from faithless, ambitious, greedy Jewish leaders.

... "the prince of the covenant" (11:22b) is the Jerusalem high priest, who would "be crushed" because of Antiochus' wicked interference in the high priestly office. Recent commentators agree that the man in question is Onias III who was firmly opposed to the Hellenizing policies of Antiochus. Shortly after his accession in 175 B.C. Antiochus was approached by **Onias' brother Jason** who in exchange for the high priestly office was willing to offer the monarch a generous bribe of "three hundred and sixty **talents** of silver, as well as eighty **talents** from another source of income" (2 Macc 4:8). **Jason, moreover, not only agreed to the Hellenization** of Judaism but would himself take **positive measures to promote this policy** (cf. 2 Macc 4:9–19). Not being one to pass up a good deal, Antiochus graciously accepted Jason's bribe and deposed Onias.¹¹

[Post lecture note: depending on the country, a talent could be anywhere from 50-70 pounds]

Antiochus was skillful at exploiting these internal divisions.

The Murder of Onias III, Jewish High Priest

In ca. 172, Menelaus [another Jewish leader] approached Antiochus and outbid Jason for the high priesthood by three hundred talents of silver (2 Macc 4:23–24). Now it was Jason's turn to be deprived of office. Some time later, when Onias learned that Menelaus had stolen some gold vessels from the Temple, he made a public protest and to ensure his own safety fled to the sanctuary of Daphne. In 170, Menelaus had Onias treacherously murdered outside that sanctuary (cf. 2 Macc 4:32–34).¹²

23, Making a covenant with him. The normal Hebrew for "making-a-covenant" would be *hithaber*.

The word *hithaberūt* is either Aramaic or a late Hebrew borrowing from Aramaic.

This word is evidence for the **late date** for Daniel (2nd century B.C., rather than 6th century B.C.)

"Him" refers to the "covenant leader," i.e., the High Priest Onias III, murdered under the rule of Antiochus.

23, ... in a little of a nation [??] AB translates "**with a small party**," and then adds:

This is probably the meaning of the **rather barbarous Hebrew** *bim^e 'at gôy*, literally, "**in a little of a nation**."¹³

This "barbaric" Hebrew is more evidence for the **late date** of Daniel -- and that it is a translation of a work originally written in Aramaic.

¹⁰ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 295.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 269.

24, with the rich things of the province

RSV notes that this can also be translated "with the **rich men** of the province." The Hebrew is ambiguous. AB suggests that the phrase is an echo of *mišmannê hā'āreš* (RSV, "**the fatness of the earth**") This phrase occurs in Gen 27:28, 39 in the blessing Isaac gives to Jacob – the blessing stolen from Esau!

24, **to them**. To whom will he spread around his favors?

The antecedent appears to be "**the little of a nation,**" / "**the small party**" of his followers in v. 23.

Anchor Bible Note

The treachery and double-dealing of Antiochus in consolidating his power and influence were quite well known; . . . The mention of his invading "the richest parts of the provinces" (11:24a) is . . . a reference to his "ability in seizing by hook and crook the wealth of the provinces, in advance of the attack upon Egypt" (Montgomery, *Daniel*, ICC, p. 452). 11:24b–c alludes to Antiochus' extravagant and senseless squandering of plunder, spoil, and other stolen riches upon **his friends and supporters**; . . . 1 Macc 3:20 states explicitly that Antiochus gave gifts "with a more liberal hand than the preceding kings." Josephus *Antiquities* xii 7, 2 . . . speaks of Antiochus as "being munificent and liberal with gifts."¹⁴

Possible Future Lectures

I am thinking that after we study Daniel, I might want to take a closer look at **Maccabees**. These books give us an insight into the history of Judaism immediately before the time of Jesus.

Week 28, Lecture 85. Antiochus' First War with Egypt, Daniel 11:24d-28.

Translation, 24d-28

^{24d} And against fortifications he will plot his plots, **but for a time**. ²⁵ And he will stir up his power and his heart against the King of the South with a great army, and the King of the South will arm himself for war with a force great and exceedingly strong; but he will not stand, **for they will plot plots against him**. ²⁶ **And** those who eat his rations will shatter him and his **force will-sweep-away**, and many will fall pierced. ²⁷ And **both of them, the kings** – their hearts for evil, and at one table they will speak falsehood, but it will not succeed, for *[there is]* **still and end** for the appointed-time. ²⁸ And **he** will return to his land with great wealth, and his heart *[will be]* against **the holy covenant** and **he will act**, and he will return to his land.

24d = the final phrase of verse 24. The first 3 phrases (24a, 24b, 24c) I have already translated. AB suggests that 24d actually belongs with v. 25. I have followed this in my translation.

24, . . . but for a time. As mighty as Antiochus is, his power will not last.

The author of Daniel is going to be wrong on some of the details of his predictions. But he got this big point right.

25-26, **they** will plot plots against him

AB suggestion: omit the letter *vav* ך ("And") at the beginning of verse 26, and take this phrase with the first words of it. **[Post-lecture note: I translated it in my translation.]**

Then it will say: "**those who eat his rations** will plot plots against him; they will shatter him . . .

This makes more definite who the plotters were.

If a scribe thought a sentence had ended, it would have been very easy to insert "and."

So many Hebrew sentences begin with this little word, which can also mean "but."

26, His force **will-sweep-away** (??!) This is what the Hebrew says.

The AB, on the basis of translating the Syriac and the Vulgate back into Hebrew suggest reading *yiššāṭēp* for *yišṭōp*

¹⁴ Ibid., 295.

Note that this reading affects **only vowels**.

doubled consonants, like **šš**, are written **only once** in Hebrew;

the Masoretes, when they added vowels, put a **dot** in the ones that are doubled, and left the others undotted

There are also a few Hebrew manuscripts that support this reading.

Now it says: **his force will-be-swept-away**, which makes better sense in context.

Post-lecture summary of AB suggestions:

"those who eat his rations will plot plots against him; they will shatter him, and his force will be swept away"

More Family Tree. Antiochus has a sister, **Cleopatra**, who married one of the Ptolemies of Egypt.

She has two sons, who are thus **nephews** of Antiochus, **Philometor** and **Physcon**.

She also had a daughter, **Cleopatra II**, named after her.

Their actual full names were much longer, but I think the short forms will help us keep things straight.

Anchor Bible Note

. . . it is known from other sources that the unwise advisers of Ptolemy VI **Philometor** actually provoked Antiochus to attack. Antiochus' sister Cleopatra had been the intelligent and enterprising regent of Egypt while her . . . sons were minors. When she died in 172 B.C., **Philometor** was technically king, but was actually a puppet of two ambitious advisers—the eunuch Eulaeus and the Syrian Linaeus, who foolishly urged the young king to recapture Syria and Palestine, which had been possessions of Egypt years before. In 169, Antiochus met and crushed the invading Egyptian army, . . . His army thoroughly routed, **Philometor** was persuaded again by his unwise counselors to flee, but Antiochus caught up with him and took him captive. The account of this campaign is also found in 1 Macc 1:16–19. The disastrous defeat of **Philometor's** forces is attributed to "the plots devised against him by the members of his court, who will seek to destroy him" (11:25–26). The allusion is most likely to the singularly stupid advice given by Eulaeus and Linaeus indicated above.¹⁵

The Oxford Study Bible (RSV) says simply: "In 169 he invaded Egypt & captured Ptolemy VI."

27, both of them, the kings.

The two kings in 11:27 are, of course, Antiochus and **his nephew and prisoner** Ptolemy **Philometor**. When Antiochus attempted to subdue Alexandria he failed. There powerful nobles had crowned Philometor's brother as **Ptolemy VII Euergetes II Physcon**. This act gave Antiochus a good pretext for masquerading as protector of Philometor's interests and crown. Antiochus and **Philometor** apparently became allied against Physcon—an alliance Antiochus had high hopes of using to weaken Egypt by strengthening the rivalry between his two royal nephews.¹⁶

The plan of Antiochus came to nothing when they were reconciled by their **sister, Cleopatra II**.

27, still an **end** for the appointed time

They AB gives a more idiomatic rendering: "There is still a **final phase** for the appointed time."

The author is asserting that God is in control of history; not powerful kings & politicians.

28, "He" will return. I.e., Antiochus IV, the "King of the North."

28, the holy covenant. This refers to the Jewish religion, God's covenant with the people, embodied in the Law of Moses.

28, he will act ??) I have given you what the Hebrew literally says.

AB argues that this was originally written in Aramaic, and the Hebrew translator has misunderstood.

The translator has mistaken the letter *daleth* ד d, for *resh* ר r.

¹⁵ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 296.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

One has a sharp corner, the other's is rounded. In print they are easily distinguished, but sometimes not in handwriting. This is called "*daleth-resh* confusion."

If this supposition is correct, the author intended to write: "and he will **pass through**, and he will return to his land."

Reason for "passing through" Jerusalem

JSB note: In the midst of his constant campaigns, Antiochus IV had designs once again on the gold in the Jerusalem Temple.

AB gives more details. It appears there was some turmoil in Jerusalem -- intra Jewish fighting.

It seems a rumor got started that Antiochus had been killed in action in Egypt. Jason, who had been deposed as high priest after being outbid by Menelaus . . ., seized the opportunity to try to reinstate himself in office. To ensure success Jason also murdered many of the supporters of Menelaus. When Antiochus heard of these activities he became enraged. He invaded Jerusalem, and as punishment for Jason's revolt massacred many Jews. Then with the reinstated Menelaus acting as guide, he looted the Temple and carried its treasures back to his capital Antioch. A detailed and somewhat imaginative account of this shameful episode is found in **2 Macc 5:5-21**; a condensed account in **1 Macc 1:20-24**. The highhanded and barbaric actions of Antiochus in Jerusalem resulted from his mind being "set against the holy covenant" (11:28). . . . Antiochus reacted swiftly and brutally to reinstate Menelaus because in his mind what was at issue was not religion but rather his authority, which Jason had attempted to undermine. In the purview of the sacred author, however, Antiochus was fighting against God himself when he interfered with the practice of the Jewish faith and desecrated the Temple.¹⁷

Again, these remarks make me want to take a closer look at Maccabees.

Week 28, Lecture 86. Antiochus' Second War with Egypt, Daniel 11:29-35.

Remarks from Rabbi Kline to a question on 11:36

I will spare you his technical response to my technical question, but here is how he began:

May 25/ 2017

Hi Pat,

I remember this verse. You and I must have spent a year on Ch 11. The diction is late, apocalyptic style gobbledygook.

I keep records in the margin of my Hebrew Bible. We spent 8 months on the 45 verses of chapter 11 of Daniel.

That's about 30 hours, since we study together one hour each week.

By comparison, we spent 4 1/2 months, about 18 hours, on the 45 verses of chapter 1 of the Gospel Mark.

This is why I took a deep breath before I decided to give lectures on Daniel 10-12. I'm not sure I made the right decision!

Context. In the previous lectures (84-85) we began Daniel's description of the reign of Antiochus IV, 175-164 B.C.

We considered his usurpation of the throne, and his first war against Egypt (ruled by his nephews).

In this lecture (86) we consider his second war with Egypt and its aftermath.

In the following lecture (87) will take a look at his blasphemous behavior in greater detail (11:36-39).

The next lecture (88) will consider the author's imaginative (& erroneous) prediction of this death (11:40-45)

Translation & Comments, verse 29

At the appointed time he will return and will go to the South, but this last [time] will not be like the first [time].

"At the appointed time." Apocalyptic determinism. All has been determined in advance by God.

"He" is Antiochus IV Epiphanes. "The South" is Egypt, jointly ruled by his two nephews.

"The last will not be like the first." The first invasion was successful. This one will not be.

Translation & Comment, verse 30

And ships of Kittim will come against him, and he will be rebuked and will withdraw; and he will rage against a holy covenant, and he will act, and he will have regard for those forsaking a holy covenant.

¹⁷ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 297.

NET note on **Kittim** succinctly sums up the general view of commentators.

This is apparently a reference to the **Roman** forces, led by Gaius Popilius Laenas, which confronted Antiochus when he came to Egypt and demanded that he withdraw or face the wrath of Rome. Antiochus wisely withdrew from Egypt, albeit in a state of bitter frustration.

The Greek LXX rendered the word into Greek as *Rōmaioi*, **Romans**.

AB gives additional colorful information.

When Antiochus tried to temporize, Popilius, adding insult to injury, drew a circle around Antiochus and demanded a decision before the king stepped outside it. Antiochus, of course, dared not disobey, and so with knuckles sharply rapped and pride deeply wounded, he returned home . . . The haughty and impudent Antiochus finally received some of his own medicine. His power play for control of Egypt had been totally neutralized by mighty Rome.¹⁸

More on v. 30: "He will be rebuked." The Hebrew word כָּחַל *k'h* occurs only 4x in the OT.

In this verse is variously rendered by the translations: [for reference; no need to go through these in the lecture]

- . . . and [will] **rebuke** him (LXX, NETS) [making the verb **active**]
- . . . and he will **be humbled** (Theodotion, NETS)
- . . . and he shall **be struck** (Douay, rendering Jerome's Vulgate)
- . . . therefore he shall **be grieved** (KJV)
- . . . and **be afraid** (RSV)
- . . . he shall **lose heart** (NAB, NABRE, NRSV) [making the verb **reflexive**]
- . . . leaving him **disheartened** (NET)

By coincidence, Rabbi Kline and I are reading Mark (in Greek & Syriac).

The Aramaic-Syriac word כָּחַל *k'* is cognate. It refers to what Jesus does to evil spirits. He "**rebukes**" them.¹⁹ Hence my translation. AB regards the word as an Aramaism, evidence for Daniel's late date.²⁰

A Peshar on Num 24:24²¹ This passage is part of the "Oracle of Balaam." [Prophet hired to curse Israel by King Balak]

If anyone does not know the story of Balaam, we will take care of that in Q & A.

But ships shall come from **Kittim** and shall afflict **Asshur** and **Eber** . . . (RSV)

[Original Meaning in Numbers]The Invasion of the Kittim. This prophecy predicts an invasion of **Assyria and Syria** by a **Cypriot** fleet, as well as the ultimate defeat of those very invaders.²²

Our author interpreted this to mean: "Ships will come from **Rome** . . ., and they [the Romans] will afflict the **Seleucid Syrians**, and the latter will afflict the **Hebrews**."²³

A *peshar* takes an ancient scripture text, and gives the old words new meaning by referring them to present events. Ancient authors thought that God was thinking about **their own time** when he inspired the prophet.

Modern scholars regard this as giving a **new meaning** to an old text.

My opinion is: "**Some Arguments Prove Too Much.**"

If we say God had intentions for new meanings for the Bible at the time he inspired it,
then there is no good reason not to do the same for the Quran, other holy writings
and even "secular" writings like those of Dante and Shakespeare.

I am cautious about claiming to know "God's intentions."

So I answer with a firm **maybe** – based on my Catholic instinct that **all reality is sacred**.

God can do whatever he wants, wherever he wants, but I am modest in my claims about knowing his intentions!

¹⁸ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 298.

¹⁹ E.g., Mark 1:25.

²⁰ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 271.

²¹ Ibid. 270.

²² Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 4A, AYB (Yale, 2008), 206.

²³ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 270–271.

Even more on v. 30, "He will act." & "a holy covenant"

"He will act." We have seen this before. It is a misunderstanding of the underlying Aramaic.

Daleth-Resh (ד ד) confusion. The author should have translated it: "He will pass through."

All the translations say "the holy covenant," but there is no article in the Hebrew. I think this is another Aramaism.²⁴

Verse 31, Translation and Comments

And forces from him will stand and they will defile the sanctuary, the fortress, and they will remove the daily-sacrifice, and they will sweep away the daily-offering, and they will give [i.e. "set up"] the abomination – someone-who-makes-desolate.

"Will stand." This author often uses "stand" for "arise." (*āmad* for *qūm*)

"Fortress." AB Note (following Ginsberg): Fortress is a mistranslation of Aramaic *ḥsyn* "pious ones."²⁵

In Aramaic the word "fortress" comes from *ḥsn* "be strong," which looks like looks like *ḥsyn* "pious ones."²⁶

This interpretation is also supported by 1 Macc 1:46, which discusses the same event.

[The king sent orders] . . . and to defile sanctuary and pious-ones (my translation)

The Abomination -- Someone-Who-Makes-Desolate

This is literally what the Hebrew says, but the grammar is barbaric.

Most translators alter the text, changing one or two letters, and then translate that. Often they follow the Septuagint.

1 Maccabees 1:54 refers to the same incident

And on the fifteenth day of Cheseleu [Chisleu] in the one hundred and forty-fifth year,²⁷ he [Antiochus] constructed an abomination of desolation on the altar, and in the cities around Iouda they built altars (NETS)

The reference is to a statue of Olympian Zeus that Antiochus set up in the Jerusalem Temple.

The Semitic name for this false god would be *Ba'al ṣamayim* "Lord of Heaven."

Daniel's *ḥaš-shiqqūṣ mēšōmem* is a pun, making fun of the idol.

It substitutes "abomination" for "Lord" and "desolation" for "heaven"

Verse 32, Translation & Comments

And with smooth-words he will corrupt those-violating the covenant, but a people knowing their God will be strong and will act.

"will be strong and will act," taken by the NAB / NABRE as a hendiadys [one idea in two words] "will act strongly."

Those violating the covenant

This is written from the perspective of the *Hasidim*, "the pious ones / the holy ones."

. . . the religious outlook of the book is that of only one segment of Judaism in the second century B.C., viz. the Jews whose spokesmen were like the authors and editors of the books of Daniel and I–II Maccabees. Not all Jews agreed with this unbending position. Many, doubtless in good faith, attempted to accommodate their Jewish belief and practice to the spirit and necessities of the day. They did so by becoming Hellenizers. For they were convinced that in this way they could protect, preserve, and make relevant their religion in an age very different from the old days of faith. That the consequences of such updating were disastrous in the long run does not prove that these Jews acted from base motives. Unfortunately, none of their writings has survived. What we know about them derives from such

²⁴ The procedure when I have a suspicion is to check the advanced commentaries. My favorite advanced commentaries are in the following series: Anchor Bible, Continental Commentary, Hermeneia, International Critical Commentary, Word Biblical Commentary. Sometimes one or more of them will have an answer, or several possible answers. Sometimes they will be aware of the problem, but not have an answer. Sometimes I do not have time to check them all. If I do check them all, and none seems to be aware there is a problem, that is the time to check advanced grammars -- and sometimes I do not have that much time.

²⁵ Hartman & Di Lella, *Daniel*, 271.

²⁶ See Syriac *ḥs'* "holy, just, pure" (Payne-Smith Syriac Dictionary).

²⁷ NABRE note on 1 Macc 1:54: **fifteenth day of the month of Kislev, in the year one hundred and forty-five:** Dec. 6, 167 B.C.

partisan literature as Daniel and I–II Maccabees which portray them as **scoundrels and apostates** from the faith of their forefathers.²⁸

Our current American society is not the first society to be polarized.

When this happens, there is no such thing as an honest disagreement among good people.

Those who disagree with "our position" (whatever it is) must be both wicked and foolish.

Verse 33, Translation & Comments

And the wise-ones of the people will make **many** understand; but **they will stumble** by sword, and flame, by exile and by plunder-- **days**.

"**Many**." This might be an allusion to the **Suffering Servant** of Isaiah.

His suffering brings many to righteousness (Isa 53:11).

The Jewish scholar Ginsberg sees Daniel 11 as the oldest interpretation of the Suffering Servant.²⁹

"**They will stumble**." According to Hartman & Di Lella the Hebrew translator of the original Aramaic made a mistake.

In Aramaic there is a homonym that can mean either "stumble/fall" or "be tested."

In verses 11 and 19 the word did mean "stumble / fall."

Here (and in verses 34, 35, and 41) he translates it the same way. But in these 4 verses it means "be tested."

If this is correct, the translation is: **but they will be tested** by sword, and flame, by exile and by plunder.³⁰

In the following verses (34, 35, & 41) I have written ~~stumble~~ with a strike-through font, and added the correction.

"**Days**." That's what it says! It can mean "**for days**." And "**days**" can mean various periods of time.

Most translations smooth this out.

Verse 34, Translation & Comments

And when they ~~stumble~~ are tested they will be helped -- **a little help** -- and many will-attach-themselves to them with **hypocrisy**.

"**A little help**." Many commentators think that this refers to the armed resistance of the Maccabees.

The author of Daniel seems "unenthusiastic" about Maccabean military exploits, hence his phrasing.³¹

"**with hypocrisy**." Perhaps motivated by the desire for self-preservation in the face of militant Judaism?

Mattathias, a leader of the Jewish community in Modein, seventeen miles northwest of Jerusalem, refused to comply with the Seleucid injunction to offer heathen sacrifices. Instead **he killed the royal official** sent to enforce the law.

Mattathias together with his five sons and many other followers then fled to the mountains. . . . Mattathias was now able to recruit many other like-minded Jews who armed themselves and prepared to defend their lives and their way of life. They began their campaign by **relentlessly cutting down apostate Jews**, destroying the pagan altars wherever they found them, and **enforcing circumcision** on any Jewish boys whose parents had capitulated to the Syrian interdict.³²

Would it be too strong to call this "Jewish terrorism" or "Taliban Judaism?"

John Allen raised a ruckus some years ago at the Ministry Conference at UD when he used the phrase "Talban Catholicism."

Verse 35, Translation & Comments

And some of the wise will ~~stumble~~ be tested: to refine among them and to sift, and to **purify** until **time of end**, for **still for the appointed time**.

²⁸ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 43.

²⁹ Hartman and Di Lella (*Daniel*, 300) refer to Ginsberg's article "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant" *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953), 400-404.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 271.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 300.

³² Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 42.

Purify. This reading keeps the ancient consonants, but changes the vowels added by the medieval Masoretes. Instead of *wēlalbēn*, "to make white," it assumes the correct vowels are *ūlēlabbēn*, to purify.

"**time of end**" Most translations say "time of **the** end" or "**the** end time" but the word "**the**" is not there!

"**For still for the appointed time.**" Various translations try to make sense of out this:

KJV is most honest, because it puts into **italics** the words it has inserted which are not in Hebrew.
even to the time of the end, **because it is yet for a time appointed.**¹

Here are some other attempts. [for reference; no need to go through these in the lecture]

until the time of the end, **for it is yet for the time appointed.** (RSV)

until the time of the end, **for there is still an interval until the time appointed.** (NRSV)

until the end time **which is still appointed to come.** (NAB, NABRE)

until the time of the end, **for it is still for the appointed time.** (NET) [The best, IMHO]

until the time of the end, **for an interval still remains until the appointed time.** (Tanakh)

until the time of the final phase, **for there is still the present appointed period** (AB)

I will close with a phrase from Rabbi Kline that I quoted at the beginning of the lecture: *apocalyptic style gobbledygook.*

And the question I once heard at an SBL translators session:

"Do we do our readers a favor when we render Hebrew or Greek gibberish by perfectly clear English?"

Week 28, Lecture 87. Antiochus' Blasphemous Behavior, Daniel 11:36-39.

Verse 36, Translation & Comments

And the king will **act as he pleases**, and he **will exalt himself** and **will magnify himself** above every god, and against a God of gods he will speak astonishing-things, and he will succeed until wrath is finished, for what-has-been-determined will-be-done.

Act as he pleases. These exact words describe the actions of Alexander in 11:3;

A similar phrase the actions of Antiochus III vs. Egypt in 11:16.

For Daniel this phrase characterizes the haughty human pride of mighty people who have no concern for God's will.

Will exalt himself and will magnify himself. Are these liturgical phrases?

In Hebrew there is a passive- reflexive form of the verb which often begins with the syllable *yit-*

These two words in Hebrew are: *yitrōmam* wə *yitgaddēl*.

There is a modern Hebrew prayer, the Kaddish -- most of the prayer is actually in Aramaic!

The earliest written version only goes back to 900 A.D.³³ But prayers often incorporate earlier language.

Here is a section of that prayer:

<i>yītbārak v yishtabah v yitpā'ar v yitromam</i> <i>v yitnassē' v yithadar v yit'alleh v yithallal</i> <i>shēmeh dī-qudshā'. bērik hū'</i>	blessed & praised & glorified & exalted & lifted-up & honored & raised-up & lauded be the Name of Holiness. Blessed be He!
---	---

Liturgical Language

From hearing this Hebrew, you cannot help but notice the similarity to the expressions in Daniel.

Post-lecture addition: *yitromam* is in this section; In fact, the first word of the prayer is *yitgaddal*, "magnified."

From looking at the translation, you cannot help but see the similarity to "**hallowed** be thy name."

The second word of the prayer is *yitqaddash*, which could be translated "hallowed."

I think the author is using the language to satirize Antiochus' claims to divinity.

³³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaddish#History_and_background

36, **A** "God of gods"³⁴ There is no way this can literally say "The God of gods" (*pace* all translations to the contrary)

Verse	super-literal	English equivalent
Deut 10:17	a God-of the gods	the God of gods
Ps 136:2	a God-of the gods	the God of gods
Dan 11:36	a God of gods	a God of gods

The grammatical rule in Hebrew is: if you want to make the phrase definite, add the word "**the**" to the second half.

If the word "the" appears before the second noun, the whole phrase is definite.

If the word "the" does not appear before the second noun, the phrase is indefinite.

An Aramaism? The way the article "the" works in Aramaic is different from the way it works in Hebrew.

I think the only way to understand Dan 11:36 as **the** God of gods is to take it as an Aramaism.

Example of a Cajun Grandfather: "Come spend **eight days** with us."

My high-school friend Mike was always puzzled by this invitation until he took French.

Then he found out that *huit jours* (literally "**eight days**") was idiomatic for "**a week**."

Grandpa was saying, "Come spend **a week** with us." But it came out as "**eight days**."

He was **thinking** in French, even though he was **speaking** in English.

An "Aramaism" is what you get when someone who habitually thinks in Aramaic writes in Hebrew.

Claims to Divinity

Antiochus was the first of the Seleucid kings to apply the title *Theos*, "God" to himself on his coins.

He chose the epithet "Epiphanes," for himself. It mean "manifest" -- i.e., God made "manifest."

Many people referred to him as *epimanes*, "thoroughly mad," as a pun on *epiphanes*.³⁵

Literal Translation of 37-38

And he will give no heed to **the gods of his fathers**, nor will he give heed to **[the one] desired by women**; for he will exalt himself above all. ³⁸ And ~~unto~~ ³⁶ **a god of strongholds** in his place he will honor, and ~~unto~~ a god whom his fathers knew not he will honor with gold and with silver, and with precious stone, and with valuables.

"**The gods of his fathers.**" Traditionally the Seleucids had worshipped Apollo. Antiochus changed to Olympian Zeus.

"**[The one] desired by women.**" This would be the fertility god Tammuz (or Adonis).

The main point of all of this is that Antiochus was impious, even by pagan standards!

"A god of strongholds." **Has the text become corrupted?**

Hartman and Di Lella argue that, as in verse 31, the Hebrew translator has mistakenly translated the Aramaic original.³⁷

Instead of "**a god of strongholds**," he should have written "**the God of the pious**" -- i.e., the **true God** of the Jews.

Furthermore they argue that the phrase "**he will despise**" has fallen out of the text.

There is no textual evidence for this assertion in Hebrew manuscripts or in ancient translations.

Thus, they argue the original text read: "**Even the God of the pious ones he will despise.**"

They further argue that the phrase "in his place" refers to the stand or platform for the altar in the Jerusalem Temple.

Thus "his" place is the place of the true God of Israel.

Finally they argue that the word "**and**" is a later scribal insertion that needs to be deleted.

Their translation of verse 38 thus reads:

³⁴ A search for "God of gods" (RSV) yields only 5 verses. The Prayer of Azariah 1:68 = Dan 3:90 has no Hebrew equivalent. Dan 2:47 is written in Aramaic – there is no Hebrew equivalent. Aramaic has no separate word for "the" – **sometimes** it is denoted by the absolute state. There are only 3 verses where this phrase is written in Hebrew: Deut 10:17; Psa 136:2, Dan 11:36. There is a textual problem with Psalm 84:8 (84:7, RSV). Does the Hebrew say "to/before **God**" **'el- 'elohim** (MT, followed by KJV, Vulgate, NET) or "God-of **gods** **'el 'elohim** (the text translated by the RSV, NRSV, NAB, and NABRE, following LXX, OL)?

³⁵ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 301.

³⁶ The "extra: word is simply an Aramaism. No need to go into this in the lecture.

³⁷ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 260.

Even the God of the pious ones he will despise, and on that God's stand he will honor, with gold, silver, precious stones, and costly gifts and a god whom his ancestors did not know.

Literal Translation of verse 39

And he will act to the fortresses of strongholds with a strange god, whom he will recognize; he will increase honor, and he will make them rule over the many, and he will divide land for a price.

He will act. The Hebrew translator has misunderstood the Aramaic. He should have said, "He will bring."³⁸

The misunderstanding comes from the *daleth-resh* (ד ר) confusion I spoke about in the previous lecture.

Furthermore **strongholds** is once more a mistranslation of Aramaic *hsyn* "pious ones."

With. All this confusion led the Masoretes to put in the wrong vowel with 'm.

They wrote 'im "with," instead of 'am "people."

In a military context, "people" would refer to soldiers.

Once these three corrections are made the Aramaic original would have said:

And he will bring to the fortresses of the pious ones people (soldiers) of a strange god.

This would refer to Antiochus stationing his troops in the fortresses of Judah.

This would include the fortress called the Akra in Jerusalem.

Concluding Remarks

The main reason I did not give this lecture last week was that I was trying to sort all of this out!

Now I'm glad I did it! What I have for you is not perfect, but it is much better than it would have been a week ago!

Week 28, Lecture 88. Imaginative Prediction of Antiochus' Death, Daniel 11:40-45.

Verse 40, Translation & Comments

And at [the] end-of time, he will engage in a butting-contest with him, the King of the South.

"He" is the Seleucid Antiochus IV,

"[the] end of time." There is no "the" in the Hebrew. Most translations put one there.

Neither of the ancient Greek translations has the word "the!"

I would expect one in the Hebrew; I found no suggestions as to why it is absent. Aramaism?

Butting-contest. The word comes from the root "to butt against." It is what a ram does to another animal.

The form is reflexive: it is what happens when two rams go after each other.

Most translations render this metaphorically, e.g., "engage in battle with." But the literal image is nice!

King of the South: This would be the Seleucid king of Egypt, Ptolemy Philometor.

Verse 41, Translation & Comments

And he will come into the Land of Beauty, and many will stumble be tested; but these will escape from his hand: Edom, and Moab, and the leadership of the sons of Ammon.

There are three theories as to why these three countries are singled out:

- 1) These countries were friendly to Antiochus when he persecuted the Jews, so he will spare them in this campaign.
- 2) The author is simply making a geographical reference. The campaign will not affect the eastern side of the Jordan.
- 3) These are the traditional hereditary enemies of Israel: they symbolize Jews the author regards as apostate.³⁹

³⁸ Ibid., 272.

³⁹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 304.

Verses 42-43, Translation & Comments

And he will stretch-out his hand against the [other] lands, and the land of Egypt will not escape. ⁴³ And he will rule over the **treasures** of gold and silver, and over all the valuables of Egypt; and Libyans and Cushites [will be] **under his control**.

Treasures. This is the only time the Hebrew word *mikman* occurs.

Everywhere else the Bible says "treasures" it is a different word.

"Libyans and Cushites." Libya marked the western boundary of Egypt; Cush (Ethiopia) the southern boundary.

The author's point is that "all of Egypt" will be under the power of Antiochus.

43, "**Under his control.**" Literally "at/in his steps." The translations render this variously

"in his **train**" (RSV, NRSV, NAB); in his **entourage** (NABRE)

The word for "steps" is similar to the word for "fortress" (Maşada).

Greek Theodotion says that Antiochus will rule over the Libyans and the Ethiopians "in their **fortresses!**"

Verse 44 -45, Translation & Comments

And reports from the east and from the north will trouble him; and he will go out in great anger to exterminate and to destroy many. ⁴⁵ And he will pitch the tents of his royal-pavilion between **seas** and the **mountain of beauty of holiness**, and he will **come to his end**, and there is no helper for him.

The plural "**seas**" is curious. First of all there is no article "the," although many translations add it.

NET suggests that "seas" would be the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean Sea.

AB suggests that, as in ancient poetry, the plural without the article = "the (Mediterranean) Sea."⁴⁰

"**mountain of beauty of holiness**" is overly literal: an idiomatic translation would be "**beautiful holy mountain.**"

The commentators agree that this is a reference to Mount Zion, on which Jerusalem is built.

"Come to his end." **Daniel predicts that Antiochus will die in Judah, between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean.**

Theological Geography

Antiochus actually died in the Persian part of his kingdom. (More on this in a moment).

What we have here is "theological geography."

Ezekiel 39:1-4 prophesies the defeat of armies from the north in the "mountains of Israel."⁴¹

You shall fall upon the mountains of Israel, you and all your hordes and the peoples that are with you; I will give you to birds of prey of every sort and to the wild beasts to be devoured (Ezek 39:4 RSV)

Other scenes of judgment of enemies in the Jerusalem area are found in Joel 3:2,12-15; Zech 14:2-12;

Rev. 20:7-9 alludes to these traditions.

Antiochus has sinned against the God of Israel.

Daniel 11 thus sees the neighborhood of Jerusalem as the most fitting location for his punishment.

Another Account of the Death of Antiochus

1 Maccabees 6:1-16 contains another account of the Death of Antiochus. I give you the RSV translation.

Vv. 1-3 describe an unsuccessful attempt of Antiochus to capture the city of Elymas, in the Persian part of his kingdom.

So he fled and in great grief departed from there to **return to Babylon**.⁵ There some one came to him **in Persia** and reported that the armies which had gone into the land of Judah had been routed; ⁶ that Lysias had gone first with a strong force, but had turned and fled before the Jews; that the Jews had grown strong from the arms, supplies, and abundant spoils which they had taken from the armies they had cut down; ⁷ that they had torn down the abomination which he had erected upon the altar in Jerusalem; and that they had surrounded the sanctuary with high walls as before, and also Bethzur, his city. ⁸ When the king heard this news, he was astounded and badly shaken. He took to his bed and **became sick from grief**, because things had not turned out for him as he had planned. ⁹ He lay there for many days, because deep grief continually gripped him, and he concluded that he was dying.

⁴⁰ A search in BibleWorks finds several examples that appear to support this: Gen 49:13; Isa 17:12; Ezek 27:4, 34; Dan 11:45.

Whereas the word is often rendered "seas" in other translations, NAB / NABRE renders it "sea," which seems to fit the context better. But why is Daniel using this ancient poetic form here???

⁴¹ Hartman and Di Lella (305) mention this, but there is a typo: Ezek 38:14-39 – but there are only 23 verses in chapter 38! The main reference to the "mountains" is in 39:1-4.

Antiochus is in the Persian part of his kingdom, apparently on the way to Babylon. (We are not told that he arrived there) After receiving bad news, he is struck by illness.

Final Speech of Antiochus.¹⁰ So he called all his friends and said to them, "Sleep departs from my eyes and I am downhearted with worry. ¹¹ I said to myself, 'To what distress I have come! And into what a great flood I now am plunged! For I was kind and beloved in my power.' ¹² But now I remember the evils I did in Jerusalem. I seized all her vessels of silver and gold; and I sent to destroy the inhabitants of Judah without good reason. ¹³ I know that it is because of this that these evils have come upon me; and behold, I am perishing of deep grief in a strange land."

Like all speeches reported by ancient historians, this speech does not contain the actual words of the "orator."

Rather it is a vehicle used by the ancient author to **editorialize** – to tell his readers **his own view** of historical reasons.

Final Actions of Antiochus¹⁴ Then he called for Philip, one of his friends, and made him ruler over all his kingdom. ¹⁵ He gave him the crown and his robe and the signet, that he might guide Antiochus his son and bring him up to be king. ¹⁶ Thus Antiochus the king died there in the one hundred and forty-ninth year. (RSV)

The NABRE study note is helpful

The one hundred and forty-ninth year [i.e., of "Greek" rule]. September 22, 164 to October 9, 163 B.C. A Babylonian list of the Seleucid kings indicates that Antiochus died in November or early December of 164, about the same time as the rededication of the Temple.

Thus, according to 1 Maccabees, Antiochus dies not in Israel, but somewhere in the Persian part of his kingdom.

Hanukah

The Jewish feast of Hanukah commemorates the rededication of the Temple after its defilement by Antiochus.

The story of this rededication is not found in the Hebrew Bible.

It is found only in a book Jews and Protestants call "apocryphal," and which Catholics regard as "deutero-canonical."

Another Account. 2 Macc 1:13-16 portrays Antiochus as being killed in the act of robbing a pagan temple in Persia.

. . . when the leader [Antiochus] reached **Persia** with a force that seemed irresistible, they were cut to pieces in the temple of Nanea by a deception employed by the priests of Nanea. ¹⁴ For under pretext of intending to marry her [i.e., the goddess], Antiochus came to the place together with his friends, to secure most of its treasures as a dowry. ¹⁵ When the priests of the temple of Nanea had set out the treasures and Antiochus had come with a few men inside the wall of the sacred precinct, they closed the temple as soon as he entered it. ¹⁶ Opening the secret door in the ceiling, they threw stones and struck down the leader and his men, and dismembered them and cut off their heads and threw them to the people outside (RSV)

Murder or Disease? Here Antiochus does not die from a disease, but rather is murdered.

In spite of the differences in detail, both books agree that the death occurred "in **Persia**."

The principle of ancient historians is that "bad guys die miserable deaths." They are often "creative" with the details.

So we are not surprised that there is yet another version of his demise.

2 Maccabees 9.

Vv. 1-3 narrate his unsuccessful attempt to rob a temple, followed by his hearing news the Jews have defeated his troops.

Verse 4, He resolves to "make Jerusalem a cemetery of Jews."

⁵ But the all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel, struck him an incurable and unseen blow. As soon as he ceased speaking he was seized with a pain in his bowels for which there was no relief and with sharp internal tortures . . . ⁷ Yet he did not in any way stop his insolence, . . . And so it came about that he fell out of his chariot as it was rushing along, and the fall was so hard as to torture every limb of his body. . . . ⁹ the ungodly man's body swarmed with worms, and while he was still living in anguish and pain, his flesh rotted away, and because of his stench the whole army felt revulsion at his decay. ¹⁰ Because of his intolerable stench no one was able to carry the man . . .

This story is similar to the story of the illness that precedes the death of Judas in some NT Apocrypha.

Repentance too late!

Verses 11-12 Antiochus, broken in spirit, declares that he is not a god.

Verses 13-15 He makes a vow that Jerusalem will be a free city, and all its citizens equal to citizens of Athens.

Verse 16, He promises to restore all the Temple treasures he has stolen, & add even more wealth from personal resources

¹⁷ and in addition to all this he also **would become a Jew** and would visit every inhabited place to proclaim the power of God.

Verses 18-27, When his sufferings do not abate, he writes a letter appointing his son as king after him.

²⁸ So the murderer and blasphemer, having endured the more intense suffering, such as he had inflicted on others, came to the end of his life by a most pitiable fate, among the mountains in a strange land. (RSV)

Summary

As in 1 Maccabees 6, he dies of **illness** rather than murder. All three accounts agree that he died **in Persia**, not in Judah.

Back to Daniel 11:40-45: **Misguided Attempts to Save Absolute Biblical Inerrancy**

The trouble is that nothing in these verses matches the actual course of history as it is known from other sources. [E.g., 1 & 2 Maccabees; Babylonian historical documents; PJM] This untoward situation has caused believers through the centuries great difficulty. And unusual interpretations, however well intentioned and prompted as they were by deep faith in Sacred Scripture, were put forward in a **misguided** attempt to salvage the inerrancy of the biblical text.⁴²

Hartman & Di Lella see the main point as author's confident hope in that ultimately God's power is greater than historical tyrants such as Antiochus.

Dating Daniel

. . . critics are in general agreement that this apocalypse was composed in 165 or 164 B.C., because in 11:40–45 the **author is unaware** of Antiochus' **real-life eastern campaign in 165**, or of the **rededication of the Temple in December 164**, or of the **tyrant's death late in 164 in Persia**.⁴³

Scholars thus date Daniel **after the last correct "predictions"**-- [everything up to verse 39] these were not actual predictions at all; they had already occurred in the past when Daniel wrote them as "predictions" -- and **before the first incorrect predictions**.

Conclusions, Intro to Chapter 12

In quick surveys of the OT, teachers must often jump right into Daniel 12.

I wanted to take a closer look at Daniel 10-11, the first part of "Daniel's Final Vision."

Now we have the context for a deeper appreciation of Daniel 12. This will be our topic of our next lectures.

⁴² Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 303.

⁴³ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 305.

APPENDIX: Detailed Outline of Daniel's Final Vision (10:1 – 12:13)⁴⁴

- I. The Prologue (10:1-11:1)** Most commentaries & Bibles think that 11:1 belongs with chapter 10.
 - A. Introduction (10:1)
 - B. Daniel's Fast & Penance (10:2-3)
 - C. Daniel's Vision (10:4-8)
 - D. The Angel's Opening Address: An Angel's Mission (10:9-14)
 - E. Daniel's Reaction & the Angel's Response: An Angel's Message (10:15-11:1)

- II. The Revelation of the Future (11:2-12:4)**
 - A. Persian age (11:2).
 - B. Alexander the Great (336–323 B.C.) and the breakup of his empire (11:3–4).
 - C. The battles and fortunes of the earlier Seleucids and Ptolemies (11:5–20).
 - 1. Ptolemy I Soter (323–285) and Seleucus I Nicator (312/11–280) (11:5).
 - 2. Intrigues of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246) and Antiochus II Theos (261–246) (11:6).
 - 3. Revenge of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221) for the death of his sister Berenice; his overrunning the kingdom of Seleucus II Callinicus (246–226) (11:7–9).
 - 4. Long and eventful reign of Antiochus III the Great (223–187) (11:10–19).
 - 5. Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175) (11:20).
 - D. Infamous reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164) and his bitter persecution of the Jews (11:21–45).
 - 1. Antiochus IV's Usurpation of Throne & Early Reign (11:21:24c)
 - 2. Antiochus' 1st War with Egypt & Its Aftermath (11:24d-28)
 - 3. Antiochus' 2nd War with Egypt & Its Aftermath (11:29-35)
 - 4. Antiochus' Blasphemous Behavior (11:36-39)
 - 5. Imaginative Prediction of Antiochus' Death (11:40-45)
 - E. Final victory of God's chosen ones (12:1–4).
 - 1. Ultimate Victory of the Righteous (12:1-3)
 - 2. Final Exhortation to Daniel (12:4)

- III. The Epilogue (12:5-13)**
 - 1. Duration of the Persecution (12:5-12)
 - 2. Final Words to Daniel (12:13)

⁴⁴ This outline is compiled from the material in pages 254-315 of the AB commentary by Hartmann & Di Lella.