

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_caribbean-journal-theology_01.php

ISSN: 0799-1711

PROFESSIONAL
THEOLOGICAL
JOURNAL FOR
THE CARIBBEAN
COMMUNITY

CJET

VOLUME
15

2016

Caribbean Journal of Evangelical Theology

CONTENTS

Page

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 1 | THE ALLUSION OF THE SMALL HORN IN DANIEL 7 AND 8
Richard Beckford |
| 31 | TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF SERVANTHOOD
Christopher Newton |
| 47 | A CARIBBEAN THEOLOGY OF THE ENVIRONMENT
(Part 1)
Teddy Jones |
| 77 | 1 CORINTHIANS 11: 1-16: A RHETORICAL READING
D V Palmer |
| 95 | Book Review: <i>Geared to Live</i> .
Sasha-Kay Campbell |
| 101 | Book Review: <i>Encounter with the New Testament</i>
Abson Joseph |
| 105 | VALEDICTORIAN 2015
Anne Boodho |

**THE ALLUSION OF THE
SMALL HORN IN
DANIEL 7 AND 8**

by
Prof. Richard Beckford
Lecturer
Southeastern Caribbean
College (St. Lucia)

Introduction

The historical setting and composition for the visions of Daniel 7–12 have been unanimously accepted in scholarship as the time of the rise and reign of Antiochus IV

Epiphanes. John Collins posits that “since the enlightenment scholars have viewed the book as a collection of imaginative tales¹ and visions that reflect the fears and hopes of beleaguered Jews in the Hellenistic period.”² However, the latter part of the book (chapters 7–12) is also viewed as prophetic literature, composed during the exilic period, envisioning an indefinite future fulfillment.³ This prophetic outlook of an indefinite future fulfillment is embraced by some scholars, although a few adherents see chapters 7 – 12 as apocalyptic literature.⁴ Consequently, this division among

¹ The tales constitute chapters 1–6 while the visions are chapters 7–12.

² John J. Collins, Peter W. Flint and Cameron Van-Epps, *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reflection*, vol 1 (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2002), 1. In this work Collins alluded to Robert Dick Wilson who held to a traditionalist view of Daniel. He left Princeton and formed Westminster Seminary.

³ Medieval Scholar Saint Jerome, 20th century scholar E. B. Pusey and modern scholar Joyce Baldwin are a few of the adherents to this view.

⁴ According to Society of Biblical Literature, *Semeiai*, a journal that studies the method of a particular genre. An extensive work was done in *Semeia* 14 by a group of scholars including John J. Collins. It was within this journal that a workable definition was submitted for the genre (apocalyptic literature) which is now widely accepted: “a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages

scholars has implications for their composition theories. On one hand, it implies that both tales and visions were composed at the same time while on the other hand, it infers that the composition and redaction of both were done at different times. Bernard Anderson opines that those of the exilic composition see “the book as a happy hunting ground for those who are fascinated by ‘Biblical Prophecy’ and who look for some mysterious blueprint of the future hidden in pages.”⁵

Evidently, the adherents to the view of an exilic setting and composition rely on the internal evidence of the book to support their claims; notably, chapters 1–6 (set during the period Babylonian period). Even though the contents of chapters 1–6 depict a Babylonian setting, post nineteenth century scholarship continues to suggest that chapters 7–12 were composed during the Hellenistic period. It has even suggested that the “visions arise directly out of a re-reading of the tales, and were composed as a contemporary application of the message of the stories to which they were intended to form a sequel or supplement.”⁶ If the contents of the visions are re-readings of the tales in a later period then a comparison of the visions/symbols with the contents of supposedly contemporary literature of the Hellenistic period may prove worthwhile to the discussion of the specific time of composition and the historical setting of the entire book. Therefore, this study is an attempt to examine the allusion of the small horn in Daniel with the

eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world” (John J. Collins, “Apocalypse: Towards the morphology of a genre: introduction,” *Semeia* no. 14 (January, 1979): 9).

⁵Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957), 516.

⁶Phillip R. Davies, “Eschatology in the Book of Daniel,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 17 (1980): 34.

contents of 1–2 Maccabees, suggesting and clarifying a historical parallel between the two works.

A major motif of the apocalyptic literature is crisis which is demonstrated through the deeds of the antagonist. Evidently, the visions and their interpretations of the small horn referenced in the historical apocalypse of Daniel 7 and 8 verify the period of crisis experienced by the Jews at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Carol Newsom opines that “the violations of the temple and the disruption of cultic life along, with the violence against the people, are concretely the matters that provoke the sense of crisis in the Antiochene edition of Dan 7.”⁷ This article will provide a comparison of the description of the small horn in chapters 7 and 8 with the redacted historical records of 1 and 2 Maccabees. Prior to this, I will introduce the small horn that is presented in the Aramaic and Hebrew corpus of Daniel while making a detailed literary analysis of the pivotal chapter 7. Undoubtedly, this survey of chapter 7 will place the small horn in its proper literary setting which will incorporate references to the Aramaic corpus, specifically Daniel 2 and 4, while alluding to the subsequent Hebrew corpus, principally Chapter 8.

The Vision of the “Small Horn” in Chapters 7 and 8

The imagery of the small קרן (*qeren*, horn)⁸ originates in the description of the fourth beast in chapter 7. Newsom attests that the

⁷Carol A. Newsom and Brennan W. Breed, *Daniel: A Commentary*, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 241.

⁸קרן – In the Aramaic text of Daniel, this feminine noun denotes: (1) a musical instrument in Daniel 3:5,7,10 and 15; (2) a body part of the fourth beast in the animal apocalypse in Daniel 7. The second one is the understood meaning for Daniel 7. In the Hebrew Bible, the word carries a multiplicity of meanings. First, it is associated with the physical bone structure protruding from an animal (Genesis 22:13). This bone feature was used by individuals to carry oil (1 Samuel

symbol of the horn is connected to the ancient Near East setting, namely the “Mesopotamian horned crown worn by deities.”⁹ She argues that although early Seleucid kings were attracted to this image and used it as they showcased themselves on their coins, this may not have been the source of its Danielic use.¹⁰ קרן (*qeren*) is used in the Aramaic corpus of Daniel extensively in chapter 7 as the horn(s) of the terrifying fourth beast. While the visionary

16:1; 1 Kings 1:39) and an instrument that would be blown to initiate the attacks of an army (Joshua 6:5, 6). Second, the קרן was a notable feature of the altar of burnt offering and the reference was mainly in but not confined to the Pentateuch (Exodus 27:2; 29:12; 30:2; 37:25-26; 38:2; Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 8:15; 9:19; 16:18; 1 Kings 1:50; 2:28; Psalm 118:27; Jeremiah 48:25; Ezekiel 43:15, 20; Amos 3:14). Third, it was metaphorically used to express how a group or individual would ruthlessly suppress others. In Moses blessing of Israel in Deuteronomy 33, Ephraim and Manasseh are characterized as “horns of the bull/wild ox that would “make progress” (the verb נגה indicates that this progress is warlike and destructive in nature, *BDB*, 618). The same denotation is evident in 1 Kings 22:11, 2 Chronicles 18:10, Psalm 22:21 and Ezekiel 34:21. Fourth, it means strength, might or power; this is construed in Hannah’s prayer in 1 Samuel 2:1 and 10 where she noted that her “strength/horn” is exalted in the Lord and “the Lord shall exalt the power/horn of the anointed one.” Additionally, David affirms that God is the “horn” of his salvation who rescued him from his enemies (2 Samuel 22:3 and Psalm 18:2). This notion of strength, whether divine or human, is replete in the Psalms, notably Psalms 75:5, 10; 89:17, 24; 92:10; 112: 9; 132:17; 148:14. In addition, there is a similar use in the prophetic literature in Lamentations 2:3, 17; Amos 6:13 and Micah 4:13. Fifth, the word is used symbolically in the visions of Zechariah 1 and Daniel 8 referring to earthly kings/kingdoms. In the Zechariah 1:18-21, it stands as a symbol for four entities that would scatter Israel; while in Daniel 8, the horns are the key images/figures in the animal apocalypse that originate from the image of the goat. Consequently, it appears that the third and fourth meanings of the word listed above are conveyed in the symbolic use in the visions of Zechariah and Daniel.

⁹Newsom, 225.

¹⁰*Ibid.*,225.

contemplated the initial ten horns he saw, his attention was captured by a small horn. F. Louis Hartman and A. A. Di Lella suggest that the small horn is a secondary insertion to the text while Newsom asserts that it is “an interpolation to address the situation under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.”¹¹ Davies’ conclusion is worth considering. He insisted, “It is by no means conclusive but probable, that before the present inelegant vision about an eleventh king of the fourth kingdom there existed a vision about a fourth kingdom only.”¹² Evidently, the vision of the small horn finds its root in the vision of this fourth kingdom and particularly it is a growing horn.

The *Peal* verb that is used to describe the movement of the small horn is סלקת (it arose),¹³ implying that the small horn grew as it took its place among the other horns; in order for this horn to take its place of prominence three other horns were removed. The said horn had two telling features that distinguished it from the others; it had eyes like human eyes and spoke arrogantly.¹⁴ Scholars have

¹¹F. Louis Hartman and A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 214 – 217. Hartman and Di Lella provide a wholesome discussion on the subject matter, discussing the grammatical and structural issues that give rise to their conclusion that a glossator inserted the small horn in verse 8 while no longer alluding to the small horn but an eleventh horn in the remaining text. Along with other scholars, they contend that the use of the Aramaic אלו instead of ארו (used in the other verses of the chapter) in verse 8 for “behold” and its use with the past tense verbs and not participles indicates an addition to the original literature/primary literature.

¹²Phillip R. Davies, *Daniel*, (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985),60.

¹³ In verse 8, there is the usage of the *Piel* Perfect, סלקת 3fs “it came up.”

¹⁴In chapter 7:8, this phrase מְמַלְלֵי רְבִרְבָּיִן denotes “insolent words” (Holladay 420).

agreed that the first feature speaks to the human identity of the “small horn,” specifically its haughtiness.¹⁵ The second feature is repeated in 7:11 and 20 to describe the horn that started off as small. Interestingly, additional actions are attributed to this horn in Daniel’s repetition of the vision of the fourth beast in verses 19 – 22. The horn was not merely a boastful speaker but it “made war against the holy ones and prevailed against them.”¹⁶ John Goldingay rightly observed that “the wickedness of the small horn becomes explicit.”¹⁷ Evidently, this wicked quest was for a period because in verses 11 and 22 the horn experiences judgment at the arrival of the Ancient of Days.

The other explicit mention of the קרן (*qeren*) is found in chapter 8. Collins affirms that “the image is borrowed from chapter 7 but fits the context nicely.”¹⁸ Similar to chapter 7, the horn initially is described as small but it experienced extraordinary growth towards three geographical locations (south, east and the beautiful land).¹⁹ The growth towards the “beautiful land” is

¹⁵John J. Collins in his commentary notes that the haughtiness in this text can be compared to that found in Isaiah 2:11; 5:15; Ps 101:5; John J. Collins, Adela Y. Collins and Frank M. Cross, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 299.

¹⁶Daniel 7: 21 - Two *Peal* participles are used to state the action of the horn against the ‘holy ones’ (1) וְקָרְנָא דִּיפִין עֲבָדֵיהּ – this horn made war (2) וַיִּכְלָה לְהוֹן – he prevailed against them.

¹⁷John Goldingay, *Daniel*, (Texas: Word Books, 1989), 179.

¹⁸Collins, 331.

¹⁹הַעֲבִירִי – Noun “beauty or honor” + definite article; According to *BDB*, it is used metaphorically to denote the beautiful heritage of a land (840). Therefore, Israel specifically; Judah is being referenced, primarily the city of Jerusalem.

solidified by the use of the phrase in verse 10, ותגדל עד צבא השמים, (*wahigdal ad-tsevahashamayim*, it became great as far as the host of heaven).²⁰

As the horn grew, it overpowered the host and stars of heaven and this conflict is likened to the war it made against the holy ones in chapter 7. Unlike chapter 7, its arrogant speech is not referenced, only that he “acted arrogantly against the prince of host.” This arrogance is characterized in two ways; in that it took away the regular burnt offering and removed the place of the sanctuary.²¹ The visionary elaborated on the subsequent acts of the grandiose horn which was allowed to conquer the host along with their regular burnt offering due to their wickedness. Another distinction between the horn of 7 and 8 is the depiction of it in the latter as an eradicator of truth.²² Strikingly, the demise of this horn in the vision of chapter 7 is not explicitly evident in the vision of chapter 8; it is only recorded in the interpretation. To understand this difference and the characteristics previously mentioned, an examination of the broader literary structure, primarily chapter 7, must be undertaken.

²⁰ ותגדל עד צבא השמים גדל – *Qal Imperfect 3fs*, “it became great” + *waw* consecutive followed by preposition עד used in a spatially terminative sense “as far as” + noun masculine צבא “host.” This is followed by the plural noun השמים+ definite article “the heavens.” So literally, it is translated “it became great/ grew as far as the host of the heavens.”

²¹Dan. 8:12.

²²Dan. 8:12.

Chapter 7: The Literary Context of the Vision of the “Small Horn”

Chapter 7 is the final segment of the Aramaic portion of Daniel that began in chapter 2:4b, and it is the first section of the apocalyptic corpus. This unique placing of the chapter has led scholars such as Collins, Hartman, and Di Lella to applaud its literary significance to the whole book of Daniel.²³ In accordance with chapters 1–3 and 5–6, chapter 7 begins with a narrator, but the bulk of the narration in this chapter is a record of Daniel’s dream. The narrator submits a brief introduction, then subsequently Daniel’s dream and its interpretation is presented in verses 1–27.

Daniel recounted that while he was on his bed he “had a dream and visions of his head.”²⁴ The verb employed in verse one is the Aramaic ܚܙܐ (*chazāh*) which can either mean to see or perceive.²⁵ In its use in other Aramaic literature, specifically Ezra 4:14 and Daniel 2:8, it alludes to physical sight or recognition. However, the extensive use of the verb in the Aramaic corpus is found in Daniel 2, 4, and 7.

In chapters 2 and 4, the word is associated with Nebuchadnezzar who had two dreams in both chapters where he saw various images. Similarly, the same word is used in reference to Daniel’s many sights of images within his dream in chapter 7:1, 2, 4,

²³Hartman, Di Lella, 208; Collins, 277. These commentators cite the philological connection with the folk tales and the thematic link with the vision of chapter 2; but in regards to genre, it is the first part of the apocalypse literature.

²⁴Dan. 7:1.

²⁵Holladay, ܚܙܐ 405.

6, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 21. The posture of both men while seeing these visions is similar; they were seen while upon their beds (2:1; 4:10 & 7:1). Goldingay's summary statement that chapter 7 is "the report of a dream or a nocturnal vision"²⁶ may prove worthwhile to the discourse. Clearly, Nebuchadnezzar was sleeping while he saw his first dream but as to whether or not he or Daniel were conscious in the other references is unclear.

Daniel submits that he saw a dream and visions, and the dream is spoken of in the singular and the Aramaic form is חלם (*hālam*), which is used predominantly in chapters 2, 4 and 7. It appears from these chapters that the dream contains the visions; possible evidence is found in 4:6 of the BHS. The construct noun חזווי (*chezrē*), that means visions, is used with the absolute noun חלמי (*chelmī*) that means dreams.

This construct phrase implies that the visions are contents of the dream. However, doubt is cast on the MT's construct by the LXX use of *akouson* (listen) which equates to the Aramaic שמע (*shemā*) that means to hear. Additionally, the author's statement regarding Daniel's recording of the dream in 7:1b gives support to the view that the visions are the contents of the dream. This record by Daniel which started in verse 2b and continues to verse 28 is comprised of the visions of his head, and he no longer uses חלם (*chelem*) in the chapter. Therefore, it is highly likely that, like Nebuchadnezzar in chapters 2 and 4, Daniel's dream was the source of his many visions. Hartman and Di Lella rightly conclude that "only in this first apocalypse (ch. 7) and in ch. 2 is the "vision" said

²⁶Goldingay, 146.

to have come in a “dream” - another indication of the close connection between ch. 7 and ch. 2.”²⁷

The Aramaic noun חזו (chezū, vision)²⁸ is employed multiple times within Daniel chapter 2, 4 and 7. As stated above it is often in reference to the contents of the dreams of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, and the term regularly appears in the construct state with the noun ראש (rēsh, head)²⁹ as וחזוי ראשה (wechez rērēshē, visions of his/my head). The descriptions of the visions showcase remarkable and extraordinary imageries and sceneries that are both earthly and extraterrestrial.

For Nebuchadnezzar the dominant scenery of his visions is an earthly description of the images of a statue (ch. 2), a tree and holy watcher (ch. 4), but there is the mention of heaven in 4:11, 13 and 15. This allusion to heaven is unlike the visions of Daniel in chapter 7, which has a detailed description of a transcendent scene in verses 9–10 and 13. Like the visions of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel also is privy to an earthly description of beasts and holy ones.

Daniel’s earthly features comprise of four successive beasts which are different from each other. Goldingay refers to this portion as an “allegorical animal vision introduced by a fragment of myth that is recapitulated and expanded in vv 19–21.”³⁰ They are described as a lion with eagles’ wings, a bear with three tusks, a leopard with four bird wings and four heads on its back, and a fourth

²⁷Hartman and Di Lella, 211.

²⁸Holladay, 405.

²⁹Ibid., 420.

³⁰Goldingay, 146–147.

beast with great iron teeth (4–7). Based on his visions, the latter beast had ten horns and three of them made way for another horn which is described as זעירה (*zeērah*, small)³¹ and it “had eyes like human eyes and speaking arrogantly.”³²

The vision switches from the focus on the earthly beasts to a transcendent setting comprised of thrones, specifically the throne of the ועתיק יומין (*weatīq yomīn*, Ancient of Days).³³ The throne room record is not limited to a description of the throne but includes the appearance of the Ancient of Days (עתיק יומין *atīq yomīn*) and the multitude that were also present attending to him. It seems that the heavenly scene collides with the earthly one in verse 10b, after the “court sat in judgment and the books were opened.” Immediately following this record, the seer makes reference to seeing the small horn making his magniloquent noise, and he also states the destruction of one beast and the revocation of the dominion of the others.³⁴ Another character is highlighted in the remainder of the vision that begins in verse 13b, namely כבר אנש (*kebar enash*, like a son of man).³⁵ His relationship with the Ancient of Days (*atīq yomīn*) and the earthly setting occupy the rest of the visions.³⁶

³¹Holladay, 404.

³²Dan. 7:8, NRSV.

³³ועתיק יומין – The adjective is in its construct state along with the noun in the absolute state. It is translated literally as old/ancient of days or advanced of days.

³⁴ It appears that the ancient of days who is the convener of the heavenly court of judgment initiated and removed the kingdoms from the beasts.

³⁵כבר אנש – construct noun בר (son) and preposition כ (like) followed by the absolute noun אנש (man). The phrase is literally “like a son of man.”

Unlike in the Aramaic section of the book of Daniel, the noun חזה (*chazah*, vision) is used in the singular in the Hebrew portion. Additionally, חזה (*chazāh*) is not used in tandem with חלם (*chelem*, dream) or ראש (*rēsh*, head) in the subsequent chapters, and it is only used with חלם (*chelem*) in chapter 1:17.³⁷

This dissimilarity in semantic construction distinguishes chapter 7 from chapters 8–12 and makes it similar to chapters 2 and 4. Hence, these distinctive semantic features may have their roots in the philological difference between the texts; the Aramaic corpus consists of chapters 2:4b–7:28, while the Hebrew section is chapters 1:1–2:1-4b and chapters 8–12. Evidently, chapter 7 can be paralleled with chapters 2 and 4, from a literary perspective, revealing some critical differences among the chapters.

³⁶The figure of the כְּבֹד אֱנוֹשׁ and his relationship with the עֲתִיק יוֹמִין has received considerable interpretation in ancient and modern scholarship. This work will not seek to engage the vast material on this subject available. Collins' excursus in his commentary gives a healthy detailed exploration of the כְּבֹד אֱנוֹשׁ (1993, 302-310). The "son of man" is presented to the "ancient of days" and everlasting dominion and kingship is given to him. The seer does not state who presented him to the "ancient of days" and the symbolic language used (on clouds of heaven) adds to the ambivalence of the character. However, the attendant does not make explicit reference to the "son of man" within the interpretive cycle and it appears that the only verses that allude to the "son of man" are 8 and 27. These verses imply that the kingdom will be given to the "holy ones of the Most High." The significance of the "son of man" figure for this thesis is the close proximity in the literature with the small horn. This may suggest that the author of Daniel 7 had an expectation to see the "son of man" arise during the period of the small horn.

³⁷Dan. 1:17, "Daniel had insights into dreams and visions."

There is a recurring literary pattern within the structure of chapters 2, 4, 7 and 8 that is uniquely developed in each chapter. First, the pattern begins with the chief character of the narrative, Nebuchadnezzar or Daniel, seeing a dream/vision. In chapters 2 and 7, this character is introduced by the narrator, but in chapter 4, the account begins with a letter from Nebuchadnezzar to his empire. In chapter 8, there is no narrator and the account of the vision begins in the first person.³⁸ This extensive use of the first person to relay the contents of the visions is apparent in chapter 7, but it occurs after the character is introduced by a narrator. Evidently, the use of the first person is notable in the letter of Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 4, but the first person is limited in chapter 2 because of its predominant narrative style.

Second, the pattern showcases the character's quest for understanding of the vision. In chapter 7, the seeker approaches a nameless transcendent attendant of the vision; while in chapter 8, Gabriel³⁹ was told to grant him understanding. There is a similar quest for understanding in chapters 2 and 4, but the messengers required to give interpretation are earthly and are not a part of the vision; they are characters within the narrative. Noteworthy, is Collins' observation that the interpreter of the tales became the visionary of the apocalypses and this constitutes a significant difference between chapters 2 and 4 with chapter 7.⁴⁰ Remarkably, prior to this pursuit to gain clarity to the images of their visions, both Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar experienced fright caused by the

³⁸ Dan. 8:1, "In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after the one that had appeared to me first."

³⁹ גַּבְרִיֵּאל – noun masculine proper name (man of *El*), an archangel in Daniel 8:16 and 9:21 cf. Luke 1:19" (*BDB*, 150).

⁴⁰ Collins, 277.

visions.⁴¹In addition, in chapter 2 Nebuchadnezzar was troubled in thoughts while in chapter 4, he experienced fear. Daniel was also troubled in his thoughts in chapter 7 because of his vision resulting in a change of his demeanor; “his face became pale.”⁴² However, in chapter 8, Daniel is not only terrified by the contents of his vision but also by Gabriel.

Third, the pattern ends with the interpretation of the visions which highlights the meaning of the images and symbols. With regards to the content of the interpretation, chapters 7 and 8 find common ground insofar as the revelation of the Kingdoms of Media and Persia and Greece are concerned. However, scholars do agree that the four kingdom schema seen in chapter 2 is echoed in chapter 7. Montgomery states that “the vision in chapter 7 is a reminiscent replica of the image in chapter 2.”⁴³ In addition, he argues that there is an “explicit reminiscence of the malignant character of the fourth kingdom in chapter 2:40.”⁴⁴

Newsom agrees saying, “this chapter takes up the model presented in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and reworks it in different symbolic terms, making more explicit the role of divine judgment and the Jewish identity of the eternal kingdom that succeeds Gentile rule.”⁴⁵ The difference that Collins highlights is the allusion of the

⁴¹The Aramaic word used to describe Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel’s terror is בָּהַל which means ‘to frighten’ (4:2, 6 and 7:15, 28).

⁴²Dan. 7:28.

⁴³James A. Montgomery, *A critical and Exegetical Commentary on the book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927), 283.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 283.

⁴⁵Newsom, 211–212.

antagonistic little horn in chapter 7 symbolizing the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴⁶ Hartman and Di Lella suggest that this is possible because “the story of chapter 2 was most likely written in the 3rd century B.C., long before the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes; however, chapter 7 was written during the persecution of the Jews under Epiphanes.”⁴⁷ Collins provides a strong conclusion on the matter stating that “such allusions could not be identified with the confidence in chapters 1-6, but they play an important part throughout chapters 8–12.”⁴⁸

In chapter 7, the visions are recounted in verses 1–14, while the interpretation is given in verses 17–27. Unlike chapter 8, chapter 7 is not clear as to whether the receiver understood the interpretation or not; the narrator commented, “He kept the matter in his mind.”⁴⁹ It is possible that Daniel may have reflected on the various interpretations of the visions, but by the use of the singular noun, **ומלתא** (*ūmiltā*, the matter),⁵⁰ it is best to conclude that he was still pondering the **חלם** (*chelem*) with its various contents. It appears that in order to resolve this problematic feature, the composer clearly states in chapter 8:27b Daniel’s ignorance, “but I was dismayed by the vision and did not understand it.” The interpreter’s final charge to Daniel in chapter 8 to **סתם החזון כי לימים** (*səṭōm hechāzōn kī layāmīm*, keep close the vision that (is) in regard to many days) is not found in chapter 7, but in the subsequent vision of chapters 10–

⁴⁶Collins, 277.

⁴⁷ Hartman and Di Lella, 208 – 209.

⁴⁸Collins, 277.

⁴⁹Dan. 7:28b.

⁵⁰**ומלתא** – noun in the determined state meaning “the matter.”

12, specifically 12:9. The two visions of chapters 9 and 10–12 show evidence of the features of the pattern mentioned above, but the narrative structure is different from the visions of chapters 7 and 8.

Within this interpretative cycle of chapter 7, there appears to be a summary section in verses 17–18. This synopsis of the visions is an indication of the major emphasis of the author which is clearly evident in verse 18 and repeated in verse 27; the holy ones will take possession of the earthly kingdoms. Even though Daniel received this overview he was still interested in knowing more about the fourth beast, its ten horns and the small horn that made war and was triumphing over the holy ones. So, verses 19–22 and 23–27 were smaller portions of the literary pattern evident within the chapter and the main emphasis was on the demise of the little horn due to the realities of the transcendent setting impacting the earthly scene.

Daniel’s “Small Horn” Compared with Antiochus IV Epiphanes of 1 and 2 Maccabees

The allusion of the arrogance of the small horn in Daniel chapters 7 and 8 is attested by the authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees who credited this trait to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The arrogant speech of the small horn in the vision Daniel 7:8 is interpreted as “arrogant speech against the Most High.”⁵¹ In 1–2 Maccabees, there is no explicit reference to insolent speeches against the deity of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. However, Antiochus’ letter in 1 Maccabees 1:41–51 can be construed as overt arrogance against the “Most High” of the Jews.

The contents of the letter highlighted a culturally superior complex that was exhibited in denial of indigenous religious expression. This is interpreted by the Jews, specifically the authors

⁵¹ Dan. 7:25.

of Daniel, and 1 and 2 Maccabees, as arrogance against the God of Israel. The end of the letter in 1 Maccabees 1 is further evidence of Antiochus' pompous speech where he asserted that "whoever does not obey the command of the king shall die."⁵² Although there is no explicit mention of Antiochus' audacious speech towards the God of the Jews in 1–2 Maccabees, there is a direct reference of such a vocal posturing towards the Jews. In 2 Maccabees 9, the author records Antiochus's failed attempts at conquering the temple and the city of Persepolis in the region of Persia which deflated his ego. This embarrassing expedition and news of the unsuccessful plight of Nicanor and the armies of Timothy against Jerusalem enraged Antiochus against the Jewish people. He was adamant that the Jews would suffer for his defeat in Persepolis, so the author quotes his audacious remark, "When I get there I will make Jerusalem a cemetery of Jews."⁵³

In addition, this letter along with the contents of 2 Maccabees 6:1–17 clearly harmonize with the allusion found in Daniel 7:25 that emphasizes the small horn's campaign to institute religious domination. This is indicated by the author's use of the two nouns זמנין (*zimmīn*, holy time or feast)⁵⁴ and ודא (*wedath*, law)⁵⁵ that are preceded by the *Peal* imperfect verb רבסו (weyisbar, he will

⁵² 1 Macc. 1:50.

⁵³ 2 Macc. 9:4b.

⁵⁴ זמנין – In this context the noun signals "holy time or feast" (Holladay, 404).

⁵⁵ ודא – This noun denotes law and further references can be seen in Ezra 7.

seek)⁵⁶ and the *Haphel* infinitive construct לְהַשְׁנִיחַ (*lehashnayah*, alter).⁵⁷ Undoubtedly, Antiochus IV's zealous mission of Hellenism is brought into focus and, while promulgating this agenda within his entire kingdom, he showed scant regard for the deities of these peoples and the religious practices and customs that have been established between them and their gods. This alleged letter cited by the author of 1 Maccabees is a royal decree to the entire Kingdom "that all should be one people."⁵⁸ In Antiochus's philosophy, this oneness could only be achieved if the other nations gave up their "particular customs."⁵⁹ The author of 1 Maccabees referred to this as an "adoption of a religion where they sacrificed to idols and profaned the Sabbath."⁶⁰

Antiochus IV sent a letter to those in Jerusalem and the cities of Judah stating the following: "follow customs strange to the land, to forbid burnt offerings and sacrifices and drink offerings in the sanctuary, to profane sabbaths and festivals, to defile the sanctuary and priests, to build altars and sacred precincts and shrines for idols, to sacrifice swine and unclean animals and to leave their sons uncircumcised.

⁵⁶ וַיִּסְפֹּר – וַיִּסְפֹּר peal imperfect 3ms "he will strive/seek" + *waw* conjunction.

⁵⁷ לְהַשְׁנִיחַ – לְהַשְׁנִיחַ *Haphel* Infinitive Construct + preposition לְ used to indicate purpose or intention; literally the translation is "to alter." Therefore, the subject of the clause will seek to alter the holy seasons and law.

⁵⁸ 1 Macc. 1:41.

⁵⁹ 1 Macc. 1:42.

⁶⁰ 1 Macc. 1:43.

They were to make themselves abominable by everything unclean and profane [thing], so that they should forget the law and change all the ordinances.”⁶¹ Clearly, one can see the direct alterations of the festivals and laws of the Jews. Further account of this religious overhaul is found in 2 Maccabees 6:1–11; the author writes in verse 6 that “people could neither keep the Sabbath, nor observe the festivals of their ancestors.”

Goldingay suggests that the significance of “the changing of the times” is not necessarily addressing the change to the Jewish religious system but it “denotes the taking of decisions regarding how human history unfolds and in particular how one regime follows another.”⁶² He believes this decision is an affront to God who “fixes decrees.”⁶³ Although the motif promoted by Goldingay is important in understanding the apocalypse, it fails to address the contents of the letter that indicate the significance of the religious alterations to the Jewish writings. Collins highlights this significance well by suggesting “the point at issue was apparently the suppression of the traditionally Jewish observances and their replacement with pagan rites, rather than a change in the calendar of the traditional cult.”⁶⁴

The content of the letter in 1 Maccabees 1 supports the claim of the Maccabean author that Antiochus IV Epiphanes forbade the worship practices of the Jews within the temple, specifically forbidding burnt offerings and sacrifices. This historical claim by

⁶¹1 Macc. 1:44–49.

⁶²Goldingay, 181.

⁶³Goldingay, 181.

⁶⁴Collins, 322.

the author is alluded to in the vision of Daniel 8 in verse 11–12 where the small horn took the תמיד (*tamīd*, burnt offering).⁶⁵

Newsom points to the significance of this reference in Daniel because “it was the most frequent and the most important of the required sacrifices of the temple.”⁶⁶ In the vision of chapter 8, the act against the *tamīd* (תמיד, burnt offering) was seen as arrogance against the prince of the host⁶⁷ and in the interpretation of this specific act in verse 25; it is portrayed as the king rising up against the prince of princes. Interestingly, the visions and interpretations of chapters 7 and 8 hint that the notion that religious alterations and domination of the small horn were allowances; the small horn was not operating exclusively.

In chapter 7:25, it is noted that the holy ones, along with their sacred seasons and law, were “given into his power.” In the verse, the *Hithpaal* verb employed, ויתיהבון (*wehithyahabūn*, they will be given),⁶⁸ in its passive, form indicates that the small horn was acted upon by a subject, but the author does not state who is allowing this to happen. Likewise, in chapter 8:12, the author uses

⁶⁵תמיד – The noun masculine singular implies continuity and in Daniel 8 “it speaks of daily (morning and evening) burnt-offering” (*BDB*, 556).

⁶⁶Newsom, 265.

⁶⁷Hartmann and Di Lella make an insightful observation on the prince of the host; “The Prince of the host is the true God of the Jews who rules over his heavenly bodies as his creatures; he is the Prince of princes (v. 25) and the “God of gods” (2:45) (Hartmann and Di Lella 236).

⁶⁸ויתיהבון – יהב “they will be given” *hithpaal* imperfect 3mp.

the *Niphal* verb !tNT (*tinnathēn*, it was given)⁶⁹ to convey the same thought, speaking specifically to (or about) the host and the regular burnt offerings.

Similar to chapter 7, the subject in chapter 8 allowing this to happen is not mentioned, but the use of the phrase *בפשׁה* (*bepasha*, transgression)⁷⁰ in 8:12 is a strong indicator that the author is suggesting that the acts of the small horn are divine judgment on the transgressors. Therefore, the author(s) of Daniel 7 and 8 are not exonerating the small horn from the blasphemous acts, but they want their readers to understand that the religious domination is punishment from YHWH. This point of view is frequently communicated in 1 and 2 Maccabees. In 1 Maccabees 1:11–15, the author highlighted the acts of the ‘lawless sons’ (*ui`oi/para, nomoi*)⁷¹ who persuaded many to covenant with the Greeks (“Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us”).⁷²

They took this proposal to Antiochus IV in the early period of his reign, and it was approved; “he authorized them to observe the

⁶⁹תִּנְתָּן – נתן, “it was given” *Niphal* imperfect 3fs.

⁷⁰בִּפְשָׁה – פֶּשַׁע “transgression”, noun masculine singular + preposition בְּ acting as a *bethcausa*; so the translation is “because of the transgression.” BHS suggests that it is probably *הַפְשָׁה* (the transgression) because of the LXX’s use of *ai`a`martiai/* (sins) or *a`marti,a* (sin).

⁷¹*ui`oi/* – noun “sons,” with plural adjective *para, nomoi*—“lawless or contrary to the law”(BDAG, 769); literally sons of lawlessness.

⁷² 1 Macc. 1:11.

ordinances of the Gentiles.”⁷³This covenant was initiated by Jason the High Priest, brother of Onias, according to 2 Maccabees 4:7–22. However, in the preceding chapters, the author highlights contrasting actions by Onias the High Priest who sought to preserve temple practices, and notably he was divinely aided.

After the death of Seleucus, Antiochus IV Epiphanes became king and Jason negotiated with him, which led to the introduction of the Greek way of life to the people. Jason offered money to the king on a few occasions because he wanted to secure citizenship in Antioch for the people of Jerusalem and build a stadium in Jerusalem. This was approved and Jason erected a Gymnasium near the temple. Jason embraced the Greek customs and abandoned the Jewish ones. The people welcomed the Greek way of life with enthusiasm, and even the priests abandoned their sacred duties. According to 1 Maccabees 1:14 and 15, they lost interest in the temple services and neglected the sacrifices, and they despised anything their ancestors had valued while they prized the splendors of the Greek culture.

Like the author(s) of Daniel 7 and 8, the author of 2 Maccabees explicitly connected these acts of transgression with the oppression of Antiochus IV Epiphanes on the Jews. Evidently, this is observed in his comments after he recounts Antiochus’ entrance into the temple. He states, “Antiochus was elated in spirit, and did not perceive that the Lord was angered for a little while because of the sins of those who lived in the city, and that this was the reason he was disregarding the holy place.”⁷⁴

⁷³ 1 Macc. 1:13.

⁷⁴ 2 Macc. 5:17.

This divine punishment is commented on further in 2 Maccabees 6 after Antiochus sent out his letter commanding surrender to Hellenization. The author affirms, “Now I urge those who read this book not to be depressed by such calamities, but to recognize that these punishments were designed not to destroy but discipline our people.”⁷⁵ In the subsequent verses, the author encouraged his readers that the punishment is temporary due to YHWH’s kindness, and this mention of a time-frame is paralleled with the Daniel 7:25b and 8:14.⁷⁶

Occasionally, the authors of 1 Maccabees 1:21–24 and 2 Maccabees 5:15–21 connected the arrogance of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to his entrance of the temple and removal of its furniture. This act would ultimately lead to the allusion of the overthrow⁷⁷ of

⁷⁵ 2 Macc. 6:12.

⁷⁶In chapter 7:25, by the phrase is used to refer to the timeframe עַד־עֵתָא. According to Holladay עַד־עֵתָא can either mean time or year and with the preposition עַד it can best be translated ‘during a year,’ ‘two years’ and ‘half of a year’. Collins asserts that “the calculations of 8:14; 12:11, 12 can be understood as attempts to specify the length of this period more exactly” (Collins, 322). With that said, if the text in 7:25b is accepted as *post eventu* there may seem to be some inaccuracies with the time period of three and a half years because the devastation of the temple at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes started on the 15th day of Chislev 167 B.C.E (1 Macc. 1:54) and ended when Judas rededicated it on the 25th day of Chislev 164 B.C.E (1 Macc 4:52). Montgomery presents a healthy solution, “it may be suggested that three and a half years is a current phrase for half a sabbatic lustrum as we may say ‘half a decade,’ ‘half a century,’ etc” (Montgomery, 314). Hartmann and Di Lella concludes that “half a septennium may be taken simply as a symbolic term for a period of evil since it is merely half the ‘perfect’ number seven.”

⁷⁷וְהִשְׁלַחְתָּ – שִׁלַּח “his sanctuary was removed/overthrown” hophal perfect 3ms. The verb is followed by מְקוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ, literally “his sanctuary place.”

the temple cited in Daniel 8:14. Collins cautions that “because the temple was not torn down by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the reference may be to the desecration of the altar.”⁷⁸ Newsom adds, “The parallel account in 2 Macc 10 says nothing about destruction, only about pagan structures that had been built there (v. 2); it is likely 1 Maccabees is a melodramatic exaggeration; thus “throw down” in Dan 8:11 is also probably used in a metaphorical sense.”⁷⁹

Incidentally, according to the author of 2 Maccabees 5, the desecration of the temple was preceded by internal conflict within the Jewish priestly ranks, led by former High Priest, Jason. Consequently, Antiochus thought that the civil uprising was a revolt against him in Judea so he stormed Jerusalem.

He was led by the High Priest Menelaus and entered the sanctuary and took the sacred objects of worship and gifts which other kings had given to add to the splendor of the temple. In 2 Maccabees 6:2, it is alleged that the king charged the Jews to rename the temple in Jerusalem “the temple of Olympian Zeus.”

Further, on the fifteenth day of Chislev in 167 B.C.E., a Gentile altar was built on the altar of burnt offerings, and many other sacrilegious acts were carried out in the temple. In poetic style, the historian of 1 Maccabees 1 stated, “Her [Jerusalem’s] sanctuary became desolate like a desert; her feasts were turned into mourning, her Sabbaths into a reproach, her honor into contempt; her dishonor

Therefore, “his (the prince of host) sanctuary was removed/overthrown from (its) place.”

⁷⁸Collins, 334.

⁷⁹Newsom, 265.

now grew as great as her glory; her exaltation was turned into mourning.”⁸⁰

The author of 2 Maccabees 5:15 employed the verb *katetolmēsen* (to expression presumption, arrogance, kateto,lmhsen)⁸¹ to highlight his contempt for Antiochus’ entrance into “the most holy temple in the entire world.” This disdain and hatred towards Antiochus, specifically his arrogant posture which led to the desolation of the temple, is clearly seen in 2 Maccabees 9:7–8, “Yet he did not in any way stop his insolence, but was even more filled with arrogance, breathing fire in his rage against the Jews; Thus he who only a little while before had thought in his superhuman arrogance that he could command the waves of the sea, and had imagined that he could weigh the high mountains in a balance, was brought down to earth and carried in a litter, making the power of God manifest to all.” Therefore, Antiochus’ arrogance alluded to in Daniel is not limited to his speech but is evident as well in his deeds of desolation against the sacred temple of the Jews in Jerusalem.

Antiochus IV’s desecration of the temple was accompanied by his destructive crusade against the Jewish people. As noted earlier, this began after he perceived that a rebellion had started in Judah during the assault of Jason on Jerusalem. In Daniel 7:21, the

⁸⁰1 Macc. 1:39 – 40.

⁸¹This verb is derived from kataiolma,w that means “to dare or presume” (*Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Logos Bible Software).

seer referenced it in his accounts, “As I looked, this horn made war with the holy ones and was prevailing over them.”⁸²

This is understood within the interpretation of this vision in 7:25 as the king “wearing out⁸³ the holy ones of the Most High.” Conversely, the visions of chapter 8 portray the small horn in this destructive manner, “he shall grow strong in power, shall cause fearful destruction, shall destroy the powerful and the people of the holy ones.”⁸⁴ Detailed reports of Antiochus’ murderous feats are found in 1 and 2 Maccabees, and these reports agree that the invasion of Jerusalem was preceded by his journey to the South in Egypt as he made war against Ptolemy as in the vision of Daniel 8:9. In 169 B.C.E., Antiochus IV, along with his army, slaughtered eighty thousand Jews and sold forty thousand into slavery.⁸⁵

The author of 1 Maccabees 1 lamented: “he shed much blood; Israel mourned deeply in every community, rulers and elders groaned, young women and young men became faint, the beauty of the women faded; even the land trembled for its inhabitants, and all the house of Jacob was clothed in shame.”⁸⁶ This was the beginning of an intense period of persecution of the Jews that lasted for years

⁸²Two *Peal* participles are used to state the action of the horn against the “holy ones” (1) וְקָרְנָא דְכֹן עֲבָדָהּ – this horn made war (2) וַיִּבְלֶה לְהוֹן – he prevailed against them.

⁸³יִבְלֶה – בִּלָּה, “wear out” (Holladay 399) or figuratively “harass continually” (*BDB* 1084), *Pael* imperfect 3ms.

⁸⁴ Daniel 8:24. In addition, the author states in verse 25, “without warning, he shall destroy many.”

⁸⁵1 Macc. 1:20 – 28 and 2 Macc. 5:11 – 14.

⁸⁶ 1 Macc. 1:24b – 26, 28.

until the revolts of the Maccabean brothers.⁸⁷ These revolts resulted in the temporary restoration of the temple in Jerusalem and clearly they marked the beginning of the expectant judgment upon the small horn as seen in Daniel 7.

In the visions of Daniel 7, the visionary sees judgment upon the antagonist of this apocalypse by the heavenly protagonist. Interestingly, in verse 11 it was the beast that was killed and not the small horn. The mode of death within the vision is by fire and Collins explains that “hellfire becomes the standard place and mode of eschatological punishment from this time on.”⁸⁸

With that said, it appears the visionary expected the demise of the small horn along with the fourth beast; in verse 22, the oppressive acts by the small horn are interrupted by the coming of the ancient one of days. This is interpreted in verse 26 as the revocation of the small horn’s dominion which would “be destroyed until the end.”⁸⁹ The “end” referenced here indicates the eschatological expectation of the author of Daniel 7, marked by the demise of the oppressor at the hand of the heavenly protagonist who

⁸⁷In 1 Macc. 1, the author was careful to mention those who resisted the religious reforms of the king which resulted in their deaths. Similarly, the author of 2 Maccabees highlighted the martyrdom of Eleazar, a scribe (chap 6:18 – 31) who chose to die instead of eating pork/unclean meat. In addition, the same author relays the story of a woman and her seven sons who chose a similar fate rather than to eat pig’s meat. This passive resistance would lead to aggression instigated by Mattathias the father of Judas Maccabeus.

⁸⁸Collins, 304.

⁸⁹וְלִהְיוּבְדָה עַד־סוֹפָא אבד – “to be destroyed” *Hophal* infinitive construct + preposition לְ + conjunction *waw*; literally “to be destroyed.” This is followed by the noun סוֹף “end” + the preposition עַד with a temporal use (speaking of time) “until” (Williams 119).

in turn presents his kingdoms along with others to the “people of the holy ones.” This allusion to the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is clearly recorded in 1 and 2 Maccabees. Indeed, the author of the latter book concurs with Daniel 7 that the death of Antiochus was a divine judgment.

In 2 Maccabees 9, the author reported that prior to Antiochus IV death, he retreated from the region of Persia after the people of Persopolis withstood him and his army. Coupled with this defeat and the report that Judas Maccabeus outwitted and defeated Nicanor and Timothy, Antiochus IV Epiphanes in his fury sought to inflict vengeance on the Jews. According to the author in 2 Maccabees chapter 9:5–12, it was during this time that the judgment of YHWH came upon him.

He was struck with a bowel ailment and he fell from his chariot, which brought much pain and a deterioration of his body. His body became repulsive to his army and he finally submitted, “It is right to subject to god; mortals should not think that they are equal to god.”⁹⁰A similar summation of his death is found in Daniel 8:25b, “but he shall be broken, and not by human hands.” Although the accounts of his death in 1 Maccabees 6:1–17 are somewhat similar (death is as a result of a physical ailment) to that of 2 Maccabees, the author of the former text does not attribute his death to divine activity.

The overt divine aid to the Jews accounted for in Daniel 7 should have marked the end that would usher in the reign of the holy ones over the worldly kingdoms. However, it is with this expectation that the vision of Daniel 7 parts ways with the historical records of 1 and 2 Maccabees. If the accounts of 1 and 2 Maccabees

⁹⁰2 Macc. 9:12.

are accurate, then after the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the dominion of the Seleucid kingdom was still in effect.

The son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator and Demetrius continued to fight against the Jews who battled stoutly under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers. Even though the Maccabees were able to restore the temple and establish a dynasty, it was short lived and the Romans continued their dominance over the Jewish people. Interestingly, the accounts in the visions of Daniel 8 emphasize the restoration of the temple and did not speak of kingdoms like chapter 7. So, it is possible the visions of the small horn in Daniel 7 and 8 were composed during different time periods, and the accounts in Daniel 8 show evidence of being composed closer to the period of the events of the life of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Conclusion

The significant role that the small horn played as antagonist in the historical apocalypse of Daniel is explicitly attested in the visions recounted in chapters 7 and 8. These two chapters revealed his rise to prominence among other horns of the vision and his conflict with the holy ones and the stars of heaven. These groups experienced his arrogance which was displayed through his elimination of the regular burnt offerings and violation of their temple. It was important to place the vision of the small horn within its proper literary context so an analysis of both chapters 7 and 8 was carried out, specifically on chapter 7. The study highlighted that chapters 7 is the conclusion of the Aramaic portion of Daniel which began in chapter 2:4b, and it is the first of the four visions in chapters 7–12.

Apart from its philological similarities with chapters 2 and 4, it also expounds the four kingdom schema evident in those earlier chapters but the addition of the small horn connects it thematically

to chapter 8 and subsequently with the visions of chapters 9 and 10–12.

A strong possibility exists that chapter 7 was an earlier manuscript with the content of the four kingdom schema but was redacted to incorporate the vision of the small horn. This was necessary because of the need to address the life setting or *sitz im leben* (Antiochus IV Epiphanes) which in the view of the composer/s of Daniel was the “last days/end.” Additionally, chapter 8 appears to be a later document than chapter 7 while the author added new material to speak to the specific happenings under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, namely, the desolation of the temple in Jerusalem.

The allusions of chapters 7 and 8 of the small horn that were paralleled with 1–2 Maccabees showed strong association with Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The arrogance of the small horn was identified as Antiochus’s religious domination of the Jewish people where he disregarded and desecrated their temple worship; by extension this was arrogance against the god of the Jews. Additionally, his arrogance resulted in mass destruction of the Jews and sent thousands into slavery.

With this said, the authors of Daniel and 1–2 Maccabees implied that Antiochus IV’s oppression was allowed by YHWH because of the transgression of the Jewish people and, according 2 Maccabees, these acts were led by the High Priest, namely Jason. These authors did not absolve Antiochus IV from his heinous and irreligious acts but made reference to the judgment he received at the hands of the God of the Jews; this judgment ushered in the expectation of deliverance.