

# VII

## CHAPTER SEVEN

7 <sup>1</sup>In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream and visions of his head as he lay in his bed. Then he wrote down the dream, and told the sum of the matter. <sup>2</sup>Daniel said, 'I saw in my vision by night, and behold, the four winds of heaven were stirring up the great sea. <sup>3</sup>And four great beasts came up out of the sea, different from one another. <sup>4</sup>The first was like a lion and had eagle's wings. Then as I looked its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted up from the ground and made to stand upon two feet like a man; and the mind of a man was given to it. <sup>5</sup>And behold, another beast, a second one, like a bear. It was raised up on one side; it had three ribs in its mouth between its teeth; and it was told, "Arise, devour much flesh." <sup>6</sup>After this I looked, and lo, another, like a leopard, with four wings of a bird on its back; and the beast had four heads; and dominion was given to it. <sup>7</sup>After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, terrible and dreadful and exceedingly strong; and it had great iron teeth;\* it devoured and broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet. It was different from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. <sup>8</sup>I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots; and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things. <sup>9</sup>As I looked,

thrones were placed  
and one that was ancient of days† took his seat;  
his raiment was white as snow,  
and the hair of his head like pure wool;  
his throne was fiery flames,  
its wheels were burning fire.

<sup>10</sup>A stream of fire issued  
and came forth from before him;  
a thousand thousands served him,  
and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him;  
the court sat in judgment,  
and the books were opened.

\* Insert 'and bronze claws' with Hippolytus.

† Or 'one that was old in years'.

<sup>11</sup> I looked then because of the sound of the great words which the horn was speaking.\* And as I looked, the beast was slain, and its body destroyed and given over to be burned with fire. <sup>12</sup>As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. <sup>13</sup>I saw in the night visions,

and behold, with the clouds of heaven  
there came one like a son of man,  
and he came to the Ancient of Days  
and was presented before him.

<sup>14</sup>And to him was given dominion  
and glory and kingdom,  
that all peoples, nations and languages  
should serve him;  
his dominion is an everlasting dominion,  
which shall not pass away,  
and his kingdom one  
that shall not be destroyed.

<sup>15</sup> 'As for me, Daniel, my spirit within me† was anxious and the visions of my head alarmed me. <sup>16</sup>I approached one of those who stood there and asked him the truth concerning all this. So he told me, and made known to me the interpretation of the things. <sup>17</sup>'These four great beasts are four kings who shall arise out of the earth. <sup>18</sup>But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, for ever and ever.'

<sup>19</sup> 'Then I desired to know the truth concerning the fourth beast, which was different from all the rest, exceedingly terrible, with its teeth of iron and claws of bronze; and which devoured and broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet; <sup>20</sup>and concerning the ten horns that were on its head, and the other horn which came up and before which three of them fell, the horn which had eyes and a mouth that spoke great things‡, and which seemed greater than its fellows. <sup>21</sup>As I looked, this horn made war with the saints, and prevailed over them, <sup>22</sup>until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given for the saints of the Most High, and the time came when the saints received the kingdom.

<sup>23</sup> 'Thus he said: "As for the fourth beast,  
there shall be a fourth kingdom on earth,  
which shall be different from all the kingdoms,  
and it shall devour the whole earth,  
and trample it down, and break it to pieces.

<sup>24</sup>As for the ten horns,  
out of this kingdom  
ten kings shall arise,  
and another shall arise after them;

\* Better 'because the horn was speaking arrogant words'.

† Read 'therefore' by a slight emendation.

‡ 'Arrogantly'.

- he shall be different from the former ones,  
and shall put down three kings.
- <sup>25</sup>He shall speak words against the Most High,  
and shall wear out the saints of the Most High,  
and shall think to change the times and the law;  
and they shall be given into his hand  
for a time, two times, and half a time.
- <sup>26</sup>But the court shall sit in judgment,  
and his dominion shall be taken away,  
to be consumed and destroyed to the end.
- <sup>27</sup>And the kingdom and the dominion  
and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven  
shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High;  
their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom,  
and all dominions shall serve and obey them."
- <sup>28</sup> 'Here is the end of the matter. As for me, Daniel, my thoughts  
greatly alarmed me, and my colour changed; but I kept the matter in  
my mind.'

WITH THIS CHAPTER we reach the heart of the Book of Daniel. It is related so closely to what precedes and also to what follows that, when one makes the obvious division of the book into the stories and the visions, it is very difficult to determine whether chapter 7 ought to be linked more closely with the former or with the latter. On the one hand, apart from the fact that, like most of the stories, it is written in Aramaic, there is not only a clear connection between the vision it describes and Nebuchadnezzar's dream in chapter 2: it also claims to say the last word about the brutal empires to which we have already been introduced in the stories about Daniel and his friends. On the other hand this chapter contains in semi-poetical form a more explicit version of the expectation hinted at in chapter 2, of which the elucidation and prosaic details are given in the concluding chapters. As we shall see later, another very important aspect of the situation is given in chapter 9 which will prove to have a vital bearing on our ultimate theological assessment of the Book of Daniel. Our present task, however, is to try and make what we can of the remarkable vision in chapter 7, composed, as it is, of elements with a history and complicated associations which have offered a challenge to interpreters and been the occasion of much ingenious scholarly research. The author of chapter 7 has been able to command a range of thought and imagery in which to clothe it, which invites one to look into the depths of religious thought and experience

which preceded it and also forwards into later Jewish and Christian thought which drew so heavily upon it.

The first difficulty that has to be faced in interpreting this chapter is that of making up one's mind on the question of its unity. Part of the chapter is in plain prose, but the description of the tribunal (vv. 9-10), the section about the one like a son of man (vv. 13-14) and the interpretation of the whole vision (vv. 23-27) are rhythmical in style. That might point to disunity and lead to a theory of interpolation into an originally simple narrative. This radical solution, however, which suggests that the vision of the divine Judge holding tribunal and of the one like a son of man, who comes to the Ancient of Days and receives the dominion, had originally nothing to do with the vision of the four beasts, but has been artificially combined with it, does not commend itself. We can account for the abrupt changes of style by changes in the subject-matter or suppose that the author has drawn upon varied material in creating his total picture. Though a man of imagination and artistic sensibility, as is shown by the tremendous impact his book made on subsequent thought, he betrays, not only here but elsewhere in his book, a certain awkwardness in composition which may be regarded as a feature of his style as a writer. However clumsy certain of the transitions in chapter 7 are, then, to tear apart the chapter, as is proposed by some, would destroy the contrast which is surely intended between the symbolism of the beasts and the symbolism of the man-like figure, and would in the last resort leave 'the saints of the Most High' of the interpretation (v. 27) without a corresponding symbol in the vision.

It seems reasonable to regard vv. 21-22 as the ill-conceived attempt of an interpolator to add something to the vision to correspond to something in the later interpretation, through his failure to recognize that a tendency to such elaboration in the interpretation of a prophecy or a vision is not without parallel elsewhere in this kind of writing. Indeed if vv. 21-22 are omitted nothing essential is lost. Further, vv. 13-14 require vv. 11-12 before them, describing, as they do, what was made possible after the carrying out of the sentence upon the beasts, and in particular upon the fourth beast, a sentence which was presumably pronounced by the Ancient of Days alone and carried out by his agents, though this is not explicitly stated. It is only after the age of the bestial empires has been brought to an end that authority is delegated to the one like a son of man.

One should also be very hesitant about accepting the theory that

there was an original version of this chapter which told of the succession of the four beasts without the further elaboration of the little horn which so clearly points to the tyranny of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. That is not, of course, to say that the author did not borrow the four kingdoms theory and use it for his own purpose. What the theory referred to (M. Noth, *ThSK* 98/99, 1926, pp. 143-63), which dates the original version in the time of Alexander the Great, fails to produce a situation of sufficient urgency to account for the conviction that the supernatural destruction of the fourth kingdom was imminent. Alexander the Great did nothing to bring about such a sense of urgency in the mind of a Jew. Such a situation as seemed to demand swift divine intervention is symbolized by the little horn with its mouth uttering arrogant words. That is to say, without the symbolic reference to Antiochus Epiphanes who was challenging the authority of God as none of his predecessors had done, the chapter loses its point. That the author of the book, and of chapter 7 in particular, is writing at all is due to a conviction, which takes the form of a prophecy, that a climax in world affairs requiring the direct and final intervention of God is swiftly approaching. This consideration, *viz.* that a vision without the urgent symbol of the little horn would lack its necessary background, and would indeed be trivial, seems to outweigh the arguments brought forward by Noth.

Another issue now comes up for discussion, and this will involve us more deeply in the question of the meaning of the chapter. Put in prosaic terms, the meaning of the chapter is taken to be that the age of the oppressive empires is about to be terminated by the sovereign act of God and that, when his kingdom is brought in, delegated sovereignty will be given to the faithful among the Jews as the people of his choice. This information is conveyed to Daniel, according to the fiction of the book, first in the form of a remarkable vision with its successive scenes, and then in plainer language by the supernatural interpreter, who does for Daniel what Daniel, in the story of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in chapter 2, did for the Babylonian king. The question which now requires careful consideration is the extent to which we must pay heed to the possible overtones of the imagery which goes to make up the vision. In fact, if we recognize the ultimate source of the imagery which the writer employs, are we entitled to read more into the vision than the author himself does? It is quite true that the language in which the vision described in this chapter is clothed has a history and calls up in the mind of the scholar

who has steeped himself in ancient religious thought and practice all kinds of suggestive associations. We may not, however, assume that the sum of these associations must have been present to the minds of those who read the composition in question or even to the man who used such imagery in his descriptions.

In his admirable commentary, which, whatever reservations we may have, makes an important contribution to the literature on chapter 7, Eric Heaton, following up certain suggestions of Bentzen which go back to Gunkel, has worked up an elaborate argument for the view that in chapter 7 the author draws heavily upon the imagery of the creation myth, as it appears in its Babylonian form, and in brief allusions here and there in the Old Testament itself, and also upon the biblical view of man's place in the universe which God has created. He accepts the view that there is a link between the varied elements of the chapter and the ceremonies of the Babylonian New Year Festival—whether these were known directly or indirectly to the Jewish author—one element in which was the recitation of the Creation Epic and another the annual re-enthronement of the king after being presented to Marduk. We are, therefore, asked to believe that the theme of chapter 7 is the new creation when God's kingdom is set up and the kingdoms symbolized by the beasts are either destroyed or deprived of their sovereignty, a delegated authority, in what must surely be a reflection of an enthronement scene, being given to one like a son of man, just as in Gen. 1.28 and Ps. 8.6ff. man is given an almost royal authority over the lower creation. We are further asked to consider the references to the creation myth in Ps. 74.13ff. and Ps. 89.9ff., in which Leviathan and Rahab represent the *primaeval* monster Tiamat of the Babylonian myth, and in the light of these to recognize here another example of God's salvation of his people being represented as a continuation of his victory over the dragon at the time of the creation.

There can be little doubt that the myths and rituals to which Bentzen and Heaton refer and which may have been mediated to Israel by way of Ugarit and the ancient religious practice of the Jebusite city which David converted into his capital, are the source of the imagery which appears in chapter 7 and indeed are the ultimate explanation of features in the vision to which Heaton does not refer. It will be necessary, however, to distinguish between all these associations and the actual use which the author makes of the imagery and what his readers would understand by it. At the same

time there is a danger in reading too little as well as in reading too much, into the language, and perhaps we should in the last resort admit that we cannot be certain where the line ought to be drawn. It is also extremely hard to be objective with regard to a passage the ideas of which have had such a remarkable history of acceptance and adaptation in succeeding writers.

When one looks again at chapter 7 and what the writer actually says, it must be recognized that whatever reference to the creation is intended is not made explicit. It is true that the expression 'the great sea' would probably suggest to a reflective reader that *t'ehôm* or abyss upon which order had to be imposed when God created the universe. The creatures which are represented in the vision as issuing successively from it, however, do not bear any notable resemblance to the monsters of the creation myth, either in appearance or function, but are intended rather to symbolize the brutal nature of the empires with which the Jewish people had had to do in the course of the last few centuries of their history. The nearest we get to the creation myth is in the description of the fourth beast (see below). Yet, even so, there is no reference to an actual conflict between the deity and the dragon. This, of course, may be due to the fact that, in the original Ugaritic mythology, the slaying of Leviathan was not credited to El, between whom and the Ancient of Days of the vision in Dan. 7 there seems to have been some connection.<sup>1</sup> In much the same way God (*'elôhim*) in Gen. 1 does not take over the role of the slayer of the dragon but is elevated above the struggle, which is passed over in silence, though we know from various familiar allusions in the Old Testament that Yahweh could be represented as the actor in the mythological combat. What we find in Dan. 7 is the account of a judicial sentence, after which we learn that the fourth beast was killed—we are not explicitly informed by whom—and its carcase burned up.

Moreover, the contrast between the beasts and the one like a son of man to whom sovereignty is given over the nations has really no more than a remote connection with that sovereignty of man over the lower creation spoken of in Gen. 1; the beasts in Daniel are quite distinct from 'the fish of the sea, the birds of the air and every living thing that moves upon the earth', which all belong to God's creation as over against the powers of Chaos which *ex hypothesi* are signified here by the beasts out of the great sea. At the creation man

<sup>1</sup> Cf., p. 107.

is given sovereignty over the other creatures but not over the powers of Chaos which are kept in check by God's creative will alone. The most that can be said on the other side is that the first three beasts live on tamed and harmless, the peoples they represent taking their humble place with all the other Gentile nations under the sovereignty of the saints of the Most High. But they belong to history and not to nature.

It may be said, then, that while the imagery of this chapter seems to bear some recognizable relation to the creation mythology, and while it is true that in biblical thought creation and history are both parts of one continuing divine activity, the main concern of Dan. 7 is with what God is about to do on the stage of history. Faced by what he believes to be the culminating wickedness of the powers of this world, which he sees as satanic in their brutality and depravity, the author gives expression to his triumphant conviction that God is about to intervene and replace the rule of tyranny by that of the saints of the Most High which will be the embodiment of the purpose and sovereignty of God. The problematic symbol, 'the one like a son of man', may conceivably imply some thought in the author's mind that the authority originally given to man over the lower creation is now to be surpassed by the authority given to Israel over the nations. His main point, however, would be that the tyrant nation symbolized by the fourth beast was of a beastliness which demanded not control but total destruction.

It should be recognized, however, that Heaton makes an excellent point when he draws special attention to Ps. 74, a psalm which seems to mirror a situation very similar to that in which the Jews found themselves under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. J. A. Emerton ('The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery', *JTS* New Series IX/2, 1958, p. 234) has pointed out that behind this Psalm and certain others—46, 48, 76—we can detect a cultic situation like that of the New Year Festival and some connection with apocalyptic passages in the prophets (Zech. 12-14; Joel 3; Ezek. 38-39; Isa. 17.12-14 and 29.1-8). Ps. 74 describes a time when the temple has been desecrated and when all the meeting places (synagogues?) of God in the land have been burned. That last disaster points to a later century than that of the Babylonian Exile. And the cry goes up: 'How long, O God?' One can agree that the Book of Daniel is very like a prophetic answer to this appeal. Chapter 9, like this psalm, may give us a clue to the spiritual condition to which the Book of



Daniel spoke and to those by whom the hope it kindled could be appropriated as a veritable word of God.

In Ps. 74, we must frankly recognize, the psalmist goes on to describe God's triumph over Leviathan in creation (vv. 12-17). Having reminded God of his creative triumph, the worshippers who use this lament plead with him not to 'deliver the soul of thy dove to the wild beasts', and the word which is used for wild beasts is the Hebrew word corresponding to the Aramaic term applied in Dan. 7 to the beasts which issue from the great sea. The wild beasts of the psalm, however, are not identified with Leviathan, though, of course, the more brutal side of nature may have been thought of as akin to that chaos which is forever raging behind its bars. Certainly the author of Daniel does not make explicit reference to the creation myth as the author of Ps. 74 unquestionably does. Indeed, if he is using the varied imagery of the New Year Festival, he may well be unaware of its origin, as he adopts it to indicate the nature of the dramatic transition which he believes is about to take place from a world ruled and dominated by a brutal tyranny to a world ruled by God in accordance with his settled purpose for human kind.

Before we pass on, however, to the detailed exposition of the chapter, we must look briefly at the contention of the stimulating article by J. A. Emerton to which reference has been made above (*art. cit.*, pp. 225-42). Accepting Bentzen's view that behind Dan. 7 lie the mythology and ritual practice of the New Year Festival and in particular the mythology of Ugarit, Emerton argues that the description of one like a son of man coming with the clouds of heaven suggests a divine rather than a human figure, clouds being in numerous instances in the Old Testament associated with a theophany. (He refers to an article by Feuillet in *Rev. Biblique* 60, 1953, pp. 173ff. and 321ff., discussed by Coppens in *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, edited by Noth and Winton Thomas, 1955, pp. 33ff.) To state this point very briefly, Emerton suggests that in the Ancient of Days and in the one like a son of man we have the adaptation of a myth which originally told of two gods, probably El and Baal, Baal being originally the conqueror of the dragon. This would explain the cloud accompaniment of the one like a son of man. In the Ugaritic myth Baal was promoted by El after his victory. Emerton thinks that possibly in the manipulation of the mythology associated with Jebusite Jerusalem after its capture by David, Yahweh, the Hebrew God, in the first instance displaced, not El

Elyon but Baal, and only later, upon the final triumph of monotheism, was identified also with El Elyon. He suggests that through some channel, which it is no longer possible accurately to identify, the old mythology survived and remained available as the source of imagery to be used in late apocalyptic writings. Emerton's contribution is a significant one and is worthy of the closest consideration. He would, however, be the first to admit that, as used by the author of Daniel, the polytheistic implications of the language are ignored and the one like a son of man becomes at the most an angelic figure who in some way symbolizes the faithful among the Jews through whom the rule of God will become actualized in the world.

[1] We are told that the vision of this chapter came to Daniel in the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon. (After this verse throughout the rest of the book, except in 10.1, Daniel is always represented as the speaker. Actually, however, the anxiety and concern which are attributed to Daniel are the anxiety and concern of the author himself, whom we can almost hear at times speaking *in propria persona*; cf. especially ch. 9.) The vision of chapter 8 is dated in his third year. It is in the first year of Darius the Mede that Daniel receives the explanation of the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy. A further experience comes to Daniel in the third year of Cyrus, while, at the beginning of chapter 11, there is a reference back to a supernatural event as having taken place in the first year of Darius. As far as we can judge, these dates have no significance other than that of giving a certain verisimilitude to the referring of these *vaticinia post eventum* to the period of the Babylonian Captivity. The real point of perspective, which explains the stress under which the author is writing and which he transfers to Daniel, is the time of the persecution of Antiochus, from which he looks back, schematizing the history which is significant for him, and from which he looks forward to the now imminent climax.

[2-8] In the vision which Daniel now proceeds to describe he sees the great sea churned up by the four winds of heaven and four beasts emerging from it. It is probably true, as has been said above, that by the great sea the author intends his readers to understand the *t'hôm* or abyss of Gen. 1 which corresponds philologically to the *Tiamat* of Babylonian mythology (*Nammu* in Sumerian), but he does not lay any emphasis upon this, because in v. 17, in the interpretation, the kingdoms which the beasts represent, arise out of the earth. Jeffery (*IB*, p. 452, cf. Bevan, p. 120) is perhaps right in referring to

Isa. 17.12-13 and Jer. 6.23, where the turmoil of the nations is compared to the roaring of the sea. That is to say, the author of Daniel may be thinking more of the movements of history than of the creation of the universe. It is true that the mention of the four winds of heaven recalls the Epic of Creation. Here, however, the winds churn up the sea, whereas in the Babylonian Epic of Creation the four winds are instruments in the hand of Marduk to prevent Tiamat from escaping. The nearest we get in the Creation Epic to the four beasts of Daniel (for the possible connection between the fourth beast and Leviathan, see below) is in the description, repeated several times, of the monster companions of Tiamat who are described as:

the Viper, the Dragon, and the Sphinx,  
the Great-Lion, the Mad-Dog, and the Scorpion-Man,  
mighty Lion-demons, the Dragon-Fly, the Centaur.

(J. B. Pritchard's transl.)

This gives us the lion alone of the four beasts of Daniel. The difference has led to the suggestion that the author of Daniel may be drawing upon some myth otherwise unknown to us (so Eduard Meyer, *Urspr. u. Anf. des Christentums*, vol. II, 1921, p. 197), but perhaps we may allow a measure of originality to the author of Daniel, who may simply have chosen the bestial figures best suited to his purpose. We can still, even with our limited knowledge, detect a certain appropriateness in his symbolism.

In the vision, the four beasts which rise from the sea are clearly differentiated. There is an overwhelming measure of agreement among commentators that they represent symbolically the same four kingdoms as are represented in chapter 2, by the sequence of metals in the image, *viz.* the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian and the Greek. The author of the Ezra Apocalypse (II Esd. 12.11-12), who, understandably, when one remembers that he lived in the first century AD, preferred to interpret the fourth kingdom as Rome, appropriately symbolizing it by an eagle, makes it, however, abundantly clear that the Book of Daniel had given a very different interpretation.

The circumstance that the symbolism of chapter 2 is, as it were, static until the episode of the stone, which brings sudden and catastrophic movement into the picture, makes it less appropriate than the dynamic symbolism of chapter 7. It is quite obvious, of course, from the interpretation of chapter 2 that the kingdoms are

meant to be successive, and the same may be confidently asserted of chapter 7, where the beasts do not arise from the sea simultaneously (*pace* Gressmann, *Der Messias*, 1929, p. 366), but, with the exception of the third beast, are specifically numbered, it being surely implied that they come up on the land in succession. We may confidently reject Gressmann's view that the four beasts represent the four main successor kingdoms which followed upon the break-up of Alexander's empire. Why should Daniel, who is represented as living in Babylon during the Exile, begin his historical survey only after the death of Alexander?

Coming now to the descriptions of the four beasts, we must first take note of the ingenious, but by no means convincing, handling of the text by H. L. Ginsberg (*Studies in the Book of Daniel*, ch. II, pp. 5ff.), who transfers part of the description of the bear to the lion and part of the description of the lion to the bear. The bear is thus made to stand on two feet in human fashion (as bears frequently do!) and to receive a man's mind, while the phrase which RSV translates 'was lifted up from the ground' is translated by Ginsberg as 'vanished from the earth', a meaning which it manifestly does not have in the present text. He seeks to justify the transposition partly on zoological grounds, the hind feet of the bear being better adapted to the erect posture than those of the lion. It is likewise argued by him that the description of a gluttonous nature, which the text attributes to the bear, should be transferred to the lion. All this somewhat arbitrary handling of the text is to enable Ginsberg to claim that the Babylonian kingdom is represented in chapter 7 (i.e. in the emended text) as having been destroyed when the empire passed from it. He thus establishes a difference, so he claims, between the contemporary historical situation implied by chapter 2 and that implied by chapter 7 and goes on from there to claim a pre-Epiphonian date for chapter 2 and an Epiphonian date for chapter 7. H. H. Rowley (*The Unity of the Book of Daniel: HUCA XXIII, Part One*, pp. 250ff.; also in *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament*, pp. 250ff.) acutely disposes of this supposed distinction between the dream and the vision by pointing to 7.12, where it is clearly stated (on any reasonable understanding of the words) that the first three beasts were allowed to continue in life for a while after being deprived of their sovereignty, no distinction between the lion on the one hand and the bear and the panther on the other, such as Ginsberg claims, being implied. It seems, then, that we are justified in taking the descriptions

of the first two beasts as we have them in the Massoretic Text.

The description of the first beast as a winged lion may be regarded as peculiarly appropriate for its identification with Babylon, not only because such creatures figured in Babylonian art (though also elsewhere), but because the lion is used as a symbol for Nebuchadnezzar in Jer. 50.44 (the references given by Jeffery are not conclusive), while the symbol of the eagle is used for Babylon in Ezek. 17.3 and in Heb. 1.8, where, however, the comparison with leopards and wolves is also used. It is difficult to be dogmatic about the rest of the description of the first beast. Heaton follows Montgomery and Bentzen in regarding it as probable that the allusion is to the fate which overtook Nebuchadnezzar, reducing him to the level of the beasts, followed by his restoration to human dignity (as described in ch. 4), when he humbled himself under the hand of God. Jeffery, on the other hand, thinks that the rampant posture given to the lion implies awkwardness, while 'a man's timid heart' is opposed to 'the fearless heart of a beast'. On balance the former solution of the problem commends itself.

The bear as a symbol for the Median kingdom has most probably been chosen because of its known ferocity (see Isa. 13.17-18) and the dread it aroused (Isa. 21.2ff.). The statement that 'it was raised up on one side and had three ribs in its mouth between its teeth' is obscure. There is probably here a cryptic allusion to Median greed for booty, while the bear's curious posture may imply aggressiveness rather than some kind of limitation of the effectiveness of the Medes as a power.

The third beast, a panther or leopard with four wings and four heads has, like the first, a heraldic character and is clearly intended to represent Persia. What precisely is the significance of the symbolism cannot now be determined. Either the four wings and the four heads mean the same thing and refer to the extension of the Persian Empire in all directions, or they signify different things, the wings symbolizing the swiftness in movement of the Persian armies (see Isa. 41.3) and the heads either implying extension as before, or representing the succession of the four Persian kings whose names appear in the Old Testament (so many commentators, following Dan. 11.2) or some other selection of Persian kings. Probably the circumstances that elsewhere in the book the horn is the symbol for a king (or a kingdom) should incline us to the view that the wings and heads signify swiftness and extension.

The fourth beast, which undoubtedly represents the Greek (Macedonian) kingdom of Alexander and his successors, is described as belonging to no identifiable class of animal and as being of horrible and alarming appearance. Bentzen (p. 61) thinks that the writer may have been inspired by the description of Leviathan which figures in the Ras Shamra mythology and may have survived in the Typhon of Apollodorus. However that may be, it should be obvious from the elaboration of detail which is now offered that we have come to what is of particular interest and, indeed, of urgent concern to the author, indicating, as it does, the situation which impelled him to write his book. To a lesser extent, but quite definitely, we observed a similar increase in detail in Daniel's interpretation of the image in chapter 2, when he came to the description of the fourth kingdom. The iron in the dream of chapter 2 has corresponding to it in chapter 7 the great iron teeth, while the brutality and ruthlessness of the fourth kingdom, as it seemed to a member of a subject race, is vividly portrayed.

It is generally agreed that the ten horns upon the creature's head represent ten kings, not contemporaries, but successive rulers. Interpreters have differed as to whether the succession should begin with Alexander the Great or not, and as to whether a mixture of Seleucids and Ptolemies is intended or an exclusive line of Seleucids (as is implied in the *Sibylline Oracles III*, 381-400). It is probable that the ten kings should be thought of as commencing with Seleucus Nicator, the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, and continuing in the same line down to the point at which Antiochus IV Epiphanes came to the throne. There is no doubt at all that he is the small horn springing up among the other horns, to make room for which three horns are rooted out. There has been endless discussion as to the identity of these horns and perhaps it does not greatly matter whom they represent. H. H. Rowley, who gives a masterly and exhaustive discussion of the whole historical problem of the fourth beast and its horns (*Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 98-120), himself votes for Demetrius the son of Seleucus IV Philopator (who subsequently came to the throne as Demetrius I Soter, though our author could not know that), his brother Antiochus, who was killed in infancy, and Ptolemy VII Philometor, who, through his mother Cleopatra was nephew to Seleucus Philopator, and could, therefore, be reckoned as a Seleucid. This is probably the most satisfactory solution of the problem, but certainty is unattain-

able. Among recent commentators, Jeffery (*IB*, p. 456) prefers the selection Seleucus Philopator, Demetrius and Heliodorus, even though the last-named was no Seleucid. And so on! *Quot homines tot sententiae!*

The human character of the little horn is made clear by the eyes which appeared in it and the mouth speaking arrogantly. The reference to the eyes is elaborated in 8.23, where we read of the king of bold countenance. To illustrate the mouth speaking arrogantly reference is properly made to I Macc. 1.24; II Macc. 5.17 and, of course, to the monstrous challenge which, according to Dan. 11.36 Antiochus Epiphanes issued to God himself.

[9-14] From the contemplation of the horrid succession of monsters, which symbolizes for the author the course of human history from Nebuchadnezzar to Antiochus Epiphanes and which, as he himself experienced it in its closing phases, seemed to him to involve a blasphemous challenge to God's authority such as he could not ignore, the author now looks up and 'above the dim spot which men call earth' has a vision of the divine tribunal and of the Judge calmly passing sentence. One is strongly tempted to hold that here we have the description of an actual ecstatic experience, whatever may be said about some of the later visions.<sup>1</sup> That it is possible to suggest various sources for the imagery employed in the description does not disprove this. Such fusing of images to make a composite picture, conceivably achieved at the subliminal level, is precisely what one would expect. In Scripture itself, Job 1.6 and I Kings 22.19 might suggest the *mise en scène*, while Psalms like 9, 50, 82, 93, 96, 98 might make their contribution to the picture. It is conceivable that we should also reckon on the influence of Persian imagery. A highly probable link with Ugarit has been detected in the description of the divine Judge as 'Ancient of Days' (literally 'advanced in days'); for in the Aqhat poem (III. vi. 48) El is described as *mlk 'ab šnm*, i.e. 'the king, father of years'. The Ethiopic phrase *r'ēsa mawāēl*, 'the Head or Sum of days', of Enoch 46.1, 2, etc., is doubtless modelled on the title in Daniel, which may be regarded as meaning 'the Eternal' or 'the Everlasting'. If Emerton is right (see above) this venerable figure of the vision has probably its origin in the supreme god El of the Syrian pantheon.

<sup>1</sup> But S. B. Frost (*Old Testament Apocalyptic*, pp. 191-2) thinks that in the description of a genuine vision there would have been no detailed description of God, who would have been left as a mysterious, dimly glimpsed figure.

Much speculation has been devoted to the mention of thrones in the description of the judgment scene. If there were assessors there is no specific mention of them, though, of course, God is provided elsewhere in Scripture with his entourage (see references above, Job 1.6; I Kings 22.19; Ps. 82). Nor is there any definite suggestion in the text that the thrones were intended to be occupied later on by the one like a son of man or by representatives of the saints of the Most High, though the reader may have been expected to draw that inference for himself. It is true that in later thought about the judgment it was believed that the saints would have a part in it, but that is not conclusive for the intention of the author of Daniel. Jesus tells his disciples that they will 'sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt. 19.28; Luke 22.30), but that is a different situation from the one described here. A more relevant passage is I Cor. 6.2: 'Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?' In Rev. 20.4, the seer of Patmos has a vision of thrones and seated upon them 'those to whom judgment was committed'. In Daniel's vision the interest is concentrated first upon the Judge alone and he is clearly God himself, the only God, whatever divine features in the long history of the imagery may have attached themselves to the figure of one like a son of man. There can be no doubt at all of our author's monotheistic faith. We are told in the vision that the dress and hair of the Ancient of Days are radiantly white. It may be due to a strange revival of an old belief at a new level that this descriptive feature is in Rev. 1.13-14 transferred to one like a son of man, while in Matt. 19.28 and 25.31, the glorious throne of judgment is occupied by the Son of Man himself.

The description of the throne here recalls the *merkābā*, the divine chariot of Ezekiel's vision (chs. 1 and 10) with its flames and wheels. Enoch 14.18-19 elaborates this: 'I looked and saw a lofty throne: its appearance was as crystal, and the wheels thereof as the shining sun . . . and from underneath the throne came streams of flaming fire.' The fire is a symbol of judgment and is associated in the Old Testament with theophanies. In Ps. 50, for example, devouring fire is said to precede God when he comes to judge his people. Even more relevantly in Ps. 97—one of the so-called Coronation Psalms—we are told of the divine King that

righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne.  
Fire goes before him,  
and burns up his adversaries round about.



Cf. Mal. 3.2 and Isa. 30.27-28. Commentators rightly cite Deut. 33.2 and Ps. 68.18, both of which describe theophanies and refer to the multitude of the angelic attendants upon the deity. It is unlikely that the myriad myriads standing in the Judge's presence are meant to be those awaiting judgment (so Jeffery, p. 458); it is the bestial kingdoms, especially the fourth kingdom, that are about to be condemned. This is not the later conception of the Last Judgment.

The trial begins and we are told that the books are opened. Heaton suggests the possibility that the books have their analogy in the Tablets of Fate which Marduk appropriated after his battle with Tiamat and connects this with the fixing of the fates for the coming year in the New Year Festival. Even though he may be correct in deriving much of the imagery of the vision from the ceremonies of the New Year Festival, it is much more likely that the primary reference here is not to the Tablets of Fate but to the book of which we read that in it were recorded the evil deeds of men (Isa. 65.6) to which corresponded the 'book of remembrance' which 'was written before him (i.e. God) of those who feared the Lord and thought on his name' (Mal. 3.16). Cf. Ex. 32.33 and Rev. 13.8 (where the book of life appears in a context similar to the present one). The Tablets of Fate had quite another purpose.

In v. 11 there is a reminder that this radiant vision had followed immediately upon the utterance of the arrogant words of the little horn. And then we are told of the fourth beast's being killed, how or by whom is not explicitly stated, and of its carcass's being burned up in the fire. That is the first thing that the author wishes to say urgently to his readers. The great tyrant is under the judgment of God and will pass suddenly like a phantasm of the night. The whole oppressive system of government which was imposed on subject peoples by the Seleucid power would utterly disappear at the *fiat* of God. And then the curious addition is made that the other beasts, that representing Babylon (*pace* Ginsberg) and those representing Media and Persia, get a further lease of life. Heaton quotes with approval Rowley's suggestion (*Darius the Mede*, p. 123) that the author of Daniel expects that these eastern peoples who had been swallowed up in Alexander's empire and had later been subject to the Seleucids will now regain their independence, but will not be allowed to tyrannize over other states. His own probably correct interpretation of their reprieve is that they are to become part of the nations who will become vassal

to the saints of the Most High (vv. 14 and 27). That this hope was not fulfilled does not in the least prove that it was not entertained.

With v. 13 we reach a fresh scene in the drama. It might be felt that it follows more naturally upon vv. 9 and 10, as it is set in the same key as the description of the tribunal, whereas vv. 11 and 12 are set in a different key. The interposition, however, of vv. 11 and 12 is necessary to express the author's meaning. The celestial figure of one like a son of man does not appear until the sentence upon the fourth beast has been executed. The Ancient of Days who is the Judge acts in both scenes; the one like a son of man does not assume but is granted sovereignty.

The vision as we have it, whatever may have been the original associations of the imagery which is used, is of a man-like being escorted by the clouds of heaven and introduced into the presence of the Ancient of Days, a majestic and venerable King. It seems clear that what the author intends is a contrast between the one like a son of man and the beasts which issued from the abyss. As the kingdoms that are to pass away are symbolized by supernatural beasts, it seems appropriate that the symbol of what is to replace the bestial kingdoms should be both human and supernatural.

This new figure is introduced without explanation and we are left to conjecture whether or not it belonged to a tradition which could be taken for granted by the author of the Book of Daniel as familiar to his readers. Heaton (p. 183), correctly noting that the one like a son of man is represented in the vision as going to God, not descending from God, declares that 'the background of this scene is to be sought, not in the later apocalyptic ideas of the coming of the Messiah from heaven, but in the ideas associated in Israelite belief with the reigning king'. He goes on to expound his view that what we have in this vision is a reflection of an enthronement festival. That may be so (cf. Ps. 2)—though, as we have seen, Emerton thinks rather of the enthronement of a god like Baal—but the emphasis here is, not so much on the fact that the figure is in human likeness, as on the fact that those thus symbolized are the representatives of the kingdom of God; the man-like character of the kingdom, translated from the language of symbolism, means its divine character.

C. H. Dodd (whom Heaton quotes) puts forward the interesting view (*According to the Scriptures*, 1952, p. 117) that this passage and two of the Psalms (*viz.* 8 and 80) were used as testimonies for building up a theology by New Testament writers. Inasmuch as both Ps. 80

and Dan. 7 speak of the salvation coming to an Israel which has been suffering oppression and humiliation, while Ps. 8 starts with man 'in his weakness and insignificance', before telling how he has received royal dignity, we may agree with Dodd when he declares, 'To say, as it is often said, that the Old Testament knows nothing of a suffering Son of Man is inaccurate.' In Dan. 7, however, there is no suggestion that the author has even glimpsed the thought of vicarious suffering. Nor is there any suggestion in Jewish thought that, though there was indeed some *rapprochement* between the ideas of Messiah, Servant and Son of Man, the Servant was conceived of as a Suffering Servant. The Targum on Isa. 53 makes that clear. In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, it was probably Jesus himself who, when he appropriated the title 'Son of Man' as that best fitted to indicate who he was, fused it with the thought of a *Suffering Servant* and claimed no other Messiahship. (See William Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, 1943, ch. VI.)

The interpretation of the vision implies a striking reversal of fortune which is to be brought about by the power of God. Jeffery wishes to see in the symbol of one like a son of man a secondary reference to the Messiah. 'In this book', he says, 'we find that king and kingdom interchange, and there is no *a priori* reason why this figure may not represent both the saints as a body and the saint of saints as an individual' (p. 461). We are on safer ground in doubting with Heaton (p. 184) whether the author of Dan. 7 is thinking of a Messianic leader at this point, but he invokes the principle of corporate personality to show how readily the thought of an individual Messiah might emerge from the corporate figure which appears here.

[15-18] Like Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 2, Daniel is represented as being in great confusion and anxiety of mind as a result of the vision. Just as the Babylonian king required Daniel as an interpreter, so Daniel in his turn has to depend on someone else whom, oddly enough, he finds among the angelic participants in a scene which has not yet taken place but which Daniel foresees in vision. We may perhaps see in this curious inconsistency a reflection of the absolute certainty in the author's mind that the celestial event he has described is virtually accomplished. Conversation with people seen in vision appears in Ezekiel's vision of the new temple (chs. 40ff.) and in the visions of Zechariah (chs. 1ff.). This becomes one of the conventions of later apocalyptic, and, indeed, angel interpreters play a big part

in the remaining chapters of the Book of Daniel. No doubt there is justification for the view that this angelology is a literary device to explain how the gulf between God and man was bridged, in other words, to provide a theory of how revelation comes. We should not, however, conclude from the artificial character of the device that the conviction of the reality of revelation was not tremendously sincere. Indeed we shall not be far wrong in detecting in the perturbation of Daniel's mind a reflection of the author's stress of mind. He may use literary devices, but he is using them to describe a genuine religious experience.

In v. 15 a slight emendation gives 'therefore' instead of a reference to the body as the sheath of the soul. The American RSV prefers to retain the text and translates 'my spirit within me was anxious'. Bentzen and Montgomery and other modern commentators prefer the simple emendation which is also supported by the LXX.

The angel interpreter explains the four beasts as representing four kings, or possibly, with certain ancient versions, four kingdoms, which are to arise out of the earth. This suggests that the great sea of v. 2 is to be understood symbolically. The impressive scene described in vv. 9-10 is passed over in the interpretation and the scene which describes the coming of one like a son of man is translated into the assurance that the sovereignty is to be given to the saints of the Most High and never taken from them. The fact that the interpretation is given in such bald terms suggest that the interest of the writer is concentrated upon the certainty of the coming transformation rather than upon the mysterious details of the ecstatic experience which contributed to his conviction. Indeed, if the figure of one like a son of man had, in the intention of the writer, referred to an individual, it is difficult to believe that there would have been no reflection of this in the interpretation. Instead, it is clearly implied that the symbol which interests us so much because of its subsequent history was understood by the writer as signifying the saints of the Most High, who are the faithful among the Jews, with emphasis upon the power of God which was to operate through them when they would represent his triumphant rule.

[19-27] The urgent concern of Daniel, which conceals the concern of the writer, appears in his eagerness to know what was meant by the fourth beast. Its description is given in terms almost identical to those employed in v. 7. The insertion of the 'bronze claws' which was accepted in v. 7 on the evidence of Hippolytus may, of course, have

been inserted by him on the basis of v. 19. It should be noted that the little horn of v. 8 has now outgrown the others.

It is very difficult to believe that vv. 21 and 22 are not an addition to the original text by someone who felt that there were features of the interpretation given by the angel in vv. 25-27 which did not seem to be sufficiently symbolized in the figure of one like a son of man in vv. 13-14. Certainly one might have expected that in the vision some action on the part of the little horn to follow up its arrogant words would have been included. The trouble is that the elaboration of the vision includes part of the interpretation, *viz.* the reference to the saints. It might be thought that vv. 21-22 are an earlier version of vv. 13-14 which has been misplaced and added in at this point. It is much more likely, however, that the verses have been written in by someone who knew the interpretation and had vv. 13-14 before him, so that he could allude to the Ancient of Days without further description. Who the saints are may be reserved till we come to v. 27.

The reply of the angel to Daniel's question about the fourth beast makes it clear that its difference from the other beasts corresponds to a difference between the kingdom it represents and the other kingdoms. We have already seen that it is undoubtedly the Macedonian-Greek empire of Alexander the Great and his successors that is thus characterized, and it is a sobering reflection that it was this empire, for all that it mediated to the ancient peoples of the East the achievements of Greek culture, that could appear, in the eyes of a member of a subject people, to be the worst of all tyrannies.

It is not necessary to discuss again the identification of the ten horns and the three. We are, however, told something more about the eleventh horn, which is now explained as a king who shall stand out in comparison with all his predecessors. We were told in the vision (v. 8) of the arrogant words of the little horn. We now learn that the king whom the little horn represents will speak blasphemously against God himself and will also direct his attack against the saints of the Most High. The word used is usually taken as meaning 'wear out', but it may come from a different Arabic root meaning 'afflict' or 'put to the test'. This seems to be a clear reference to the persecution of the Jews of Jerusalem and Judaea by Antiochus Epiphanes. That this is so is confirmed by the statement which immediately follows that this persecuting king 'shall plan to change times and the law'. It is generally agreed that this is a reference to the measures

taken by Antiochus as described in I Macc. 1.41ff., the times referring to the seasonal religious festivals of the Jews and the law to the Mosaic Law (even though a Persian word is used here), in particular the injunctions regarding circumcision and certain dietary rules which became matters of issue between pious Jews and the Syrian authorities. The power of the tyrant, however, was to be strictly limited to a period of time defined mysteriously as a time, times and half a time. Just as, in 4.25, the period of Nebuchadnezzar's madness is given as seven times, which is usually understood as seven years, so here we are doubtless meant to understand half that period, *viz.* three and a half years. (Cf. Rev. 12.14, forty-two months, an evident reference to this passage.) Opinion is divided between the view that all that is meant is that the persecution is to last for a very short time, and the view that in this prophecy of a duration fixed for the persecution of three and a half years we have a remarkably accurate forecast either of the period from the desecration of the temple (15 Chislev 167 BC, the setting up of the Abomination which appals; 25 Chislev 167 BC, the first sacrifice upon the profaned altar) to the rededication of the temple by Judas Maccabaeus (25 Chislev 164 BC), or of the period from the punitive visit of Apollonius to Jerusalem in the summer of 168 BC (I Macc. 1.54, 59, 29) to the above-mentioned rededication of the temple.

Unless we are to suppose that the later chapters of the book are from a different author from the author of chapter 7, it would seem that the mysterious indication of the time of endurance of persecution, by whatever process of thought it was borne in upon the mind of the author, provoked him to repeated attempts to predict to a day the time of the end (see 8.14; 12.11, 12 and the repetition of the cryptic period 12.7). Heaton's suggestion (pp. 50-51) that the author of chapter 7, who in his view was also the author of chapters 1-6, published his book after the plundering of the temple by Antiochus in 169 BC and before the desecration of the temple in 167 BC, and that the concluding chapters are from the pen of a disciple belonging like him to the circles of the *Hasidim*, would certainly absolve the author of chapters 1-7 (if that is all that he wrote) from being the initiator of the tragic story of the human endeavour to determine the time of the end which has continued all down the centuries. It would seem, however, that it was not the plundering of the temple by Antiochus which led our author to produce his summons to faith and endurance—the temple had been plundered more than once before

—but precisely its desecration, which was felt to be the proof that iniquity could go no farther, but must, by this supreme challenge to God's authority, bring down upon itself God's final judgment. It may be that after issuing his prediction that the persecution would last only a brief time (a time, times and half a time), the increasingly desperate plight of the Jews tempted him to a more precise determination of the period of endurance. It seems possible that the original book was chapters 1-7 and that it was supplemented, as the persecution went on, by additional visions issued in the form of broadsheets. The difference in literary elegance between the Aramaic portion and the Hebrew portion may be accounted for by the fact that the author was more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew, but, for some reason unknown to us, chose to supplement the book in Hebrew, the language of revelation. We know from the discoveries made in the Dead Sea Caves that Hebrew was used freely alongside Aramaic. Conceivably the use of Hebrew gave a certain authority to a writing, which may explain why chapter 1 is also in Hebrew, though, in that case, it is difficult to understand why Hebrew was not used for chapter 7.

In v. 26 the interpretation makes brief reference to the bare fact of the judgment upon the tyrant and the destruction of his sovereignty. The author has not forgotten that in the vision it is the fourth beast that is destroyed, not just the little horn. In his thought, however, the evil of the fourth kingdom has become concentrated in Antiochus. There is no real inconsistency. We further learn that the sovereignty which is to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High will be greater than that which it replaces. The rule which God bestows will be universal.

Finally we are faced with the problem of determining what is meant by 'the people of the saints of the Most High'. It is usually assumed that the phrase must mean the Jews, or, more precisely, the faithful core of the Jewish people. Jeffery (p. 467) declares, 'The saints of course are the righteous Jews.' Noth, however, has revived an idea of Procksch and argued for his view with great cogency ('Die Heiligen des Höchsten', published 1955 in the *Mowinckel-Festschrift*, pp. 146ff.; republished 1956 in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, pp. 274ff.). He admits that in Ps. 34.10 the saints are faithful Israelites, but refuses to consider Ps. 16.3 and Dan. 8.24 as good evidence, since in both places the text is very uncertain. Coming to the actual interpretation of the vision in chapter 7 he rejects vv. 21-22

as being suspicious on literary grounds. In v. 25a he points out the parallelism between the Most High and the saints of the Most High and finds a meaning for the verb which governs the last named expression which would suit the interpretation of the saints of the Most High as heavenly beings. In v. 25b he thinks we have an addition by someone who supposed that the reference was to the faithful Jews. In v. 27 he interprets the expression 'the people of the saints of the Most High' as referring to heavenly beings, and supports this interpretation by two passages in the *Hodayot*, the book of psalms, from Qumran, arguing that the word in these two texts which other translators have rendered by 'with' (*im*) should be read as 'people' (*am*), thus obtaining phrases very like the present one, in which 'people' would be used of heavenly beings. This, he believes, weakens the argument of those who insist that the word 'people' in v. 27 makes it necessary to take the reference as being to the Jewish people, or, rather, to the faithful among the Jewish people. It may be argued in reply that in both places (the references given by Noth are to editions by Sukenik and the passages will be found translated into English by T. H. Gaster in *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, pp. 142 and 147, where it will be noticed that he reads the disputed word as *im*, 'with' or 'in', not as *am*, 'people') a preposition is really required. Moreover, he can only get the desired interpretation of v. 25a by violent textual surgery. The solution of the problem may be that the writer thinks of the faithful among the Jews as controlled by the heavenly powers, so that they can almost be identified with them. God acts through his people who may thus be called 'saints' (literally 'holy ones'), the name used elsewhere in the book of celestial beings. It is perhaps significant in this connection that in *The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness*, the faithful Jews will have celestial warriors mingled with them in their ranks (see, e.g. Gaster, *op. cit.*, p. 275). One should perhaps not make too much of the fact that in the vision the people of the saints of the Most High is represented by one like a *man*, as 'man' here seems to be a symbol for the celestial. The emphasis is on heavenly power which acts through the faithful Jews as contrasted with the power of chaos which acts through the kingdoms of this world.

[28] The concluding verse of the chapter suggests different things to different people. Jeffery declares (p. 468), 'It is difficult to resist the impression that this last verse has the coming chapters in mind.' Heaton, on the other hand, thinks that the words 'Here the account



ends' may indicate that the book originally ended at this point. At all events, Daniel, in the verse as we have it, represents himself as perturbed by what he has just heard and he continues to ponder the matter. One may incline to the view that these words are intended to prepare us for the visions which follow.