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*Daniel 2*

One of the most famous images in the Book of Daniel, and indeed in all of apocalyptic literature, is the statue that Nebuchadnezzar sees in his dream in Daniel chapter 2. This statue has a head of gold, its chest and arms of silver, its middle and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of clay. The statue is destroyed when “a stone cut from a mountain” strikes the feet and brings down the statue. Daniel interprets the parts of the statue as a series of kingdoms. Nebuchadnezzar is the head of gold to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, the might, and the glory. After him will come another kingdom inferior to his, then a third, which will rule over the whole earth. Then there shall be a fourth kingdom, strong as iron, which will crush and shatter all these. The iron is mixed with clay, symbolizing intermarriage, but the iron and clay will not hold together. Then finally, the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed. It will crush the previous kingdoms and will stand forever.[[1]](#endnote-1)

 While the kingdoms are not named, the first four are patently to be identified with Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece, since these are the kingdoms that succeed each other throughout the book. Chapters 1-5 are set under Babylonian kings, Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Chapter 6 is in the reign of the fictitious “Darius the Mede,” but the last verse refers to the succeeding reign of Cyrus the Persian. Chapter 7 reverts to the reign of Belshazzar, and this is also the setting for chapter 8. Chapter 9 is in the reign of Darius the Mede. Chapter 10 is set under Cyrus of Persia, but the angel Gabriel tells Daniel that his fighting the “prince” or patron angel of Persia, and that after him the “prince of Greece” will come. Chapter 11 begins with a prophecy that there will be three more kings of Persia, but then it continues with a detailed prophecy of the Hellenistic kingdoms, down to the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes of Syria, 175-164 BCE). No Median kingdom ever ruled over Judah. This is why we get the fictitious Darius the Mede in Daniel 6 and again in 11:1. Daniel was evidently drawing on an older schema that was not of Jewish origin.[[2]](#endnote-2)

 In Daniel 2, the metals have declining value, a motif paralleled in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*. In his *Works and Days* Hesiod describes a sequence of five ages – golden, silver, bronze, a fourth that is not identified with a metal, and iron. The fourth age breaks the pattern of decline and is inserted to accommodate the heroes of Greek legend. Hesiod was evidently adapting a schema of four ages and metals that was already current by the eighth century BCE. The origin of the schema is unknown.

*The origin of the four kingdom schema*

 This four-kingdom schema was not peculiar to the Book of Daniel. The same sequence, but with Assyria rather than Babylon as the first kingdom, is found in the Fourth Sibylline Oracle, a Jewish text, in Greek, that dates to the late first century CE in its present form, but the nucleus of the oracle is probably older. It is also attested in several Roman historians.[[3]](#endnote-3) A fragment of Aemilius Sura, who is otherwise unknown, is preserved by Velleius Paterculus, around the turn of the era:

The Assyrians were the first of all races to hold power, then the Medes, after them the Persians, and then the Macedonians. Then when the two kings, Philip and Antiochus, of Macedonian origin, had been completely conquered, soon after the overthrow of Carthage, the supreme command passed to the Roman people.[[4]](#endnote-4)

In the Jewish texts, the final kingdom is a kingdom of God; in the Roman texts, the final, presumably lasting kingdom, is Rome.

 The idea that there was a sequence of world kingdoms, identified as Assyria, Media, and Persia, is as old as Herodotus. In the course of his inquiry as to how the Persians had become lords of Asia, the historian wrote:

“The Assyrians had held the empire of upper Asia for the space of 520 years, when the Medes set the example of revolt from their authority.” Later, “the Medes were brought under the rule of the Persians.” (Herodotus 1.95, 130). In this he claimed to follow “Persian authorities,” and in fact the inclusion of Media reflects a Persian point of view. This sequence is also found in Ktesias, who had been court physician to Artaxerxes II. The sequence Assyria-Media is also found in the Book of Tobit. The suspicion arises that this view of history reflected Persian propaganda, which sought to portray Persia as the heir to the great kingdoms of the ancient Near East. Caution is in order here. The sequence of world empires is not attested in Achaemenid inscriptions and we have no direct evidence that it was part of Persian propaganda.[[5]](#endnote-5)

 In an influential essay published in 1940, Joseph Swain argued that the extension of the schema to include Greece must have developed in the context of anti-Hellenistic resistance.[[6]](#endnote-6) Aemilius Sura, quoted above, considered the Second Punic War (218-201 BCE) as the time of the overthrow of Carthage, so Swain reasoned that he must have written before the Third Punic War (149-46 CE). Because he considered Philip, who died in 179 BCE, to mark the end of Macedonia, he must have written before the third Macedonian war (171-68). If this is correct, then the four kingdom schema was known before the book of Daniel was written. Swain supposed that the sequence of world kingdoms including Media became known in Rome in the context of anti-Seleucid propaganda, around the time of the Battle of Magnesia, in 190 BCE, when Rome defeated Antiochus III (the Great). In any case, it seems likely that the sequence of four kingdoms, including Media, was current before the rise of Rome. Another early witness is found in the Fourth Sibylline Oracle.[[7]](#endnote-7) The Sibyl divides history into ten generations and four kingdoms. The Assyrians are said to rule for six generations, the Medes for two, the Persians for one, and the Macedonians in the tenth. A long oracle against Rome follows, out of numerical sequence, bringing the review of history down to the late first century CE. It seems clear, however, that the original oracle either ended with the tenth generation or with a predicted kingdom of God that was to follow it. It was presumably written before the rise of Rome.

 In both Jewish and Roman expressions of the four-kingdom schema, the climactic, final, kingdom is not the fourth but the fifth – the kingdom of God in Daniel, Rome in Aemilius Sura. It could easily function subversively, to predict the demise of the fourth kingdom. This is certainly the case in Daniel, more obviously in Daniel 7 than in Daniel 2. The Roman texts, in contrast, are triumphalist, from a Roman perspective. Swain supposed that the sequence had been developed for the purpose of anti-Seleucid propaganda. This is admittedly speculative, but at least it seems clear that it functions as anti-Seleucid propaganda in Daniel 7.

 An intriguing parallel to Daniel is found in the Persian Bahman Yasht, or Zand-i Vohuman Yasn.[[8]](#endnote-8) This text survives in Pahlavi, from the ninth century CE. Zands were midrashic elaborations of lost texts from the Avesta, part translation and part commentary. The Avesta is thought to derive from Zoroaster, whose date is controversial but was surely earlier than the Achaemenid period. It was not collected, however, until the Sassanian period (221-642 CE). So while it is clear that the Bahman Yasht is based on old traditions, it is relatively late in its present form.

 According to the Bahman Yasht chapter 1, Ahura Mazda showed “the wisdom of all-knowledge to Zoroaster. Through it he saw “the trunk of a tree, on which there were four branches, one of gold, one of silver, one of steel and one of mixed iron.” These are then explained to him as “the four periods which will come” in the millennium of Zoroaster. The same division of metals and periods is found in another Persian, Pahlavi, text, the Denkard, but the periods are identified differently.[[9]](#endnote-9) Daniel and the Bahman Yasht share the vision form, the association of the metals with silver, and a sequence of metals beginning with gold and silver and ending with iron mixed with something. These parallels can hardly be coincidental. Both the Yasht and the Denkard identify the metals with post-Sassanian kings, many centuries later than Daniel. Daniel’s statue provides a more appropriate setting for the metals than the tree of the Bahman Yasht, but the periodization of history is much more at home in Persian than in biblical tradition. It is unlikely that one of these texts depended directly on the other, but they seem to share some common traditions.[[10]](#endnote-10)

 In the Bahman Yasht, the period of mixed iron is that of “the ‘divs’ having disheveled hair.” Samuel K. Eddy ingeniously saw here a reference to the Greeks, who are depicted as wild-haired in mosaics and paintings, in contrast to the neatly depicted hair-styles of the Persians.[[11]](#endnote-11) The Yasht would then have been written after the conquests of Alexander, and would have predicted the passing of the Greek, more specifically the Seleucid, kingdom, at the end of the millennium. It would have been updated later, in the post-Sassanian period. The Persian text is problematic, since its date and redaction are uncertain, but it lends some support to the view that Daniel was relying on an historical schema that was used more widely in the Seleucid empire.

 In Daniel 2, the king refuses to tell his courtiers the content of his dream. Consequently, the Babylonian wise men are unable to interpret it. Daniel succeeds because it is revealed to him by the Most High God. The emphasis in the chapter is on the superiority of Daniel’s revealed wisdom to that of the Babylonians. The king does not seem to be perturbed by the revelation that is kingdom will be followed by a succession of weaker ones. He falls down and worships Daniel and acknowledges Daniel’s God. It may be that Nebuchadnezzar was not concerned about what might happen in the distant future. It should also be noted that Daniel is not very specific about the nature of the fifth and final kingdom. Since it is set up by the God of heaven, from a stone cut from a mountain (suggesting Mt. Zion), Jewish and later Christian readers assume that it is a Jewish kingdom, but Nebuchadnezzar could well have supposed that it is a Babylonian kingdom – a return to the golden age of his own reign.

 There is some limited evidence that Babylonians hoped for a restoration of their dominion after their power had declined. The idea of a definitive lasting kingdom is attested in a text from the sixth century BCE known as the *Uruk Prophecy*. This text extols a king who “will establish judgments for the land” and restore the shrines of Uruk. The king in question is most probably Nebuchadnezzar. The prophecy, however, does not predict that he will be followed by decline. Rather, “after him his son will arise as king in Uruk and rule the entire world. He will exercise authority and kingship in Uruk and his dynasty will stand forever. The kings of Uruk will exercise authority like the gods.” [[12]](#endnote-12)

 Daniel 2 clearly implies that Babylonian power will pass, as indeed will the power of all human kingdoms. Daniel, however, does not present his interpretation in a threatening way. The destruction of pagan kingdoms is still far in the future. We might speak of this as “deferred eschatology.”[[13]](#endnote-13) The power of foreign kingdoms will pass, eventually, but their destruction is not necessarily imminent. For the present, the power of Nebuchadnezzar is conferred on him by God and is presumably part of the divine plan. The stories of Daniel 1-6 assume that Jews can prosper under foreign rule, even in the service of foreign kings. If the four kingdom schema was devised to express resistance to world empires, that purpose is muted here.

*Daniel 7*

 We get a quite different sense of the four kingdoms, however, in Daniel chapter 7.[[14]](#endnote-14) Here we are told that “the four winds of heaven were stirring up the great sea” (Dan 7:2). Four great beasts come up out of the sea. They are all hybrid creatures, like the fantastic creatures of Babylonian mythology. The first is like a lion, but has eagle’s wings, the second like a bear, and the third like a leopard. The fourth is the most terrifying of all. It has great iron teeth, and it tramples with its feet (probably an allusion to the war elephants used by the Seleucid (Syrian) kings. The fourth beast has ten horns, but then another upstart horn emerges which speaks arrogantly. An angel explains this vision to Daniel. At first, he says that the beasts are four kings that shall arise out of the earth. When Daniel inquires further he is given a fuller account of the fourth beast and the little horn, which rise up against the Most High.

 This vision reaches its climax in a judgment scene. An Ancient Figure with white hair appears, evidently the Most High God. Then “one like a son of man” appears on the clouds of heaven and is presented before the figure on the throne. To him is given dominion and glory and kingship. The interpretation, however, says that the kingdom is given to the Holy Ones of the Most High, and then again to “the people of the Holy Ones of the Most High” (Dan 7:27).

 The angel’s interpretation does not do justice to the symbolism of the vision. The turbulent sea has a long history in biblical imagery.[[15]](#endnote-15) It is said of Yahweh that “by his power he stilled the sea” (Job 26:12) and that he dried up the sea (Isa 59:10). It is associated with monsters, Rahab (Job 26:12, Isa 51:9) and Leviathan Isa 27:1. Back before the Bible, the personified Sea was a character in Canaanite mythology, known to us from texts found at Ugarit in northern Syria in 1929. Other features of Daniel 7 recall Canaanite mythology too.[[16]](#endnote-16) The most puzzling aspect of Daniel’s vision is that it seems to have two divine figures, the white haired figure on the throne and the “one like a son of man” who comes on the clouds. The white haired figure is obviously the Most High God. Yet elsewhere in the Old Testament, Yahweh is always the one who rides on the clouds (Deut 33:26; Pss 68:5; 104:3 etc.). Having two divine figures would not be a problem in a Canaanite context: the white-headed supreme God is El and the rider of the clouds is Baal. The whole vision evokes a Canaanite myth where the Sea (Yamm) challenges Baal for the kingship, which is conferred by the high god El. Elements of this and other Canaanite myths appear throughout the Old Testament. At the time when Daniel was written (168-164 BCE) it would have been familiar to the people of Jerusalem because the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes installed a cult of Baal Shamem (Lord of Heaven) in the Jerusalem temple. Daniel refers to this cult with a derisive pun as “the abomination that makes desolate” (*shikkutz meshomem*, Dan 8:13; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11).[[17]](#endnote-17)

 Daniel appropriates and reinterprets the symbolism of the Canaanite myth.[[18]](#endnote-18) In the Jewish context, the Ancient One is Yahweh, and the rider of the clouds is the archangel Michael, prince of Israel (compare Dan 10:21; 12:1). The four kingdoms, including that of the Greeks and Syrian Seleucids, are beasts that rise from the sea, in open rebellion against the God of Heaven. The Holy Ones are the angelic host, led by Michael. The people of the Holy Ones, who ultimately receive the kingdom, are the Jewish people.

 For our present purpose, the importance of this vision is that it shows the four kingdoms that shape human history as forces of rebellion against God. In Daniel 2, in contrast, they were ordained by God, and ran their course peacefully. Daniel 7, however, was written in different circumstances than Daniel 2. It presupposes the attempt by Antiochus IV Epiphanes to suppress the traditional Jewish cult in Jerusalem, as described in 1 Macc 1-2 and 2 Macc 4-6. Consequently, it takes a much more negative view of human history.

*The Roman period*

 A new world empire emerged on the scene not long after the Book of Daniel was written. Rome would dominate western history for many centuries to come.

 The Fourth Sibylline Oracle, already mentioned above, has the sequence Assyria, Media, Persia and Macedonia. Macedonia is both the fourth kingdom and the tenth generation. It follows these with an oracle about Rome, which is not integrated into the numerical sequence (Sib Or 4: 102 – 129). The Sibyl notes the destruction of Jerusalem (Sib Or 4: 116). The eruption of Vesuvius is taken to be a sign of the impending eschatological upheavals, triggered by “the fugitive from Rome” (the returning Nero, who was thought to have escaped and fled to the east). Then

Great wealth will come to Asia, which Rome itself

Once plundered and deposited in her house of many possessions.

She will then pay back twice as much and more

To Asia, and there will be a surfeit of war (145-8).

The oracle ends with a great conflagration and the resurrection of the dead.

It would appear that this was an older oracle, from the early Hellenistic period. It was updated to include Rome, but the four kingdom schema was not yet revised. Since the first kingdom is Assyria rather than Babylon, the Sibyl does not appear to be dependent on Daniel.

 By the end of the first century CE a consensus developed that Daniel’s fourth kingdom should be identified as Rome. We find this in the apocalypse of 4 Ezra (2 Esdras 3-14).[[19]](#endnote-19) In chapter 11, Ezra has a dream in which he sees an eagle with twelve wings and three heads coming up out of the sea. It is eventually confronted by a lion. In chapter 12, he is given an interpretation:

“The eagle which you saw coming up from the sea is the fourth kingdom which appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel, but it was not explained to him as I now explain it to you” (12:12). The eagle clearly symbolizes Rome, although the identification is not made explicit. It had twelve wings and three heads, symbolizing emperors, who have been variously identified. In 4 Ezra he is confronted by the Messiah, the Lion of David. In 4 Ezra 13 this messianic figure is depicted as a man who comes up out of the sea and rides on clouds, like the son of man figure in Daniel 7. He takes his stand on a mountain and destroys the Gentiles who come to attack him, presumably including Rome.

 The historian Josephus, also writing at the end of the first century CE also identified the fourth kingdom as Rome.[[20]](#endnote-20) He regarded Daniel as one of the greatest prophets, who not only prophesied future things but fixed the time at which they would come to pass (*Ant* 10.266). He only paraphrased one of Daniel’s visions, chapter 8, and he related it clearly to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He affirmed, however that “Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the temple laid waste” (Ant 10.276). It has been suggested that he was referring here to Daniel 11-12,[[21]](#endnote-21) but the reference is obscure.

 Josephus makes no allusion to Daniel 7. His interpretation of the four kingdoms can be seen from his treatment of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in chapter 2. There we are told that the head of gold represents Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonian kings who were before him. He seems to regard the Medes and Persians as one kingdom, since “their empire will be destroyed by another king from the west.” This can only refer to Alexander the Great. This kingdom, however, will be followed by a fourth, which will be “like iron and will have dominion forever because of its iron nature (10.209). No mention is made of the division of this kingdom, symbolized by iron and clay. There can be no doubt that it refers to Rome. Josephus adds that “Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write about what is past and done and not of what is to be” (*Ant* 10.210). It is generally assumed that he did not want to offend the Romans by speaking of their eventual overthrow. His complete omission of Daniel 7 can be attributed to the same reason.

 The sequence Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, and Rome (often represented as Edom) persists in rabbinic tradition. Rabbinic interpretation of Daniel, as of other biblical books, is scattered through a vast corpus of literature.[[22]](#endnote-22) According to Exodus Rabbah 35:5: “Gold refers to Babylon, silver refers to Media; brass refers to Greece; Rome that destroyed the temple is likened to iron.” An elaborate example is found in Leviticus Rabbah 13:5, which finds the four kingdoms anticipated in Gen 2:10 (“A river flowed out of Eden . . . and there it divided and became four rivers”); Gen 15:12 (“a dread and great darkness fell upon him”) and Lev 11:4-8 (the camel = Babylon; the rock badger = Media; the hare = Greece; and the pig = Rome). It has been argued that this text with its negative portrayal of Rome represents a Jewish reaction to the triumph of Christianity in the fourth century.[[23]](#endnote-23) This may be, but the identification of Rome as the fourth kingdom was established already at the end of the first century and was a commonplace of Christian as well as Jewish interpretation. It is still attested by Rashi (1040-1105).

 Eventually the Jewish tradition adapted the schema to account for the rise of Islam. *Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer* 28 reads Gen 15:7-21 in light of the four-kingdom schema, in which the animals sacrificed represent the peoples who come to oppress the Jews. In one manuscript the turtledoves symbolize the Ishmaelites.[[24]](#endnote-24) In one variant of the schema, it begins with Rome, moves to Greece/Byzantium, then to the Sassanid Persian Empire, and finally to “Ishmael.”[[25]](#endnote-25) In some accounts, the fourth kingdom consisted of a dominion shared by Rome (Edom) and Islam (Esau).[[26]](#endnote-26) The twelfth century exegete Ibn Ezra regarded Rome as an offshoot of the Greek empire, and the fourth empire as Islam, the most powerful empire ever.[[27]](#endnote-27) His contemporary Judah HaLevi wrote a poem in which he prayed that the feet of clay would be manifested in the end of days.[[28]](#endnote-28) Ibn Daud, in twelfth century Spain, identified the four kingdoms as Persia, which included Babylon and Media, Greece, which included Rome, Persia-Rome, and Islam.[[29]](#endnote-29) The Coptic version of the Book of Daniel contains a long additional chapter in which the four kingdoms are identified as the Persian, Roman, Greek and Ishmaelite.[[30]](#endnote-30)

 The story of Daniel also provides the starting point for medieval Jewish apocalyptic compositions. The Persian *Apocalypse of Daniel*, redacted after the First Crusade in the twelfth century, is part of a long story that begins with Daniel’s career at the Babylonian and Persian courts.[[31]](#endnote-31) It then moves to a prediction about various kings, from the time of Muhammad and later. It concludes with an elaborate scenario involving a false messiah, the messiah ben Joseph, and finally the messiah ben David, the raising of the dead, and a messianic age of thirteen hundred years. A Hebrew translation of this document appears under the title *Ma’aseh Daniel* (“The Composition of Daniel”) in Jellineck’s *Beth Ha-Midrash*.[[32]](#endnote-32)

*The Christian Tradition*

 It is primarily through Christian tradition, however, that Daniel came to play a prominent role in the conception of history in the western world.[[33]](#endnote-33)

 The first extended commentary on the Book of Daniel, and on any Old Testament book for that matter, was produced by Hippolytus of Rome at the beginning of the third century CE, during the persecution of Septimius Severus.[[34]](#endnote-34) Hippolytus saw no problems with the historicity of the tales in Daniel 1-6. He interpreted Daniel’s prophecies with a Christological focus. The stone in chapter 2 is Christ, come from heaven. The fourth kingdom in chapter 7 is identified as Rome. While the fourth beast was interpreted as Rome, however, the he-goat in chapter 8 was identified as Alexander the Great, and in that chapter the little horn was Antiochus Epiphanes. In this Hippolytus followed Josephus and reflected the original historical context of the Book of Daniel.

 Hippolytus, however, did not think the end of history was imminent. The ten toes of the statue and the ten horns of the fourth beast were taken to require that the Roman Empire would be divided, and this had not yet come to pass.[[35]](#endnote-35) Hippolytus held that the world would last six thousand years, and that this would be followed by the thousand year reign of Christ. Since he dated the the birth of Christ fifty five hundred years after Adam, the end of the world was still a long way off.[[36]](#endnote-36)

 The eschatological dimension of Daniel receded further in the writings of Origen in the early third century. Origen’s commentary on Daniel is lost, but scattered examples of his exegesis of the book are preserved in other works. Origen interpreted Daniel allegorically. His understanding of Dan 7:13 can be inferred from his commentary on Matt 24:30: Christ comes every day to the soul of every believer, and the clouds are the Scriptures that make this manifest.[[37]](#endnote-37) The Antichrist, in addition to being an eschatological figure, also signifies all heresies.[[38]](#endnote-38) The prophecy that the wise will shine like stars is fulfilled in the life of believers, who are the light of the world.[[39]](#endnote-39) For Origen, the seventy weeks of years of Daniel chapter 9 were fulfilled with the coming of Christ.[[40]](#endnote-40)

 After Constantine, Christian interpreters tended to see the fourth kingdom differently. Eusebius suggested that the reception of the kingdom by the Holy Ones of the Most High in Dan 7:18 referred to the transition Roman imperial power from Constantine to his sons, suggesting a smooth transition from the fourth kingdom to the fifth.[[41]](#endnote-41) The fifth kingdom would be continuation and spiritualization of the fourth. This interpretation was widely accepted by Roman Christians.

 Arguably the most important contributions to the interpretation of Daniel in the patristic period were those of the Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry (ca. 232-303) in book 12 of his treatise *Against the Christians*, and Jerome in his commentary on Daniel.[[42]](#endnote-42) Porphyry was the first to show that Daniel was pseudonymous and that the book must have been written after the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, which it claimed to prophesy. (He regarded the prophecy of resurrection in Dan 12:2 as a metaphorical reference to the Maccabean revolt). He apparently followed the usual Jewish and Christian identification of the first two kingdoms as Babylonian and Medo-Persian. The third kingdom was that of Alexander, and the fourth was that of Alexander’s successors, the Diadochi. Porphyry rejected the identification of the fourth kingdom as Rome, because he, correctly, identified the little horn as Antiochus Epiphanes. The value of Jerome’s commentary lies largely in the fact that he preserved Porphyry’s work, and to a lesser extent also rabbinic views.[[43]](#endnote-43) He adhered to the Antiochene tradition, with its preference for historical rather than allegorical interpretation. But he defended the Christological interpretation of the stone in Daniel 2 and the one like a son of man in chapter 7.[[44]](#endnote-44)

 Throughout the patristic period, Daniel served as a source for chronological speculation rather than for imminent expectation. Augustine conceded the usual identification of the four kingdoms but did not dwell on it.[[45]](#endnote-45) The great majority of the church fathers argued that the seventy weeks of years had been fulfilled in the first century C.E. either in the life and death of Christ or in the destruction of Jerusalem. The dual interpretation of Daniel 11, whereby the text referred to Antiochus Epiphanes, but also typologically to the Antichrist remained popular down to the Middle Ages, and is found in Nicholas of Lyra in the early fourteenth century.[[46]](#endnote-46)

*The Medieval Period*

 The coronation of Charlemagne on Christmas Day 800 was hailed as a decisive transition in the history of world kingdoms. The monk who wrote the *Deeds of Charlemagne* claimed that God had moved from East to West through the four kingdoms, and that Charlemagne offered a new and glorious beginning: “He who ordains the fates of kingdoms and the march of centuries, the all-powerful Disposer of events, having destroyed one extraordinary image, that of the Romans, . . . then raised up among the Franks the golden head of a second image, equally remarkable, in the person of the illustrious Charles.”[[47]](#endnote-47) Here we find the medieval concept of *translatio imperii* (or “transfer of dominion”). Otto of Freising, a twelfth-century German bishop and writer, argued that the *translatio imperii* passed from Rome to Byzantium, then to the Franks in 800 CE, from there to the Lombards and finally to the Germans. Otto worried, however, that the German empire had feet of clay. From the thirteenth century, the German kings were said to rule over “the Holy Roman Empire,” the German continuation of the fourth kingdom.[[48]](#endnote-48)

 In the popular apocalypticism of the Middle Ages Daniel was not as important as Revelation but was often cited for the four kingdoms and the Antichrist. Joachim of Fiore cited Dan 7:27 in support of his idea of a third age after the defeat of the Antichrist.[[49]](#endnote-49) In that new age, the papacy would be dissolved. The idea of the Last World Emperor, the final king of Daniel’s fourth empire, was used to justify the increase in the power of the emperors over against the papacy.[[50]](#endnote-50) For example the fourteenth century Franciscan Jean de Roquetaillade suggested that the emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen was the Antichrist, as referred to in Dan 7:8, and that the French king Charles of Anjou would be the Last World emperor.[[51]](#endnote-51)

 Popular apocalyptic ideas found expression in a series of apocryphal apocalyptic writings in the name of Daniel. These were *ex eventu* (after the fact) prophecies about the rise and fall of kingdoms, such as we find in Daniel 11 and in many of the Sibylline Oracles. A key work in the development of this genre was the so-called Syriac Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, composed in the mid-seventh century CE.[[52]](#endnote-52) It makes relatively little reference to Daniel, but it identifies the four winds of heaven that stir up the great sea in Daniel 7 as four kingdoms, “Cushite,” Macedonian, Greek and Roman. Beginning in the 9th century, variations of Pseudo-Methodius appeared as “Visions of Daniel.” A number of such pseudo-Daniel works have survived: *The Slavonic Daniel* (entitled *Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors and the Last Days and on the End of the World*), the *Last Vision of Daniel* or the *Greek Apocalypse of Daniel, the Vision of Daniel about the Last Time and the End of the World*, and the *Daniel Diegesis*.[[53]](#endnote-53)

 *The Book of a Hundred Chapters* by the so-called Revolutionary of the Upper Rhine, written in German at the beginning of the sixteenth century was the last comprehensive expression of the popular eschatology of the Middle Ages. In it the four kingdoms were identified as France, England, Spain, and Italy.[[54]](#endnote-54)

 A new element in the interpretation of Daniel appears in the late Middle Ages, with the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist. Already in the thirteenth century, in the disputes between Frederick II (1194 – 1250) and the papacy, each side accused the other of being the Antichrist.[[55]](#endnote-55) The anti-Papal line of interpretation found its classic expression in Martin Luther. Luther published an exposition of Daniel 8 in his work on the Antichrist in 1521 and a preface to the translation of Daniel in 1530, revised in 1541.[[56]](#endnote-56) In the 1520’s, Luther argued that the divine providence had arranged for the transfer of empire, learning and religion from Rome to Germany. “It was with the Jews, but away it went . . . Rome and the Latin lands have also had it, but away it goes and now they have the Pope.”[[57]](#endnote-57)

 While Luther rejected radical millennialism, he affirmed that the end of days and the fulfillment of all prophecy was at hand. He understood Daniel to refer to the fall of Rome to the Turks and granted that the little horn could refer to Muhammad as well as to the Pope. He saw a direct reference to the Pope as Antichrist in Dan 11:36-45.

 Luther’s exposition of Daniel 8 was translated into English by John Frith, and George Joye produced a commentary based on that of Melanchthon and other European reformers.[[58]](#endnote-58) Joye held that “not only the Turk, Mahomet, the Popes of Rome, their cardinals, bishops, monks priests and friars” but also “all emperors, kings and princes” played the role of the Antichrist.[[59]](#endnote-59) John Knox preached his initial sermon on Daniel 7 and identified the fourth beast as the Roman church.[[60]](#endnote-60) Thomas Müntzner, who died in the Peasant revolt developed a more militant millenarianism, which he expressed in a sermon on Daniel 2.[[61]](#endnote-61)

 Calvin, like Luther, identified the Antichrist with the papacy, but did not impose this identification on his interpretation of Daniel.[[62]](#endnote-62) He held that Daniel’s visions extended to the time of Nero but no further. In Daniel 7 the fourth beast was Rome, and the ten heads referred to the senate. The little horn referred to the Caesars and the empire. The conferral of the kingdom on the holy ones referred to the first spread of the gospel rather than to the second coming. He insisted that the fourth kingdom was not Rome but the Seleucids, and that the Christian era as a whole was to be identified with the stone cut from the mountain in Daniel 2. Although he failed to appreciate the insight of Porphyry, or the positions of later critical scholarship, Calvin attempted an historical interpretation, in contrast to most of the Reformers. On theological issues, however, his positions were typically Protestant, dominated by the quarrel of the Reformers with Rome.[[63]](#endnote-63)

 Luther’s commentary on Daniel was accompanied in printed versions by “Daniel’s Dream Map.” This was a map of the world, as then understood, in which each continent was assigned to a beast.[[64]](#endnote-64) The Turkish army, which besieged Vienna in 1529, is represented as the third beast. In the 1570’s a Catholic priest Jean Boulaese created a popular chart showing the history of the world according to the four kingdom schema. In 1585 Lorenz Faust published a book titled *Anatomia statue Danielis*, which included a woodcut depicting the statue from Daniel’s dream. The face on the statue resembled the king of Saxony, whom Faust may have believed to be the last emperor. The names of world rulers throughout history are inscribed on the statue, Mesopotamian kings on the head, Median and Persian kings on the chest, Roman emperors on the skirt, Byzantine and Ottoman rulers on the right leg, and Holy Roman emperors on the left leg.[[65]](#endnote-65)

 The first Protestant commentator to accept Antiochus Epiphanes as the fourth beast was Hugh Broughton, whose commentary was published in 1596 and relied to a great degree on the current Jewish interpretation of Daniel.[[66]](#endnote-66) Hugo Grotius (1585-1645) also identified the fourth kingdom as the Greek and dispensed with the identification of the papacy as the Antichrist.[[67]](#endnote-67) Thomas Brightman, a contemporary of Broughton, argued that Daniel referred to all of Jewish history down to the Middle Ages.[[68]](#endnote-68) Walter Raleigh used Daniel in his *History of the World* to provide the link for the integration of biblical history with the succession of universal kingdoms. In the Cromwellian era, an anti-Cromwellian faction in the army was called “Fifth Monarchy” men, in reference to the final kingdom in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, and William Aspinwall pictured the coming new order as *A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy*.[[69]](#endnote-69) At the same time the Portuguese Jesuit Antonio Vieira, who worked in Brazil, argued that Portugal was the fifth kingdom, and that it was its mission to convert all peoples to Christianity.[[70]](#endnote-70)

 The trope of *translatio imperii* was eventually applied to America. The Anglo-Irish philosopher and bishop, George Berkeley wrote a poem entitled “Verses on the Prospect of Planting Arts and Learning in America.” The poem ended as follows:

Westward the course of empire takes its way

The first four Acts already past

A fifth shall close the Drama with the day

Time’s noblest offspring is the last.[[71]](#endnote-71)

 The Puritans who migrated from England to North America brought with them a strong interest in the fulfillment of prophecy. This interest was focused on Revelation rather than Daniel. Daniel did, however, play an important role in the Millerite movement in the mid nineteenth century.[[72]](#endnote-72) William Miller (1782-1849) calculated the end of the world on the basis of Dan 8:14 (two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings). Making the usual equation of one day and a thousand years, and starting from the return of Era in 458 BCE, Miller arrived at 1843 as the date of the end. When 1843 came and went, some Millerites fixed a new date, October 22, 1844. When that day also passed, one Millerite recalled, “we wept and wept until day dawned.”[[73]](#endnote-73) The Millerite movement can be seen as the end of one trajectory in the interpretation of Daniel, but there have been ongoing attempts to calculate the end of the world on the basis of Daniel. The most recent was that of Harold Camping, a Californian evangelist in 2011. Camping was exceptional in the history of apocalyptic prophecy insofar as he eventually admitted that he was wrong.[[74]](#endnote-74) The Millerite movement gave rise to the Seventh Day Adventist church and also to the Jehovah’s Witnesses.[[75]](#endnote-75)

 Another 19th century development, Dispensationalism, has continued to figure prominently in American life. The Dispensationalist movement was based on the teachings of the Irish-born John Nelson Darby (1800-1882) founder of the Plymouth Brethern.[[76]](#endnote-76) Darby placed the fulfillment of prophecy either in the pre-Christian past or in the eschatological future and avoided attempts to match prophecy with events in European or American history. Some of his followers, however, developed graphic overviews of history, usually based on the statue of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Daniel 2 or the four beasts from the sea in Daniel 7. A particularly famous example is the chart created by Clarence Larkin (1850-1924), a former draftsman who had become a Dispensationalist preacher, in his book *Dispensational Truth*, originally published in 1918).[[77]](#endnote-77)

*Conclusion*

 Since the rise of historical criticism of the Bible, the great debates about universal history, the identification of the Antichrist, and millennial expectation are no longer taken seriously by scholars, although they live on in some Evangelical Christian circles. Some scholars have lamented the decline in the importance of the book for the culture at large,[[78]](#endnote-78) but the loss is really a gain. The prophecies of Daniel can no longer serve as Christological proofs or as guides to the structure of universal history. Attempts to calculate the end on the basis of numbers in Daniel have always been problematic. The theological name-calling of the medieval and Reformation periods, especially with regard to the Antichrist, is no longer regarded as edifying. Viewed in its historical and literary context, Daniel is more akin to poetry than to historiography or futurology. While it is an important witness to the history of the Maccabean period, its witness is couched in the language of myth, richly informed by the mythological traditions of the ancient Near East. That language has often been misunderstood by literalist interpreters, but it has nonetheless enriched the religious imagination of the western world.
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