

ALTAY COŞKUN

The Chronology of the Desecration of the Temple and the Prophecies of *Daniel* 7–12 Reconsidered*

ABSTRACT: The counterfactual allusion to the death of Antiochos IV in *Dan* 11.40–45 implies a *terminus ante quem* of December 164 BC. While scholars have previously extended this *terminus* to all Seleukid prophecies in *Daniel* 7–12, we should rather confine it to *Dan* 10–11, allowing for a later composition of the remaining Seleukid prophecies. Their author had full knowledge of the king's death and the nearly simultaneous purification of the temple of Yahweh. If we accept the latter as the end point of the 'prophesized' religious persecution, a detailed Judaeian chronology for 171–164 BC can be established that is in line with *1Macc* and at least in part also with *2Macc*.
Keywords: Book of Daniel – Seleukid Prophecies – Antiochos IV Epiphanes – Temple of Yahweh – 'Abomination of Desolation' – Maccabean Revolt

* I would like to thank Rabbi Ben Scolnic, David Engels and Søren Lund Sørensen for their encouragement and helpful feedback on previous versions of this paper. – The desecration of the temple has been the object of uncountable studies. Foundational is the investigation of Bickermann 1937; now also see, e. g., Bunge 1971, 469–479; Bringmann 1983, 120–140; Gera 1998, 223–230; Scolnic 2005; 2007; Mittag 2006, 226–230; 252–268; 274 f.; 280 f.; Bolyki 2007; Dąbrowa 2010, 16; Engels 2014 and 2017, 349–380. All of them focus on inner-Judaeian tensions, whereby they point out, to a growing extent, that religious conflicts were less relevant than socio-economic tensions. Bringmann 1983, 99 has combined this background with the fiscal needs of the king; cf. Collins 1993, 62; Morgan 1993, 266 f.; Seeman 2013, 86 f.; Gorre & Honigman 2014, esp. 331–334; also Ma 2013. The violent escalation in 168/67 BC is often explained as a response to the revolt of Jason, paired with the humiliation by the Romans in Egypt (see below, section 2), thus esp. by Gruen 1993, 261–264 (cf. 274), who concludes: 'Antiochus victimized the Jews in a Seleucid power play' (critical: Morgan 1993, 265 f.). The more traditional view that the king himself was driven by a religious agenda has been gaining ground again. See LaCoque 1988, 21–27; Grzybek 1992, 203 f.; Millar 2006b, esp. 80–85 (also pointing to the innovative title *Theos Epiphanes* and his shift from Apollo to Zeus) and Ma 2012, 72–75 (also see 75–81 on administrative implications); on p. 82 f. he characterizes him as 'universaliste ... interventionniste'; *1Macc* 1.41 'peut refléter le souvenir locale d'une volonté uniformisante'. Most recently, Bernhardt 2017, 217–274 has argued that, following the revolts in 168 BC, Antiochos demanded cultic honours for himself especially in Koilesyria, although he continued to be flexible and accept local variations; these could easily be accommodated through the admission of his cult statue as a *synnaos theos*. For a deliberate imitation of the Roman oppression of the *Bacchanalia*, see Goldstein 1976/79, 125–160; Scolnic ca. 2018. Baslez 2014 identifies a more interventionist policy in administrative and religious terms as the decisive factor for the revolt. The co-existence of the Antiochene polis in Jerusalem beside the traditional temple state is certainly a factor of irritation to reckon with (see below, n. 10 for references).

1) Introduction

The ‘Abomination of Desolation’ marked the notorious pinnacle of the conflict between Antiochos IV Epiphanes (175–164 BC) and the Judaeans: on 25 Kislev 167 BC (*1Macc* 1.54, 59), a pig was sacrificed to Zeus Olympios in the sanctuary of Yahweh, an act that was emblematic for the most existential crisis that ancient Judaism went through during the Second-Temple period. The wave of outrage, bloodshed and despair only began to subside with the purification of the temple and the reinstatement of the daily sacrifices in accordance with the Torah on 25 Kislev 164 BC (*1Macc* 4.52). Tensions between the Judaeans and Seleukid rulers would reignite several times over the next century, but the traditional temple cult would largely remain unaffected.¹

Josephus is our oldest surviving source that draws on *Daniel* for his reconstruction of Judaeans history under Antiochos IV Epiphanes, and Porphyry is the first ancient writer we can name to have claimed that the author of *Daniel* lived under that king. Ever since, there is full agreement that (at least) chapters 7–12 are concerned with the dramatic conflict under Antiochos IV, whether one’s writing is guided by the belief that the prophecies (or visions, as some prefer to say) resulted from divine revelation in the Babylonian and Persian periods, or whether one requires the same rational principles for Judaeans, Greek and Roman History.² Unbiased academic research must of course

- 1 These dates are accepted by most scholars: e. g., Schürer I 1973, 128; Nodet 2005, 66–84; the present study, esp. section 2, confirms this chronology, as does my systematic scrutiny of the chronology of *1Macc*: Coşkun, in preparation. But alternative suggestions that date one or both of these events a year earlier are still frequent, e. g., Bringmann 1983, 25–28; 40–51; Bar-Kochva 1989, 563 f.; Ehling 2008, 111–114; Tilly 2015, 137; 159. Bunge 1971, 452–457 (cf. 423–430; 447–449) suggests yet a different approach: the purification of the temple happened on the occasion of a delayed celebration of Tabernacles late in 165 BC, but was later conflated with a celebration of Antiochos’ death on 25 Kislev 164 BC. Similarly, now Bernhardt 2017, 312 f.; 555–561 argues that the remembrance of the purification (Aug. 164 BC) and the king’s death (Dec. 164 BC) were later conflated; p. 558: ‘Die Neuweiheung des Tempels als hasmonäisches Gründungsfest schlechthin erfuhr durch die retrospective Verlegung in den Kislev eine symbolische Aufladung und Steigerung.’ But similar motivations may have induced Judas to wait until 25 Kislev 164 BC in the first place, especially when that memorable day was approaching anyway. Part of Bernhardt’s complex argument is based on accepting cumulative evidence for spring or fall 312 against spring 311 BC, based on which Dec. 168 BC is chosen as the beginning of the religious persecutions of some three-and-a-half years (pp. 537–540).
- 2 *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 10.10 f. (186–281) made Daniel a central figure of his Babylonian and early Persian narratives; 12.7.6 (319–322) claims the fulfillment of the Danielic prophecies with the desecration and purification of the temple, although the time difference is given as exactly three years instead of three and a half (see below, n. 5 and 72). Moreover, 20.10.1 (233–238), presupposes an (alternative) attempt at relating the final seven years of the prophecies to 159–152 BC (see below, n. 36). Yet another trace of Daniel’s time frame is to be found in *Bell. Jud.* 1.1.1 (32), on which see below, n. 69. – Porphyry, *Against the Christians* 12 = Hieron. *in Dan* prol. & 7.7–12.12 = *FGrH* 260 F 35–58, ed. Toye; see the latter’s commentaries for more context and bibliography, esp. *ad* F 35. Also see Millar 2006a, 57: ‘As for the date and context of the canonical Daniel as we have it, no serious commentator would now question Porphyry’s demonstration that the work belongs in the 160s under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and that up to and including that point the prophecies in it are pseudo-prophecies, relating and giving meaning to events which had already occurred. At the time when the author was completing the work, the imposition of the “abomination of desolation” in 167 had occurred, and the restoration of the Temple cult in 164 had not.’ And p. 59: ‘Josephus ... accepted “Daniel” as a historical personage of the sixth century B. C. living under the Babylonian Captivity, and hence treated his dreams and visions as genuinely prophetic. He thus equally took the references in Daniel to Antiochus

strictly exclude divine agency as an explanation for past events, and distinguish clearly between predictions that came true, as attested by external evidence, and those which appear counterfactual after a rigorous historical scrutiny. The former we call *vaticinia ex eventu*, shaped by the effective experience or knowledge of the author, who poses as the prophet Daniel, whereas the latter belong to the realm of imagination, of hopes as much as fears. My concern, however, is that generations of critical scholars have assigned too much of the remarkably precise information contained in *Daniel's* prophecies to the sphere of imagination without giving it the benefit of doubt. I am not the first to observe that the amount of detail exceeds what one would normally expect from a prophecy or revelation,³ but so far, no interpretation of the timeframe has been offered that avoids serious inconsistencies, aporia or special pleading.

There are, as far as I see, two obvious reasons for this. First, *Dan* 11 implies a strong *terminus ante quem* of late 164 BC; by drawing on this chapter, most scholars have suggested a composition around 166 BC (see below, section 3). The problem is that this *terminus* has been applied to all of the Seleukid prophecies, despite the fact that they form at least semi-independent units within the (various versions of the heterogeneous) *Book of Daniel* – wrongly so, as I shall seek to prove. The fact that part of the original version is in Hebrew, another part in Aramaic, and a few further chapters are contained only in the various Greek translations should caution us against any kind of ‘unitarian’ prejudice. Likewise, the narrative and thematical discrepancies in the different chapters also reveal the heterogeneous nature of the work.⁴

Second, *Dan* 7–9 and 12 do not offer absolute dates, but durations. The major difficulty here is that most of the given time units approximate 3,5 years, but whenever specified the day counts differ, ranging from 1,150 over 1,290 to 1,335 (see below, sections 5–7). The resulting confusion seemed to confirm the early *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the Seleukid prophecies, because the author appeared as simply not knowing when precisely the ‘Abomination of Desolation’ would end. The most common trend in scholarship is therefore to explain those discrepancies as resulting from revisions or additions after salvation had not yet come, and more patience was to be encouraged

Epiphanes as prophetic, and also understood the prophetic element as including the Roman Empire.’ Also cf. Efron 1987, 37; 43.

- 3 For a recent plea to take *Daniel* more serious as a contemporary witness, see Scolnic 2016, 357. Also see Bernhardt 2017, 40: ‘Tatsächlich war Genauigkeit im Ereignisbericht sogar unerlässlich, damit die religiös überformte und symbolische Deutung von den Zeitgenossen überhaupt verstanden werden konnte’; he also positions *Daniel* within the ‘Tradition vorderasiatischer Ex-Eventu-Prophezeihungen’.
- 4 See Collins 1993, 1–38; Lucas 2002, 17–21 and 317–326; Nelson 2012, 20–30; cf. Millar 2006a, 56–59 on various text editions and 60 f. on implications of the narrative; also Grabbe 2008, 103–107; Bernhardt 2017, 38. The present discussion can largely avoid discussing the intricacies related to the different ancient versions. But see below, with ns. 40–43 and 78 for some observations.

among the resisting Judeans.⁵ Some scholars have in fact realized that such a claim triggers insurmountable problems, though without offering any convincing alternatives.⁶

I was curious to see whether those commentators who wish to uphold divine inspiration behind the visions of *Daniel* might be in a better position to understand those timeframes, since they are not bound by any potential *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the book, as imposed by our critical methodology. In fact, Jerome counted out those 1,290 and 1,335 days and presented suggestions for what happened then. Interestingly, however, modern ‘believers’ tend to follow the same lines as the ‘less inspired’ scholars, perhaps with a somewhat stronger inclination to insist on the ‘symbolic’ meaning of the visions – a safe recourse for those who seek to maintain the infallibility of heavenly revelation. But plausible interpretations for the symbolism behind the figures 1,150, 1,290 and 1,335 have not yet been presented either.⁷

The solution of the problem is actually not too difficult: the author of *Daniel* wanted to be understood, probably more so than most others who ever published visions, oracles or revelations, as the tremendous amount of detail permits us to conclude. Thanks to the unique evidence with which the *First* and *Second Book of Maccabees* provide us, all relevant indications in the Seleukid prophecies can in fact be deciphered, with no need of any special pleading. The aim of the present study is thus to identify start and end points for the durations of the Seleukid prophecies, and their plausibility should be assessed on the basis of whether they are consistent, not only with the independent historical evidence but also with each other.

My investigation has originated in a larger-scale endeavour of establishing as precisely as possible a chronological sequence of major political and military events of Maccabean History. For this, it is not simply enough to decide between *1Macc* or *2Macc*, and to adduce the parallel traditions of *Daniel* and Josephus, where they are in unison

5 E. g., Bunge 1971, 450 f.; 459; Hammer 1976, 5; Schürer III.1, 1986, 246 f.; Efron 1987, 33 (cf. 36; 39): ‘The Book of Daniel was finally sealed at the time of the conversion decrees and the start of the Hasmonean Revolt’; also p. 38 on the chronological implication of *Dan* 11.34 (‘a little help’); Collins 1993, 322; 336; Mittag 2006, 24 n. 34; Parker 2006, 178: ‘the 1,335 days or 2,300 evenings and mornings . . . may well be a pedantic correction by a later hand of the “adjustment”. . . a Jewish chronicler might with relative ease have adjusted the month of the defilement within the year in which it had taken place so as to make the interval not *just* three years, but rather *exactly* three years’; Nelson 2012, 17: ‘the final verses of Daniel might come from a later hand. When the end does not come after 1,150 days (8:14), it is pushed later to 1,290 days (12:11). The heavenly kingdom still does not arrive, so it is revised to 1,335 days (12:12). When that day passes uneventfully, the book closes with the general assurance that the end will eventually come (12:13).’ For slight variations, see Nelson 2012, 30 (where the 1,150 days are equated with the three and a half years of 7.25; 9.27; 12.7) and 311 (where all three day counts may be seen as equalling 3.5 years). Also see Goldstein 1976/79, 167, who regards the 1,335 days as expired in Tishri 163 BC: ‘The sabbatical year ends and the date goes by for the miraculous consummation of history predicted by the seer in Daniel’. Cf. Toye, *FGrH* 260 F 35.

6 Cf. Lucas 2002, 297. Also see Bernhardt 2017, 40, quoted above, n. 3.

7 Hieron. in *Dan* 12.7, 11, 12 = Porphyry, *BNJ* 260 F 58a, 58b, 58c, on which see below, ns. 49 and 72. And see, e. g., Baldwin 1978, esp. 42–44; 194 (defence of historicity of the narrative framework, taking Daniel’s gift as seer at face value); 168 f.; 171 (symbolism); Coffman 1989, 133; cf. 122 on *Dan* 7.25, which betrays the limitations of the approach: ‘The key fact of *what this means* is plainly taught in the book of Revelation; but as far as we have been able to determine, the true meaning is today unknown by practically the whole world of Bible scholars.’ Symbolism is of course also mentioned by more critical scholars, e. g., Lucas 2002, 194; 298: ‘The numbers may have some symbolic significance that is now lost to us.’ Cf. Goldingay 1989, 214.

with our own reconstruction, or to reject them respectively where they are in contradiction. The safest conclusions are not only based on arguing their consistency with the 'better' evidence, but they also require an explanation for how the deviant traditions came into being.⁸

The present article unfolds those parts of my Maccabean research that involve the *Book of Daniel*. First, I shall address the controversy on the time when Antiochos pilaged the temple of Jerusalem: by closely comparing four alternative traditions, I shall re-instate summer 169 BC as the most likely date, and give more credit to the precision of *Dan* 11.25–39 than is usual (section 2). Next, the general timeframe of the Seleukid prophecies will be set out following *Dan* 9 and 11: the seven years of suffering will be dated to the period extending from 171/70 BC to 25 Kislev 164 BC (sections 3–4). The ensuing parts will gradually unfold the sequence of events from the outbreak of the tensions with Antiochos to the purification of the temple, simply by trusting the knowledgeable ability of the contemporary author of *Dan* 7–9 and 12. His chronological implications largely align with the independent evidence, so that the additional pieces of information unique to *Daniel* are exploited to enhance our reconstruction of the Seleukid-Judean conflict (sections 5–7). One further implication of *Dan* 12 will finally lead up to the suggestion that the latest Seleukid prophecy was finalized in January 163 BC (section 7). A summary with an outlook (8) and a bibliography will conclude this study.

2) When Did Antiochos IV Sack the Temple of Jerusalem?

According to *1Macc* (1.16–20), the source that is generally regarded as most trustworthy, Antiochos IV turned against Judaea on his return from Egypt in Year 143 of the Seleukid Era (SE). Irrespective of the era style – the Macedonian style yields ca. October 170/ca. September 169 BC, the Babylonian ca. April 169/ca. March 168 BC – we are led to late summer 169 BC.⁹ Both the city of Jerusalem and the temple are said to have suffered (*1Macc* 1.21–28). The king's next coup is reported to have happened 'two years later' (*1Macc* 1.29), thus around summer 167 BC: the city was pillaged, a garrison established on the Akra (*1Macc* 1.33–36, which may be related to the recent *polis* or *politeuma* of Antioch-in-Jerusalem)¹⁰, and many Jews enslaved or expelled (*1Macc* 1.29–40). Soon thereafter, in the context of empire-wide religious legislation (*1Macc* 1.41–43, 51), Jewish law and circumcision were banned, the Torah burnt, pagan rituals imposed, and the

8 See Coşkun, in preparation; cf. Coşkun ca. 2018a; ca. 2018b; ca. 2018c.

9 Foundational for understanding the Seleukid Era in *1Macc* is Bickermann 1937, 155–159; cf. 1980; and see Coşkun, in preparation for some minor modification. For a recent synthesis of the Sixth Syrian War and the two Egyptian campaigns of Antiochos IV, see Fischer-Bovet 2014; cf. Hölbl 2004, 128–135. The former suggests (p. 222), the latter at least considers (p. 132) that a revolt in Judaea might have been the reason for the retreat in 169 BC, but such a view is not supported by the evidence. As the present section will show, a revolt in Jerusalem only happened in 168 BC, but not even this caused the king's withdrawal from Egypt.

10 Also attested in *2Macc* 4.9, on which see D. Schwartz 2008, 6; 530–532; cf. *1Macc* 13 f. and 38; *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 12.5.4 (252); with Mittag 2006, 239–247; Ma 2012, 71–79 and Ma 2013; cf. Goldstein 1976/79, 105–125; Gorre & Honigman 2014, 334 f.; Engels 2014, 52–54; 62; 2017, 359–372. Also see below, with n. 55.

reluctant were expelled or executed (*1Macc* 1.43–64). All of this had passed before the altar of Zeus Olympios (the ‘Abomination of Desolation’) was set up as of 15 Kislev and received sacrifices beginning with 25 Kislev 145 SE^B (*1Macc* 1.54, 59).

In contrast, *2Macc* 5.11–21 reports the sack of Jerusalem and the pillage of the temple by Antiochos only on his way back from his 2nd Egyptian campaign, which took place in summer 168 BC. The date is motivated by the previous conquest of Jerusalem: having (wrongly) heard of the king’s death, Jason felt emboldened to oust his rival Menelaos, who had replaced him a few years ago as high priest. *2Macc* 5.24–26 continues to report further massacres in Jerusalem, which were perpetrated after the king’s return to Antioch under the command of a certain Apollonios. The pinnacle was achieved ‘not much later’ (*2Macc* 6.1), when an Athenian official of the king delivered the order to abandon Jewish rituals and establish a cult for Zeus Olympios instead (*2Macc* 6.1 f.), which resulted in much bloodshed (*2Macc* 6.3–7.42).

In addition, there is the contemporary testimony of *Daniel* 11.28–32. He attests various attacks ‘on the Holy Covenant’, beginning with the end of the first Egyptian campaign. I here quote the English translation of *The Greek Word* (on which see the *References* section at the end of this article):

‘(28) And he shall return to his land with much substance; and his heart [shall be] against the holy covenant; and he shall perform [great deeds]¹¹, and return to his own land. (29) At the [set] time he shall return, and shall come into the south, but the last [expedition] shall [not] be as the first. (30) For the Citians¹² issuing forth shall come against him, and he shall be brought low, and shall return, and shall be incensed against the holy covenant: and he shall do [thus], and shall return, and have intelligence with them that have forsaken the holy covenant. (31) And seeds shall spring up out of him, and they shall profane the sanctuary of strength, and they shall remove the perpetual [sacrifice], and make the abomination desolate.’¹³

The interpretation of § 28 in *The Greek Word* ‘he shall perform [great deeds]’, instead of the more intuitive ‘he shall perform [it]’, seems to imply that the translator wants to disconnect the king’s strong feelings against the Holy Covenant from the actions he undertook on his way back to Syria. Apparently, the translation reflects a preference for the version of *2Macc* over *1Macc*, and thus downplays Antiochos’ ill will after the first Egyptian campaign. On this reading, the king’s wrath resulted in a mere intention,

11 See below, after n. 13, on the difficulty that this translation implies.

12 The *Kittaioi* are to be identified with the Romans, more specifically with the ambassador Popilius Laenas, who induced Antiochos IV to evacuate Egypt in ca. July 168 BC., see, e. g., Efron 1987, 39; Collins 1993, 383; Millar 2006a, 52; Scolnic 2007, 118–120; Nelson 2012, 282; 306. Cf. Scolnic 2015 for the suggestion that this phrase still reflects the original meaning of *Kittim* as Cypriotes, implying that the Roman ships had come via Cyprus while at the same time allowing for traditional biblical terminology.

13 *Dan* 11.28 καὶ ἐπιστρέψει εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑπάρξει πολλῇ, καὶ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ διαθήκην ἁγίαν, καὶ ποιήσει καὶ ἐπιστρέψει εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ. 29 εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἐπιστρέψει καὶ ἤξει ἐν τῷ νότῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὡς ἡ πρώτη καὶ ὡς ἡ ἑσχάτη. 30 καὶ εἰσελεύσονται ἐν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐκπορευόμενοι Κίτιοι, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται· καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ θυμωθήσεται ἐπὶ διαθήκην ἁγίαν· καὶ ποιήσει καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ συνήσει ἐπὶ τοὺς καταλιπόντας διαθήκην ἁγίαν. 31 καὶ σπέρματα ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναστήσονται καὶ βεβηλώσουσι τὸ ἅγιασμα τῆς δυναστείας καὶ μεταστήσουσι τὸν ἐνδελειχισμόν καὶ δώσουσι βδέλυγμα ἠφανισμένων.

which came to fruition only when additional anger caused during the second Egyptian campaign made him lash out effectively against the temple of Jerusalem. Linguistically, however, it is difficult to add 'great deeds' to the text as an omitted direct object of ποιήσει, since the identification of the implicit object should draw on the immediate context. But even if such loose grammar were granted, it would be inadmissible to interpret καὶ ποιήσει so differently in 11.28 and 11.30, especially since it is twice preceded by an expression of the king's wrath ἐπὶ διαθήκην ἄγιαν, and succeeded by reporting his return home (καὶ ἐπιστρέψει). Hence, in the eyes of *Daniel*, Antiochos effectively implemented damaging actions in both situations.

Many scholars have thus posited two campaigns of Antiochos to Jerusalem, one in 169 BC on his return from his first Egyptian campaign (the high priest Menelaos gave him access to the temple and its riches), and a second in 168 BC (when the king responded to the uprising of Jason, leading to a full-scale war in Jerusalem).¹⁴ The smoothness of this solution notwithstanding, Daniel Schwartz has cautioned us recently not to embrace such a harmonizing approach; the versions of *1Macc* and *2Macc* are too similar as to refer to two different events; in addition, the former report is incompatible with another pillage of the temple in the year thereafter: nothing would have been left to loot. We hence have to make a choice.¹⁵

Leading authorities of previous generations, such as Emil Schürer and Elias Bickermann, clearly favoured the report of *1Macc*, insisting that Antiochos brought hardship over Jerusalem in 169 BC. But their attempts at explaining how or why Jason or the Epitomator of *2Macc* erred remain weak. Nor do they do justice to the testimony of *Daniel*. There is hardly a way around accepting that the 'prophecy' implies serious action against Jerusalem or its sanctuary both after the first *and* second Egyptian campaign. *Daniel*, however, does not require the king's personal presence in Jerusalem at any time, nor does he state that the temple was sacked twice.¹⁶ Klaus Bringmann, too, prefers the version of *1Macc*, explaining the account of *2Macc* as a device of dramatizing historiography, in which 'die einzelnen Phasen des Judäa treffenden Unglücks zu einer einzigen

14 See, e.g., Habicht 1979, 224, n. 1a (with references); Bringmann 1983, 29; Gruen 1993, 245–247; 261–263; Morgan 1993, 265–267; Scolnic 2007, 118–120 (cf. pp. 109 and 114 f.); cf. Tcherikover 1959/99, 186 f.; Grabbe 1991, 67 n. 39; Ma 2012, 71; Nelson 2012, 281–283; Bernhardt 2017, 218–220. Goldstein 1976/79, 163 remains somewhat ambiguous: after acknowledging the pillage in 169 BC, he states for 168 BC: 'On his way back to Antioch, he utters threats against the turbulent Jews'. Doran 2012, 125 f. is aporetic, claiming that the author of *2Macc* 'is not concerned with giving details but focuses on the emotional hardship of the Jews ...'; on pp. 127–133, however, he largely follows the account of *2Macc*.

15 Thus D. Schwartz 2008, 533–536.

16 Pace Tcherikover 1959/99, 186. – According to Schürer I 1973, 128 f., *2Macc* confused the second Egyptian campaign with the second phase of the first campaign. Bickerman 1937, 160–168 develops a (confused) argument that distinguishes an erroneous Seleukid from a correct Hebrew tradition, adding the strange claim that the king's 'Anwesenheit wird auch durch das Zeugnis Daniels ausgeschlossen' (for 168 BC). It seems inadmissible to me to draw on Hieron. *in Dan.* 11.21: not only is this a garbled account (which conflates the first and the second Egyptian campaign), the reference to Greek and Roman historians also runs counter to Bickermann's own argument. He is nevertheless followed by Stern, *GLA* I no. 33, pp. 115 f.; Collins 1993, 62 f.; 383 f.; Tcherikover 1959/99, 186; cf. Lucas 2002, 41; Millar 2006b, 82. – More convincing is the argument of Mittag 2006, 249–254, although he does not address *Daniel* at all (see below).

gewaltigen Katastrophe zusammengeballt [werden]: This way, Bringmann suggests that the events stretched over 169 and 168 BC, rather than 168 and 167 BC.¹⁷

Other scholars, however, have found more appealing the combination of Antiochos' humiliation in Egypt (emphasized in *Dan* 11.30) and the revolt of Jason (as stated in *2Macc*). Accordingly, they either maintain the version of *2Macc* (and conflate it with *1Macc*), or prefer it (and correct *1Macc* accordingly).¹⁸ For the latter purpose, D. Schwartz has drawn especially on Josephus, who seems to be confirming the lower date; this is of some bearing, since Josephus is normally believed to depend on *1Macc*.¹⁹ He, too, dates the king's intrusion into the city of Jerusalem to Year 143 SE (*Ant. Jud.* 12.5.3 [246 f.]), but while this is said to have been an inroad only on the city, the full-scale attack on the cult is separated by two years and dated to 25 Kislev 145 SE^B: then the pillage of the temple, the ban of sacrifices and rites as well as the massacre and mass enslavement are narrated (12.5.4 [248]), culminating in the sacrifice of pigs to an idol on Yahweh's altar (12.5.4 [253]).²⁰

This argument does not hold ground. It is apparent that Josephus (or his source) knew and conflated the two traditions that we otherwise find in *1* and *2Macc*. In his account, Antiochos came to Jerusalem in person twice (Josephus departs from both traditions by having the king implement his religious policy himself).²¹ The ineptitude of the conflation becomes obvious when Josephus maintains the two-year interval of *1Macc* 1.29, for this originally separated the aggressions of 169 and 167 BC. The inferiority of Josephus' account is further betrayed by the motivation given for the first (and not the second) intrusion into Jerusalem: the king's retreat from Egypt is allegedly caused by the Romans (12.5.2 [244]–12.5.3 [246]), which is an apparent but misplaced borrowing from *Dan* 11.30.²² In addition, it is untenable to claim that the city was the aim of Antiochos' attack in 169 BC and the temple only in 168 BC.²³ After all, this would be incompatible with the explanation of *2Macc* 1–11, namely that the Seleukid aggression was caused by the uprising of Jason during the second Egyptian campaign in 168 BC, for this

17 Bringmann 1983, 36. He incorrectly speaks of a 'Dublette', although the sack of the temple is narrated only once in *2Macc*; he speaks of 'anachronism' on p. 37. Bringmann is further inconsistent regarding his previous concession of two attacks on Jerusalem or the temple (p. 29). Similarly, Grabbe 1991, 67 f., though he bases his view on the flawed assumption of a Judaean version of the Seleukid Era starting with Nisan 312 BC, and on the likewise untenable claim that the 'two-year' interval of *1Macc* 1.29 began with the first invasion of Egypt rather than the previous sack of the Jerusalem temple.

18 For Jason's revolt, also see Scolnic 2007, 114–116; Barclay 2007, 2015; with modification also Mittag 2006, 250–254. Based on the close connection with the second Egyptian campaign in *Dan* 11.29–31, Bringmann 1983, 34 suggests to date Antiochos' religious legislation that culminated in the 'Abomination of Desolation' on 25 Kislev to 168 BC.

19 D. Schwartz 2008, 535. But see the reservation of Nodet 2005, 407–431 regarding the dependency of Josephus; also Coşkun, in preparation.

20 Also see Millar 2006b, 87 f. for the evidence of the pagan cult rituals.

21 Morgan 1993, 266 insists on the personal presence of Antiochos in both years, 'because anything that interested Antiochos personally he took in hand personally'.

22 For *Daniel's* undue influence on Josephus, also see Goldstein 1976/79, 212; 219.

23 This would, by the way, reverse the traditional reconstruction by Habicht and others, see above.

resulted in a war against the city and the stationing of an army.²⁴ It is thus for multiple reasons that Josephus' two-fold reconstruction cannot stand. His distinctions are best explained as climactic differentiation, after he had decided not to choose between the two competing traditions, but instead to harmonize them.²⁵ Josephus is therefore of no help to decide between the alternative versions of *1* and *2Macc*.²⁶

D. Schwartz further explains 'that the pro-Hasmonean author of *1* Maccabees had good reason to ignore any pre-Hasmonean rebellion against the Seleucids'. I admit that all of the events of 168 BC have been omitted from *1Macc*, but the more likely reason for this seems to be that the author was not interested in undermining his simplistic dichotomy of Hellenizing Jews betraying their traditions and collaborating with the king on the one hand, and good-willed Jews ready to die for the Covenant on the other.²⁷ Be this as it may, the author's reluctance to mention Jason's revolt is no sufficient reason to predate the sack of the city and the temple by a year.

Since we are to make a choice, I suggest we accept the version of *1Macc* 1 as the more consistent and plausible tradition. While no differentiation between the first and the second Egyptian campaign is made, the context represents Antiochos as the victor, which he truly was in 169 BC. We do not hear of any disruptions in Jerusalem prior to Menelaos guiding the king into the temple to help himself to its riches, which the king regarded as debts owed to him. It is less likely that he would have found everything intact one year later after the violent conquest and reconquest of Jerusalem in 168 BC. Moreover, Peter Franz Mittag has pointed out that there is indirect support for this high chronology through *2Macc* 4.47 f.: three representatives of the *gerousia* approached Antiochos to complain against Menelaos (the meeting took place in Tyre early in 168 BC); the king decided not only to reject their charges, but even to have them executed. This harshness is best explained if understood against the background of the previous 'confiscations': criticism against Menelaos was regarded as criticism against the king – some-

24 D. Schwartz 2008, 535 may be right to state that Polybios' judgment – he criticized Antiochos' raid as unjust (*apud* Josephus, *c. Ap.* 2.83 f. = Stern, *GLA* I no. 33) – does not require a date prior to the upheaval; ignorance of Jason's coup or hostility towards Antiochos would have been a sufficient reason, besides his known partisanship for Demetrios I. According to *Jos. Bell. Jud.* 1.1.1 [32] (cf. Bringmann 1983, 38 f.), a pro-Ptolemaic leaning caused the revolt and thus also the harsh response of the king. While the Ptolemaic court had lost control of most of Egypt and was thus not in a position to influence the events in Judaea, it is still possible that Antiochos IV drew such a connection.

25 Thus also Bickermann 1937, 163–165, who supposes a contamination of *1Macc* and Nikolaos of Damascus, who, in turn, was aware of the tradition of *2Macc*.

26 Of little use is *Jos. Bell. Jud.* 1.1.1 f. (31–35), where all aggressions against the cult of Jerusalem, from the deposition of Onias III over the pillage to the desecration of the temple, are garbled. In fact, the characters of Onias, Jason and Menelaos are partly conflated. The reference to the king's war with Ptolemy VI is thus of no help for the chronological question. Slightly different is the judgment of Bickermann 1937, 165: 'Diese hellenische Version der Ereignisse, deren Ähnlichkeit mit dem Sonderbericht von Makk. II unverkennbar ist, liegt für uns am reinsten, weil von jüdischen Zutaten unberührt, in der Erzählung vor, die Josephus im ersten Buch seines "Jüdischen Krieges" wiedergibt. ... Josephus, und vor ihm Jason, hängen beide von derselben heidnischen Tradition ab.' Bickermann (n. 2) also believes that the time of 3,5 years has been taken over from *Dan* 9.27.

27 D. Schwartz 2008, 535. For a simplistic, dichotomic representation of Judaeian factions in *1Macc*, see S. Schwartz 1991, 37; Kampen 2007, 13–16; Scolnic 2016, 382; Coşkun, in preparation. Also see above, n. 24.

thing he could not tolerate when on his way to resume fighting in Egypt.²⁸ Accordingly, the intrusion of 169 BC must have caused sufficient harm to the temple, hence justifying *Daniel's* cryptic expression that the king's 'heart was set against on the Holy Covenant', but it still fell short of an attack on the cult itself.²⁹

In addition, *1Macc* ultimately aligns with *Daniel* in that Antiochos first caused harm to the Holy Covenant after the first Egyptian campaign, and once more after the second campaign. Admittedly, the causation in *Daniel* would suggest that action against Jerusalem followed still on his way back to Syria in 168 BC. The revolt of Jason, as reported by *2Macc*, did indeed require immediate action, probably no later than August or September 168 BC. Either we understand the 'two-year' indication of *1Macc* as an inclusive count,³⁰ or the interval was meant to end only with the more important attack on the cult itself, which would follow in 167 BC. It is remarkable that all of our three main sources agree that, after the king's stripping of the temple (whether in 169 or 168 BC), further punitive actions followed in two stages (sometime after the second Egyptian campaign): the first set of measures consisted of capturing and occupying the city (the temple is not mentioned, although the garrison on the Akra and the return of Menelaos must have affected the cult), whereas the second phase directly targeted the traditional cult and its adherents.

At any rate, there is sufficient additional evidence to date the opening of the 'war' on Jewish religion (or whatever of this is admitted as historical) into the course of 167 BC. It is widely accepted that the conflict culminated (at least symbolically) in the sacrifice offered to Zeus Olympios on 25 Kislev. Tradition further has it that this 'Abomination of Desolation' lasted for three years, before the victories under Judas Maccabee led to the reconquest of Jerusalem and the purification of the temple exactly on the third anniversary, 25 Kislev 164 BC. Once again, *1Macc* is largely consistent with this chronology, which can be corroborated through additional evidence.³¹

28 Mittag 2006, 249 f.

29 Similarly, Bringmann 1983, 33 f., who, however, goes on to claim that the damage done prevented the performance of the required sacrifices. The claim 'einer einzigen zusammenhängenden Aktion gegen den Heiligen Bund' in close proximity to the humiliation by the Romans is, however, contradicted by the three-layered response attested by *Daniel*, *1Macc* and *2Macc*.

30 Thus Mittag 2006, 253 n. 104; cf. Bringmann 1983, 32 f.; his early chronology results from his general insistence on the Macedonian style of the Seleucid Era, a premise that most scholars rightly find incompatible with the evidence; see, e. g., Bickermann 1937, 156; Goldstein 1976/79, 25; Bar-Kochva 1989, 562–565; Mittmann-Richert 2000, 24 f.; Nodet 2005, 78; D. Schwartz 2008, 11; for in-depth discussion, see Coşkun, in preparation.

31 See above, ns. 1 and 30. – For a completely different view, see Bunge 1971, 461–468: he rejects the idea that *Dan* reflects three stages of intervention in 169, 168 and 167 BC but claims instead that *Dan* 11.29–31 specifies three simultaneous actions, not a sequence; all are connected with Eleusis in 168, so that they refer to the mission of Apollonios, which he dates to summer 168 BC, together with the partial destruction of the city, the construction of Akra, the desecration of temple and the dispatch of Geron (*2Macc* 6.1). Also see the positions of Bringmann and Bernhardt (below, n. 52).

3) A First Approach to the Chronology of the Prophecies in *Daniel* 9 and 11

Let us now turn to the ‘Seleukid’ visions of *Daniel*, which deserve further exploration for the overall chronological discussion. I shall start with *Dan* 9.24–27, since these verses pretend to bridge the time gap between the fictional presence of the prophet Daniel with the Judaeans crisis under Antiochos IV. The total duration of the oppression until the reestablishment of the most holy sanctuary is given as 70 weeks; more specifically, the time until the resurrection of Jerusalem and the investiture of a new ‘Anointed’ (i. e. high priest) is given as seven weeks, upon which 62 weeks of regular functioning will follow; the last week, however, will come with hardship for the Jews, culminating, in its second half, in the abolition of the sacrifices and the erection of an idol.

Most scholars accept that the latter time frames are not meant literally, but echo the prophecies of Jeremiah,³² who is said to have announced 70 years of suffering under Babylonian rule in ca. 605 BC (*Jer* 25.11 f.) and once more in or after 598 BC (*Jer* 29.10). Babylonian kings defeated the Judaeans at various times under Yehoiakim (608–598 BC), Yekoniah (598 BC) and Zedekiah (598–587 BC), leading to various abductions of elite members and resulting in the destruction of the temple in 587 BC. On no count did the Jewish exile extend to exactly 70 years, since Babylonian rule was ended with the victory of the Persian King Cyrus in 539 BC.³³ The number of 70 is thus rightly seen as part of a symbolic prophecy, perhaps uttered for the first time before the effective defeat of the Babylonians was in sight. With some generosity, however, the time from the destruction of the First Temple to the inauguration of the Second may yield a period of around 70 years, at least if a date of ca. 517 BC under King Darius is accepted for the resumption of the cult.³⁴ But even if granted, there is no arithmetic way to equate the remaining time until the purification of the temple in Kislev 164 BC with 62 + 1 year weeks, i. e. 441 years.³⁵

32 Nelson 2012, 220 calls ch. 9 ‘a midrash on Jeremiah 25:11–12; 29:10–14.’ Cf. Efron 1987, 38; 71–80 (with a detailed but confusing discussion); 109–112; Scolnic ca. 2019 for further discussion.

33 On Babylonian and Persian chronology, see, e. g., Lucas 2002, 37–39; Nelson 2012, 2–8; 15; 235–237; 240; 244 f.; also Collins 1993, 29–31. Note, however, that these surveys, which have been designed as introductions to *Daniel*, tend to be inconsistent regarding the start of the years and the (lack of) inclusive count.

34 Also see Scolnic ca. 2019, n. 25 with reference to *Zech* 1.12. A similar suggestion was put forward already by Porphyry, whereas Jerome prefers to distinguish the Persian King Darius I from an uncle of Cyrus, another son of the Median King Astyages, who allegedly conquered Babylon together with his nephew Cyrus: Porphyry, *BNJ* 260 F 39 = Hieron. *in Dan.* 9.1; cf. the commentary by Toye *ad locum*, though with the questionable conclusion that it was Porphyry to equate the Median and the Persian Darius, instead of Jerome. The author of *2Chron* 26.32 f. likewise regards the liberation by Cyrus as the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy, thus probably counting back to the first Babylonian victory over the Judaeans; cf. Millar 2006a, 53 f. Schürer III.1, 1986, 248 f. argues for a reinterpretation of the time frame in *Daniel*, reducing the 70 years to the first seven out of the 70 year weeks, that is the roughly 49 years from 587 to 538 BC; he finds a miscalculation by 62 year weeks (i. e. 434 instead of only 368 years) unspectacular. Cf. Nelson 2012, 222 and 224 (with some inaccuracies regarding inclusive counting and year turns in non-Julian calendars). But the problems of those 70 years need not concern us here any further.

35 Cf. Nelson 2012, 232 f. (on the total of 490 years); 235–237 (on the first 49 years before the end of the Babylonian exile or the inauguration of the Second Temple); 237 f. and 240 (on the next 420 years, ending with

While I admit that the ‘Jeremian’ time frame of 70 ‘weeks’ can ultimately not be accepted without much spiritual generosity, I suggest that the choice of this model by the author of *Dan* 9.24–27 was at least in part inspired by the fact that the time of suffering under Antiochos IV could quite plausibly be described as a year week, that is roughly the seven years extending from 171/70 BC (141 SE^B) to 25 Kislev 164/163 BC (148 SE^B).³⁶

This view contradicts the general trend, which rather tends to reject the numerical indications in *Daniel* as mere ‘visions’, ‘prophecies’ or ‘revelations’. A major reason for such skepticism is the wide-spread assumption that the Book of *Daniel*, or at least chs. 7–12 were composed between 167 and 165 BC, thus at a time when Judas had not yet recovered Jerusalem, let alone restored the temple of Yahweh. Accordingly, the author did not have a chance of knowing precise durations on which to base fact-inspired predictions.³⁷ *Dan* 11 seems to lend the strongest support to the assumption of a *vaticinium ex eventu* combined with wishful thinking. After a remarkable narrative, which retells the long line of wars from Alexander the Great to the aftermath of the Sixth Syrian War (170–168 BC), *Dan* 11.40–45 describes the evil king’s final battle resulting in his death. Since the last details are remote from the actual events, Antiochos’ death towards the end of 164 BC offers a solid *terminus ante quem*.³⁸ We can even go a step further, since this

the murder of Onias III, on whom see below, with ns. 36 and 44); 244 f. (on more futile attempts at finding clean solutions).

36 Note that *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 20.10.1 (233–238) roots in the same ‘Jeremian-Danielic’ prophecy, but clearly shows an interpretation that long postdates Antiochos IV. First, 70 years are assigned to the period between the Babylonian captivity and the liberation by Cyrus, and 414 years are attributed to the line of uninterrupted high priests. This falls 6 years short of the 62 year weeks; for their completion, three years of Onias (obviously a conflation of Onias III and Menelaos, as revealed by the reference to the son, i. e. Onias IV), and another three years under Jakimos (sc. Alkimos) have to be added. The subsequent seven-year *intersacerdotium* is fully in line with the chronology of *1Macc*, which has Alkimos die in 159 BC and Jonathan inaugurated as high priest in 152 BC. This variation of the prophecy, which only concedes a single cataclysmic year week immediately preceding the salvation, needs to omit the desecration of the temple during the high priesthood of Menelaos. We have to do with an apparent pro-Maccabean fiction which attempts to harmonize *Dan* 7–12 with *1* and *2Macc*, or perhaps more precisely, with the specific version of *1Macc* that Josephus drew on for his *Jewish Antiquities* (see above, n. 19). This crude rewriting of history led, among other things, to the (otherwise quite unlikely) conflation of Menelaos with Onias III in *Ant. Jud.* 20.10.1 (235 f.), whereas Menelaos is presented as yet another brother of Onias III in *Ant. Jud.* 12.5.1 (238). This moral upgrade of Menelaos merges the conflict between Onias III and Jason with the war between Jason and Menelaos, obviously with the aim of shifting the cataclysmic 70th year week to the *intersacerdotium* prior to Jonathan’s accession. This pro-Maccabean fabrication recalls the particular emphasis on John Hyrkanos’ prophetic gift in *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 13.10.3 (282 f.) and 13.10.7 (300); cf. *Bell. Jud.* 1.2.8 (68); see Regev 2010, 69 f. n. 37 and pp. 117 f.; D. Schwartz 2017, 81 f. – I shall argue elsewhere that Josephus cannot be the source of this deviation from the tradition of *1Macc* (4.46; 9.27), but rather claim an intermediate source with a deuteronomistic agenda, see Coşkun, in preparation.

37 E. g., Bunge 1971, 460; Hammer 1976, 5; LaCocque 1988, 8; Collins 1993, 38; Koester 1996, 246; Mittag 2006, 24 n. 34; D. Schwartz 2008, 372 f.; Nelson 2012, 17. Cf. also the references in Baldwin 1978, 18; 35 et al.

38 The Babylonian king list (*BM* 35603 rev. 10–15, ed. Sachs & Wiseman 1954, 208 f.; cf. Habicht 1979, 190 f.; Bringmann 1983, 17; Grzybek 1992, 197 f.; Seeman 2013, 100; Scolnic 2014b, 6 f.) states the king’s death was reported in the 9th month (Kislev), which equals 19 Nov. to 19 Dec. 164 BC. His corpse was brought to Babylon in the subsequent month, Tashrit (19 Dec./17. Jan. 164/163 BC), see Del Monte 1997, 82; Clancier 2014, 432. Accordingly, he died in Kislev or the preceding month Marheslavan, so that news could have reached Jerusalem around 25 Kislev. – For the death of Antiochos IV as *terminus ante quem* for *Daniel*, see, e. g., Bickermann 1937, 143 f.; Grabbe 2008, 105; Nelson 2012, 9 f.; 16; 288–292; Bernhardt 2017, 38. On his

projected outline of military encounters reveals unawareness of the fact that the king departed on his eastern campaign in 165 BC. Chapter 11 was most likely written under the fresh impression of the parade of Daphne in 166 BC, which had once more demonstrated Antiochos' full strength: even the Judean prophet who was eagerly awaiting the king's death could not imagine that his downfall was instant, but rather had to predict further major victories lest his vision be rejected as outright fanciful.³⁹

Therefore, part of the *Book of Daniel* may well appear to be contemporary to the religious persecution, and this is not only so in some of the ostensibly Seleukid chapters 7–12.⁴⁰ Admittedly, for the Greek translation of the parts whose Hebrew and Aramaic versions have been preserved, scholars have often conceded a date as late as 100 BC, but normally pointed out that later work on the text did not yield an adaptation of the prophetic chronologies.⁴¹ Quite notably, a few chapters of *Daniel* have even been considered to postdate 164 BC, but the Seleukid prophecies on the temple cult in *Dan* 7–12 have normally not been considered to have been affected by such updates.⁴²

Countering this common opinion, I would like to argue instead that the Seleukid visions of *Dan* 7–9 and 12 were formulated after the re-establishment of the traditional cult on 25 Kislev 164 BC. For the chronological implications of *Dan* 11.40–45 that have been

death, see Polyb. 31.9. Cf. Mittag 2006, 24, and pp. 282–331 for a detailed historical account; also see the source survey by Nodet 2005, 79–84. – There are a few conspicuous exceptions. Parker 2006, 156 believes that the author had knowledge of the purification, and thus further concludes: 'we need not assume that the author of Daniel did not yet know that Antiochus IV had died, but merely that he did not yet know *where and how*'. Goldstein 1976/79, 164 and Baslez 2014, 358 n. 79 also assume knowledge of his death, but their calculations do not add up; see below, n. 60. Differently, now Bernhardt 2017, 310–313; 536–561 argues that the author of *Daniel* knew of the temple purification (which he dates to Aug. 164 BC), but not yet of the king's death.

- 39 The procession of Daphne (Polyb. 30.25 f.), or rather the king's invitation of all his subjects to participate with delegations, has previously been seen as a catalyst for the escalation of inner-Judean tensions. But this is hard to sustain for a number of reasons (see Bringmann 1983, 34–36), not least due to the uncertain chronology (a time in fall 166 BC is most likely: Bunge 1976). This said, from hindsight, the unique empire-wide initiative with strong cultic implications may well have contributed to the later perception of the persecution of the Jewish cult as part of a general policy.
- 40 E. g., Schürer III.1, 1986, 245: 'The book is the direct product of the Maccabaeen struggles, born in the very midst of them'; Mittmann-Richert 2000, 120; 117: ca. 165 BC, also referring to *Dan* 3.32–38. For Seleukid readings of chs. 1–6, also see Efron 1987, 33–35; 96–104; Millar 2006a, 65; Nelson 2012, 28 f. (who advocates a 'unitarian' text, but drafted in four stages: pp. 20–30).
- 41 E. g., Schürer III.2, 1987, 725. On the different versions and language mix, see above, with n. 4.
- 42 E. g., Schürer III.2, 1987, 725 proposes 163 BC as *terminus ad quem*; for the story of Susanna (*Dan* 13) and the priest of Bel (*Dan* 14); Collins 1993, 412 and 418 dates them to the 2nd century, regarding the translation into Greek around 100 BC as the *terminus ad quem*; rejecting the age of Simon as the most probable time (p. 438; cf. Schürer III.1, 1986, 247 n. 3). This has, however, been reasserted by Mittmann-Richert 2000, 118 and 127 ff., esp. 130: 'Damit stehen alle Zusätze zum Buch Daniel als Zeugnisse einer Zeit vor Augen, die auf die im kanonischen Danielbuch angekündigte Gerichtswende bereits zurückblickt, gleichzeitig aber die Tatsache verarbeiten muß, daß die Dinge sich geschichtlich anders vollzogen haben, als Daniel sie geschaut hat. ... So wird in den Zusätzen in der Manier des kanonischen Erzählteiles die Erfüllung dessen ausgesagt, was die prophetische Tradition insgesamt, Daniel bereits eingeschlossen, zum Sieg Israels über das babylonische Heidentum geweissagt hat. Daniel, in dessen Person prophetische, priesterliche und richterliche Beauftragung absichtsvoll verschmolzen erscheinen, wird damit zum neuerlichen und alle Lebensbereiche umfassenden Garanten der geschichtlichen Verhältnisse in der Zeit der überstandenen Religionsnot.'

unfolded above, I exclude *Dan* 11 from this argument. I add its prelude, ch. 10, as well as its epilogue, ch. 12.1–3/4, which are closely connected to the Seleukid-Ptolemaic vision. It is conspicuous that any reference to the seven-year time frame is absent from these sections. In contrast, timing is present as a secondary theme in chs. 7–8, which focus on the visions of the beasts; chronology is the central topic of chs. 9 and 12.5–13, whose emphasis is on the certainty of salvation after a clearly-defined period of suffering. The latter two chapters will seamlessly cohere, in fact collapse into a single one, if chapters 10–12.3 are excluded.⁴³

4) The Final Year Week in the Vision of *Daniel* 9

In the preceding section, I have suggested that the prophecized 70 year weeks of *Dan* 9.24–27 ended with the purification of the temple on 25 Kislev 164 BC. One obvious implication of this choice is that the final year week would thus have begun in 171/70 BC. In other words: the ‘apocalyptic’ crisis revealed to Daniel can barely be connected with the deposition of Onias III early under the rule of Antiochos IV (2*Macc* 4.7–10) or with his (alleged) murder, as is widely believed,⁴⁴ but rather with the deposition of his

43 The mention of Michael in *Dan* 12.1 seems to reconnect the narrative with *Dan* 10.21, after the somewhat bulky interruption through the insertion of the Ptolemaic-Seleukid vision (*Dan* 11). *Dan* 12.1–3 foretells the salvation by Michael as god-sent protector. The vision finds its conclusion in *Dan* 12.4, where the book of the revelations is closed and sealed. This last paragraph, if not the last four, works well in the two different versions of the Seleukid prophecies, and thus explain why the later editor inserted the formerly replaced chapters back into the book exactly here. But he did not mitigate the tension that arose through the (re-)introduction of (now two) angels on the river banks (*Dan* 12.5, instead of only one in *Dan* 10.4 f.). In the revised narrative, the two are needed for the communication of the divine plan across the river (*Dan* 12.6 f.). Obviously, the author of *Dan* 10.4 f. never meant to connect it with *Dan* 12.5, since the former is presented as a vision seen in the third year of King Cyrus (*Dan* 10.1), whereas the latter, in a unitarian reading, would be an extension of the Seleukid-Ptolemaic vision, dated to the first year of King Darius (*Dan* 11.1). Apparently, he who composed the revised version knew quite well the previous text, and therefore chose to date the revelation of the time frame of salvation also into the first year of Darius’ rule (*Dan* 9.1). With this, a certain consistency was re-established within the Danielic tradition (cf. *Dan* 6). I further suspect that *Dan* 10 + 12.1–3/4 was the oldest version to directly address the conflict under an unspecified Greek rule (*Dan* 10.20). The Ptolemaic-Seleukid vision (*Dan* 11) must have been composed independently, since, in its final version, it discontinues the vision under Cyrus (*Dan* 10); *Dan* 11.1 rather dates the Seleukid-Ptolemaic vision under Darius (perhaps for the same reason as *Dan* 9.1), thus harshly interrupting the foretelling of the angel’s fight against the archangel of the Greeks (*Dan* 10.20 f.). On the peculiar nature of *Dan* 11 and its main source, also see Millar 2006a, 60 and Scolnic 2014a, though in different contexts and with different conclusions. – Such analytical readings should not surprise us given that the heterogeneous nature of *Daniel* has been elaborated on repeatedly: see above, ns. 4, 40–42, and below, n. 78. For a fierce but unconvincing defence of the unity of *Daniel*, see, e. g., Efron 1987, 35.

44 For the deposition of Onias III as the beginning of the last ‘week’, see, e. g., Efron 1987, 80 n. 66; Scolnic 2007, 96 n. 9. For the (assumed) murder of Onias, see, e. g., Schürer III.1, 1986, 248; Nelson 2012, 9; 238 (dating it to 171 BC) and 280 (dating it to 170 BC). But the tradition of Onias’ assassination (2*Macc* 4.33–38) seems to be a later fabrication and is contradicted by a significant part of the tradition. Jos. *Ant. Jud.* 12.5.1 (237) lets him die a natural death, apparently to pretend a smooth succession to the high priesthood by his brother. More importantly, Jos. *Bell. Jud.* 1.1.1 (31–33) and 7.10.2–3 (420–436) have him take refuge in Egypt and found the temple of Yahweh in Leontopolis. See Piotrkowski 2014 (also drawing on Rabbinic sources) and Coşkun, in preparation (also drawing on Jos. *c. Ap.* 2.49–56).

brother and successor Jason (2Macc 4.23–27). Despite Jason's heinous characterization in 2Macc, recent scholarship has dedramatized his coup against his brother, and also presented a more balanced interpretation of his reform agenda: ambitious and ruthless though he was, he tried to modernize Judaism without abandoning its basic religious principles.⁴⁵ Further to his credit is that, after all, he took arms against Menelaos in 168 BC, and this with strong support of the Judaeans, so that Menelaos was helpless without the support of the king. Such circumstances discourage the view of Jason as an apostate.

At any rate, even Jason's negative press in 2Macc (4.7–22; 5.6–10) pales before the sacrilegious deeds of Menelaos: the latter had Onias III (allegedly) murdered (2Macc 4.23–50), allowed Antiochos IV into the temple to help himself to all its treasures (2Macc 5.15), led Seleukid troops in their campaign against the cult and its adherents (2Macc 5.23, cf. Dan 11.30). The pinnacle of his failings was reached when he did not prevent the 'Abomination of Desolation'. To Menelaos' defence, not even the narrative of 2Macc gives him an active role in this (2Macc 5.24–7.42), but neither did he use his influence at the royal court, which he continued to have at least until 164 BC (2Macc 11.32, 29, in a letter wrongly attributed to Antiochos V), to avoid the desecration.⁴⁶

The exact chronology is uncertain, since we do not know how soon after the accession of Antiochos IV Jason ousted his brother Onias III, nor how precise the indication is that gives three years to his high priesthood (2Macc 4.23). 1Macc 1 omits those details, and Josephus' accounts are likewise imprecise: *Ant. Jud.* 12.5.1 (237–241) withholds year dates, but puts the military conflict between Jason and Menelaos before Antiochos' Egyptian War (*Ant. Jud.* 12.5.2 [242]).⁴⁷ Accordingly, there is nothing to object the suggestion that Jason most likely became high priest in ca. 174/73 BC and Menelaos in ca. 171/70 BC.⁴⁸ I therefore conclude that Menelaos was appointed to the high priesthood – the most deleterious of all tenures before the destruction of the Second Temple – about seven years before 25 Kislev 164 BC. While my proposition may still be regarded as hypothetical at this point, it will gain credibility with every detail of *Daniel's* prophecies that finds a plausible explanation. Let us now turn to the subdivisions of the final year week.

45 See, e.g., Mittag 2006, 227; 235–247; Scolnic 2007, 109–143; Engels 2014 (cf. Engels 2017, 349–380). On Jason, also see above, ns. 18, 24 and 36.

46 Also see Gruen 1993, 253–263: Menelaos acted out of personal ambitions, but the allegation that he had encouraged the cult reforms (as implied in 2Macc 13.4) or that he was an aggressive Hellenizer cannot be substantiated; after all, it was Menelaos who induced Antiochos IV to scrap the cult reforms and grant an amnesty (2Macc 11.27–33). For the latest (partial) defence of Menelaos, see Bernhardt 2017, 156–163. The same, however, also makes a good case for the view that Menelaos had officially been entrusted with the cultic reforms, a task which he then delegated to Athenaios, a member of the Judaeen Council (2Macc 6.1); this way, Bernhardt 2017, 245–247 rejects the traditional interpretation that a random Athenian called Geron was put in charge: 'Menelaos ließ Athenaios die Eingriffe in den Kult vornehmen, um zumindest teilweise sein Gesicht zu wahren.'

47 The catalogue of the high priests in *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 20.10.1 (237 f.) is practically useless for our chronological concerns; see above, n. 36.

48 Cf. (without this argument) Schürer I 1973, 149, who dates Jason's tenure to 'probably from 174 to 171.'

5) The ‘Three and a Half Times’ in *Daniel* 7 and 12

Two visions set a time frame of ‘three and a half times’ to the hubris of Antiochos (here named the ‘King of the North’) and the interruption of the daily sacrifices in the temple of Yahweh (*Dan* 7.25; 12.7). Most scholars accept that those ‘times’ should be identified with ‘years’. The frame of the (final) year week makes this indeed the only plausible choice.⁴⁹

The first years of the crisis were quite bad for the Judeans, as they brought with them higher exploitation of the cult and the people, as well as higher pressure towards modernization, both of which resulted in resistance and turmoil (*2Macc* 4.23–50). The conflicts of this period culminated in the sacrilegious pillage of the temple by the king, which I have dated to ca. August 169 above (section 2, with *1Macc* 1.16–20, despite *2Macc* 5.15). While these developments caused outrage, the two Maccabaeen accounts agree with the narrative of *Dan* 11.28 in that the functioning of the cult was not affected. Apparently, the middle of the apocalyptic 70th year week had not yet been reached, and worse was yet to come in the course of 167 BC, such as the ‘Abomination of Desolation’ on 15/25 Kislev 167 BC (*1Macc* 1.54, 59).⁵⁰

The narratives of our two Maccabaeen accounts single out two discrete steps in-between Antiochos’ pillage of the temple and the inauguration of the new cult. The latter is said to have been preceded by some general religious decisions that Antiochos had made in Antioch (*1Macc* 1.41–64; *2Macc* 6.1–11). Somewhat earlier than that, but also after his return to his main royal residence, he had decided on further measures in response to the revolt of Jason, which he had put down not long ago: he sent a strong garrison to the Akra, which was responsible for much bloodshed in Jerusalem. One version ascribes the fulfillment of this mission to a certain Apollonios, commander of a unit of Mysian mercenaries (*2Macc* 5.24–26), whereas the other speaks of an unnamed fiscal official (*1Macc* 1.29–40: ἄρχοντα φορολογίας). It is widely acknowledged now that the latter term is a mistranslation for ‘Leader of Mysians’ from the Greek source to the

49 The three and a half years are also accepted by Porphyry and Jerome: the former seems to be thinking of the time that the desecration lasted, the latter of the time between the cultic edict of Antiochos (preceding the desecration by about half a year) and the purification: Porphyry, *BNJ* 260 F 58a, 58b, 58c = Hieron. in *Dan* 12.7, 11, 12, on which see above, ns. 2 and 7, and below, n. 72. – Differently, Goldingay 1989, 181 explicitly rejects the identification of ‘times’ or ‘periods’ with years, and denies any specific chronological meaning, concluding: ‘If the earlier part of v 25 alludes to the reign of Antiochus more generally rather than to events after 168 BC in particular, the periods referred to here as likely began with his appropriation of the throne in 175 BC, his encouragement of the Hellenistic reforms of Jason, his appointment as high priest, or his first desecration of the temple in 169 BC ...’ Lucas 2002, 218 remains undecided.

50 Differently, Nelson 2012, 240 regards 25 Kislev 167 BC as the middle of the seven-year period. But this would render the first half too long (four to five years, depending on when Onias III was deposed or killed) and the second half too short (exactly three years, ending on 25 Kislev 164 BC). In addition, such an argument belies his view (p. 17) that the author had to extend the day count for the suspension of the cult (see above, n. 5). – Note that Bringmann 1983, 25–28; 39 f. dates the ‘Abomination of Desolation’ to Kislev 168 BC (and the purification to 165 BC), understanding all era years in *1Macc* as SE^M (see above, n. 1). On Bernhardt 2017, 559 f., see below, ns. 52 and 60.

Hebrew original or from the Hebrew to the Septuagint text.⁵¹ *1* and *2Macc* thus attest the same intervention, which was a further response by Antiochos to the unrest started by Jason in 168 BC.

Some uncertainty remains as to when Apollonios arrived: was it before or after the winter of 168/67 BC? Perhaps we should simply trust the author of *1Macc* once more, and understand μετὰ δύο ἔτη ἡμερῶν (*1Macc* 1.29) as pointing to the overnext calendar year after the sack of the temple in Year 143 SE^B = (ca. Aug.) 169 BC (*1Macc* 1.20). This leads us to spring or summer 167 BC, which is early in Year 145 SE^B.⁵² The event thus happened around three and a half years before the purification of the temple on 25 Kislev 148 SE^B = 164 BC, and at about the same distance from the succession of Menelaos to the high priesthood, if the abovementioned date of 141 SE^B = 171/70 BC is accepted. Do the military operations of Apollonios justify the understanding that they opened the final abysmal half-week? The report of *1Macc* 1.36–40 seems to affirm this,⁵³ for after detailing the fortification of the Akra, the story goes on as follows:

(36) For it was a place to lie in wait against the sanctuary, and an evil adversary to Israel. (37) Thus they shed innocent blood on every side of the sanctuary, and defiled it: (38) Insomuch that the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled because of them: whereupon the city was made an habitation of strangers, and became strange to those that were born in her; and her own children left her. (39) Her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness, her feasts were turned into mourning, her sabbaths into reproach, her honour into contempt. (40) As had been her glory, so was her dishonour increased, and her excellency was turned into mourning.⁵⁴

Defilement is thus expressed explicitly through the ‘innocent bloodshed’, and further implied in ridding the sanctuary of its law-abiding priests and in disregarding the Sabbaths. The settlement of strangers in Jerusalem would have enhanced this understanding. Add to this the explanation of John Ma (in a different context) that the dispatch of a garrison by Antiochos went along with his administrative decision to cassate Jerusalem’s status as an autonomous city (beside Antioch-at-Jerusalem); as a result, its

51 See Mittag 2006, 253 n. 104: ‘Inzwischen wird aber allgemein angenommen, dass es sich hierbei um eine falsche Lesung und Übersetzung des hebräischen *sar hammusim* (Anführer der Mysier) in *sar hammsim* (Obersteuereinnnehmer) handelt; in 2 Makk. 5.24 wird dieser “Anführer der Mysier” namentlich genannt’. Cf. Goldstein 1976/79, 211 f.; Bringmann 1983, 32.

52 Tcherikover 1959/99, 196 (with reference to *Dan* 11.31) dates Apollonios’ arrival to 167 BC, Goldstein 1976/79, 163 (with no reference to *Daniel*) to April 167 BC. Engels 2017, 378 lets the religious reforms start in summer 167, but he seems to be dating the first sacrifice to Zeus Olympios prior to Antiochos’ religious edict in fall 167 BC – a slip? Differently, e. g., Bringmann 1983, 29–34 and Bernhardt 2017, 540–542 (differently, p. 221: September 168 BC) date the events from the arrival of Apollonios to the first pagan sacrifice in December 168 BC.

53 The question is, however, denied by Goldstein 1976/79, 213, but his argument conflates the punitive measures of 168 BC with the mission of Apollonios.

54 (36) καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς ἔνεδρον τῷ ἁγιάσματι καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διαπαντός. (37) καὶ ἐξέχεαν αἶμα ἄφρων κύκλῳ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος καὶ ἐμόλυναν τὸ ἁγίασμα. (38) καὶ ἔφυγον οἱ κάτοικοι Ἱερουσαλήμ δι’ αὐτοῦς, καὶ ἐγένετο κατοικία ἄλλοτριῶν· καὶ ἐγένετο ἄλλοτρία τοῖς γενήμασιν αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ἐγκατέλιπον αὐτήν. (39) τὸ ἁγίασμα αὐτῆς ἠρημώθη ὡς ἔρημος, αἱ ἑορταὶ αὐτῆς ἐστράφησαν εἰς πένθος, τὰ σάββατα αὐτῆς εἰς ὀνειδισμόν, ἡ τιμὴ αὐτῆς εἰς ἐξουδένωσιν. (40) κατὰ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς ἐπληθύνθη ἡ ἀτιμία αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ ὄψος αὐτῆς ἐστράφη εἰς πένθος.

inhabitants were reduced to the status of *paroikoi*, and the control of its sanctuary must have been transferred to the rival *polis*.⁵⁵ Against this background, *Daniel's* time frame of twice three and a half years appears to be much more than a spiritual fiction: the conflict entered a new stage in the middle of 167 BCE.

6) The Prediction of *Daniel* 8 and Antiochos' Religious Decree

Next, we have to consider the implication of *Dan* 8.13 f.: a time frame of 2,300 'mornings and evenings' is given, which may either be read as 1,150 or 2,300 days. The text and its meaning are somewhat unclear, except for the fact that the end point of the prophesied period is explicitly the 'cleansing of the holy', that is once more 25 Kislev 148 SE^B = 164 BC.⁵⁶ Assuming lunar months with an average length of 29.5 days, 2,300 days yield 77.96 months. Surmising the 19-year cycle of the Methonic (Babylonian) calendar, which added intercalary months in years 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17 and 19, the time span would add up to about six and a half years, minus two or three intercalary months. While this falls short of seven years by a substantial amount of days (or even months), it might still be seen as the reality underlying the seven years,⁵⁷ given the ancient practice of inclusive count. If accepted, this would move the start of the final year week to late summer or early fall 170/69 BC; accordingly, we would have to date the accession of Menelaos a bit later than suggested above (171/70 BC).⁵⁸

But there is a more plausible alternative, namely to single out mornings and evenings, and thus to count only 1,150 days back from 25 Kislev 164 BC, as is now the preferred understanding in Biblical scholarship.⁵⁹ In other words, this interpretation would not affect the first half of the final year week, but rather direct us to an event that happened 140 days (or 4.75 months) later than the arrival of Apollonios, which I have previously identified as inaugurating the second half of the final year week. Counting 140 days down

55 Ma 2012, 72–82, esp. 78; also Ma 2013 for more details on the loss of independence. And see above, with n. 10 on the *polis*. – Tcherikover 1959/99, 195 explains the pagan cult in the temple as a simple result of the settlement of Syrians.

56 *Dan* 8.13 f.: καὶ ἤκουσα ἐνὸς ἁγίου λαλοῦντος, καὶ εἶπεν εἰς ἅγιος τῷ φελοῦντι τῷ λαλοῦντι: ἕως πότε ἡ ὄρασις στήσεται, ἡ θυσία ἢ ἀρθεῖσα καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐρημώσεως ἢ δοθεῖσα, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἡ δύναμις συμπατηθήσεται; / καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωῆ ἡμέραι δισχίλια καὶ τριακόσια, καὶ καθαρῶσθῆσεται τὸ ἅγιον. 'And I heard one saint speaking, and a saint said to a certain one speaking, How long shall the vision continue, [even] the removal of the sacrifice, and the bringing in of the sin of desolation; and [how long] shall the sanctuary and host be trampled? / And he said to him, Evening and morning [there shall be] two thousand and three hundred days; and [then] the sanctuary shall be cleansed.' Cf. Nelson 2012, 208, discussing both alternative counts.

57 On the calendar, see Bickerman 1980, 24–26; 29 f.; Gleßner 2004; Stern 2012, 71–123.

58 Inclusive count is potentially admitted by Goldingay 1989, 213, who however prefers a symbolic reading. Nelson 2012, 208 would rather relate this to the murder of Onias III, unless he preferred to count 1,150 days. Yet differently, according to Bunge 1971, 458 f., 1,150 days yield three years and two months, but should be seen as equaling the last three-and-a-half years, whose start he dates to summer 168 BC.

59 Most scholars explain the number with the suspended sacrifices on each morning and evening, see esp. Collins 1993, 336. Critical, however, is Goldingay 1989, 213: 'The morning and evening whole offering was seen as one unit rather than as two independent ones.'

from May or June 167 BC leads us to either the seventh (Elul) or eighth (Tishri) month of 145 SE^B = September/November 167 BC. I suggest that we equate this ominous event with the empire-wide religious reforms that Antiochos IV is supposed to have designed from Antioch (1*Macc* 1.41–64; 2*Macc* 6.1–11).⁶⁰ In fact, the vision of *Dan* 8.8–12 lends further support to this interpretation:

(8) And the he-goat grew exceedingly great: and when he was strong, his great horn was broken; and four other [horns] rose up in its place toward the four winds of heaven. (9) And out of one of them came forth one strong horn, and it grew very great toward the south, and toward the east,⁶¹ and toward the host: (10) and it magnified itself to the host of heaven; and there fell to the earth [some] of the host of heaven and of the stars, and they trampled on them. (11) And [this shall be] until the chief captain shall have delivered the captivity: and by reason of him the sacrifice was disturbed, and he prospered; and the holy place shall be made desolate. (12) And a sin-offering was given for the sacrifice, and righteousness was cast down to the ground; and it practised, and prospered.⁶²

60 Differently, Goldstein 1976/79, 163 dates the king's edict to Apr./Dec. 167 BC, but he states on p. 164 (cf. 101): 'News of the death of Antiochus IV reaches Jerusalem, 1150 days after desecration of 15 Kislev, 167. Jews thereafter celebrate the day annually as the Day of the Tyrant.' This is dated to '12 Adar on the defective calendar (January 28), 163'. Goldstein's chronology for Antiochos IV is incompatible with other data (see above, with n. 38), not least with his own positions (see above, ns. 5, 14, 52 f., and below, n. 75). The entry in *Megillat Taanit* remains quite unclear: 'On the 12th thereof is the day of Tyrian (*sic*)'; Zeitlin 1922 related this to the recruitment for the Roman war of AD 66. At any rate, Goldstein does not consider how the premise that 164/63 BC was a defective year would also affect the date of the purification of the temple on 25 Kislev and all according time counts. – Also lacking a solid foundation is Baslez 2014, 358 n. 79: 'cette mort est connue à Jérusalem 1105 jours après l'occupation du temple; le retrait d'Antiochos V et le recouvrement du temple étaient fêtés le 23 Shebat, en février.' Her claim is not supported by the two references she gives (*Dan* 12.12 and Nodet 2005, 79–84). I assume that 23 Shevat is a typo for 28 Shevat (mid-Feb.), and that this should be based on *Megillat Taanit*: 'On the 28th thereof Antiochus (the king) departed from Jerusalem. If it relates to Antiochos V at all, this would have to be 162 BC, since it is unlikely that the campaign of Lysias had begun before spring 164 BC; see below, with ns. 74–77 on the chronology. The unexplained number of 1,105, unless regarded as typo for 1,150, may be explained with an erroneous calculation that I found in Nelson 2012, 208: he insists on identifying the day on which the traditional sacrifice was suspended with the one on which the pagan sacrifice was introduced. His argument is flawed, because, on the one hand, he acknowledges that 1,150 days are longer than three years, which he – somewhat confusingly equals with 1,105 days according to the solar calendar (instead of ca. 1,096) or 1,090 days according to a 'lunar calendar of thirty days per month' (a contradiction in itself); on the other hand, he states (pp. 17, 30) that those 1,150 days expired uneventfully and had to be extended. In addition, he forgets the alternative time indications in *Daniel*, on which see above and below. – Most recently, Bernhardt 2017, 559 f. has suggested that *Dan* 8.13 f. (1,150 days) leads us to February 164 BC, when peace was being negotiated with Lysias. This is incompatible with the end point alluded to in *Daniel's* prophecy; in addition, Bernhardt fails to see that the first negotiation with Lysias was led by Menelaos – which would barely have encouraged much hope in the author of *Daniel* (see 2*Macc* 11.27–33, which Bernhardt 2017, 319 f. quite surprisingly relates to 163 BC).

61 The words 'and toward the east' are missing in *The Greek Word*, an obvious oversight.

62 *Dan* 8.8: καὶ ὁ τράγος τῶν αἰγῶν ἐμεγαλύνθη ἕως σφόδρα, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἰσχυραὶ αὐτὸν συνετριβή τὸ κέρασ αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγα, καὶ ἀνέβη ἕτερα κέρατα τέσσαρα ὑποκάτω αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀνέμους τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. (9) καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς αὐτῶν ἐξῆλθε κέρασ ἐν ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη περισσῶσ πρὸσ τὸν νότον καὶ πρὸσ τὴν ἀνατολήν καὶ πρὸσ τὴν δύναμιν. (10) καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη ἕως τῆσ δυνάμειωσ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ τῆσ δυνάμειωσ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄστροων, καὶ συνεπάτησαν αὐτά, (11) καὶ ἕωσ οὐ ὁ ἀρχιστράτηγος ρύσεται

There is common agreement that the one-horned he-goat represents the Empire of Alexander the Great, succeeded by the four Diadochs Ptolemy, Kassandros, Antigonos and Seleukos I Nikator (again, revealing wonderfully the detailed knowledge our author had of the Hellenistic period). Antiochos IV is the offspring of Seleukos I. He not only attacked Egypt in the south and campaigned eastward, but also challenged traditional national cults throughout his empire, at least according to Judaeon traditions.⁶³ *2Macc* 6.2 specifies the Samaritan temple on the Garizim, besides that of Jerusalem; *1Macc* 1.41 f. points out that all peoples of his kingdom were to abandon their traditional cults. The vision of *Daniel* shows the new horn of the he-goat disrupting the whole *kosmos*, overthrowing the divine order of the nations (a remarkable perspective for a monolatristic Jew!), challenging even the chief captain (ἀρχιστράτηγος), that is the god of the Judaeans.

The time frame of 2,300 ‘mornings and evenings’ has been given as a response to this question (*Dan* 8.13): ‘How long shall the vision stand⁶⁴, [even] the removal of the sacrifice, and the bringing in of the sin of desolation; and [how long] shall the sanctuary and host be trampled?’⁶⁵ Since the vision is the he-goat whose latest and most excessive horn is growing into the stars of heaven and disturbing the cosmic order, the most appropriate start point is indeed the royal decree (whether factual or imagined) that was seen as imposing a unified cult on all subject peoples.⁶⁶ While there appears to be some inconsistency as to when the traditional sacrifice was effectively abandoned, the introduction of the ‘sin of desolation’ and the violent oppression of the temple both resulted from the hubris of Antiochos IV, here represented as the monstrous horn of the portentous he-goat. On this account, his sacrilege would be undone only with the purification of the temple, perhaps in combination with his death, reports of which may have reached Jerusalem only a few days before 25 Kislev 148 SE^B = 164 BC.

7) The Prediction of *Daniel* 12 and a New *Terminus ad Quem* for the Composition of the Latest Seleukid Prophecy

Chapter 12 offers further details. *Dan* 12.11 f. presents the exact figures of 1,290 and 1,335 days for the duration of the crisis. I suggest we try trusting those numbers as well.⁶⁷ Both

τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν, καὶ δι’ αὐτὸν θυσία ἐταράχθη, καὶ ἐγενήθη καὶ κατευδῶθη αὐτῶ, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον ἐρημωθήσεται (12) καὶ ἐδόθη ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ἁμαρτία, καὶ ἐρρίφη χαμαὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἐποίησε καὶ εὐδοῶθη.

63 Once again, the perspective of the Judaeon literary tradition seems to be quite distorted, see above, n. * on the general historical interpretation of the religious crisis.

64 *The Greek Word* translates ‘continue’, but the literal translation is to be preferred due to its deliberate ambiguity.

65 See above, n. 56 for the full quotation.

66 Also see *Dan* 11.37–39, with Bickermann 1937, 173 f.

67 Neither of them is a multiple of seven (days, weeks, months or years), so that they are not suspicious. Admittedly, the sum of those two figures is 2,625 and thus a multiple of seven; it would yield seven lunar years of 365 days plus 70 days. But summing up the numbers is not an option, since *Dan* 12.11 explicitly lets the 1,290 days start with the suspension of the cult.

get surprisingly close to 3.5 years without matching this sum exactly. Surmising once more lunar months with an average length of 29.5 days, the former yields 43.78 months, the latter 45.25 months. According to the Methonic calendar, 3.5 years would comprise 42 regular months plus a minimum of one or a maximum of two intercalary months.⁶⁸ 1,290 days may thus fall short of three and a half years only by about one week (in case of 44 months), or perhaps exceed the time frame by no more than three weeks (in case of a total of 43 months).⁶⁹

The start and end points of *Dan* 12.11 f. are somewhat nebulous:⁷⁰ the former blurs the suspension of the cult for Yahweh with the inauguration of the pagan cult; the latter is not specified at all, but the implication should be that the purification of the temple and the resumption of the sacrifice for Yahweh are referred to. If so, then we should once more identify the arrival of Apollonios in Jerusalem as the start point of the abysmal final half-year week. His occupation of the city can therefore be dated to the second (Iyyar) or third (Sivan) month of 145 SE^B = ca. May/June 167 BC. Accordingly, the winter upon Antiochos' return from Egypt and Jerusalem in 168 BC was used to recruit further troops for the garrison, which marched south in spring 167 BC. On this account, their arrival in Jerusalem quickly disrupted the daily sacrifices, since the 'worthy' priests were either killed or expelled, whereas the high priest who took over (Menelaos) was impure and thus defiled or at least invalidated the cult in the eyes of the authors of *Daniel*, *1Macc* and *2Macc*.⁷¹

If this should be the correct interpretation of the 1,290 days, then the 45 additional days would have followed after 25 Kislev 164 BC, and thus be completed early in Shevat,

68 On the calendar, see above, n. 57. Similarly, Parker 2006, 178 suggests to add one intercalary month.

69 Goldingay 1989, 309 f. concludes similarly: 'When allowance is made for intercalation, 1290 days can represent 3 ½ lunar years ... or 3 ½ solar years.' Also see Parker 2006, 166: 'Couching it as a prophecy, this book asserts that the abomination remained in the temple for three and a half years or 1290 days. ... the abomination was erected in the year 145 of the B. S. E. – three years later, in 148 B. S. E., the Temple was purified. 1 Maccabees and Daniel differ not as to the year, but only as to the exact month of the defilement. ... On Daniel's chronology the abomination came into the Temple in about the third month of the 145th year of the B. S. E. ... or about June of 167 B. C.' – Note that *Jos. Bell. Jud.* 1.1.1 (32) explicitly dates the interruption of the cult to 3.5 years. Despite the blunder stated in its context (see above, n. 26), there is no need to reject this piece of information. It is admittedly difficult to assess the value of this testimony, since it may have been drawn directly from *Daniel*; the author of *Bell. Jud.* was apparently not capable of establishing a reliable time line on his own.

70 Cf. Goldingay 1989, 310, with no firm conclusion: 'Thus vv 11–12 could terminate with Judas's victories, the temple rededication, Antiochus's death, the arrival of news of his death, or the further events envisaged by 11:45–12:3.' – Bernhardt 2017, 559 f. does not pay attention to the end points in *Daniel*. Equating 1,290 days with three years and seven months, he identifies the event with Judas' conquest of Jerusalem in summer 164 BC; 1,335 days are calculated as yielding a bit more than three years and eight months, ending with the temple purification in August 164 BC.

71 *2Macc* 5.25 f. focuses on the desecration of Sabbath, but also ends with the notion of pollution in 5.27: 'Ιούδας δὲ ὁ Μακκαβαῖος δέκατός που γενηθεὶς καὶ ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, θηρίων τρόπον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διέξῃ σὺν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν χορτῶδη τροφήν σιτούμενοι διετέλουν πρὸς τὸ μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ μολυσμοῦ. 'But Judas Maccabeus with nine others, or thereabout, withdrew himself into the wilderness, and lived in the mountains after the manner of beasts, with his company, who fed on herbs continually, lest they should be partakers of the pollution.'

which is about the last days of January 163 BC.⁷² Most likely, *Daniel* was pointing to another important event. One possibility is the pronouncement of Antiochos' death in Jerusalem. But, comparing the Babylonian evidence, this seems less plausible, and a date shortly before 25 Kislev is much more likely for the news reaching Judaea.⁷³ Effective or at least approximate synchrony of the purification and the learning of the king's death would indeed best match the evidence.

Alternatively, we may look for another achievement of Judas, perhaps a successful campaign against one of the 'nations roundabout', the first of which was a victory against the Idumaeans (*1Macc* 5.3). Even more likely, one may think of the new fortifications on Mount Sion. Judas is said to have finished them shortly after the resumption of the rites (*1Macc* 4.60). Given the ongoing threat from the garrison on the Akra, such fortifications instilled hope in the cult's continuity. These, however, were demolished by Antiochos V not much later, something that the author of the Danielic prophecies did not yet know (*1Macc* 6.62).⁷⁴

Further arguments can be produced in support of the view that the Seleukid prophecies were finalized early in 163 BC.⁷⁵ Shortly before the demolition of the aforementioned fortifications, Judas and Antiochos V agreed on peace terms, or at least a truce. On the one hand, the king conceded full tolerance for the traditional cult, but, on the other hand, he most likely required to include the wish for his well-being into the daily prayers at the temple, as Edward Dąbrowa has argued convincingly.⁷⁶ We can certainly exclude that the author of the Danielic prophecies was aware of this amazing turn: it would have affected the whole ideological argumentation underlying his visions, even if the now-to-be-respected king was only the son of Antiochos IV Epiphanes. The dramat-

72 There is, however, the alternative possibility to relate the difference of 45 days (*Dan* 12.11 f.) to the time between the death of Antiochos and the purification of the temple; especially the wording of *Dan* 7.25 f. may indicate that the 3.5 years describe the time of Antiochos' religious rage, which only ended with his life. If so, this would result in a day early in Marheslavan 164 BC for his passing away, and in an earlier disruption of the temple cult in spring 167 BC; it would not affect early 163 BC as the most likely time of composition for *Dan* 7 and 12. Also cf. the dispute between Jerome and Porphyry: the former implies that the latter understood the 45 days to have passed between Judas' victory and the cleansing of the temple until the resumption of the traditional sacrifice (*BNJ* 260 F 58c, ed. and transl. Toye): *Porphyrius hunc locum ita edisserit, ut quadraginta quinque dies, qui super mille ducentos nonaginta sunt, victoriae contra duces Antiochi tempus significant, quando Iudas Machabaeus fortiter dimicavit et emundavit templum idolumque contrivit et victimas obtulit in templo dei. quod recte diceret, si Machabaeorum liber tribus et semis annis templum scriberet fuisse pollutum et non tribus*. 'Porphyry explains this passage as follows: the 45 days in addition to the 1290 signifies the time of the victory against Antiochos' generals when Judas Maccabaeus fought bravely, cleansed the temple, destroyed the idol, and offered blood sacrifices in the temple of God. He would be right if the book of Maccabees had recorded that the temple was polluted for three and a half years and not three.' Jerome thus refutes Porphyry by claiming that the pollution had lasted only three years (cf. *1Macc* 1.54, 59 and 4.52; *Jos. Ant. Jud.* 12.7.6 [319–322], on which see above, n. 2), not three and a half years (which is, however, exactly what *Dan* 7.25 and 12.7 say, see above, section 5).

73 For his death in Nov. or Dec. 164 BC, see above, n. 38.

74 On the fortification, see Dąbrowa 2010, 21.

75 Goldstein 1976/79, 165 relates *Dan* 12.7 to the siege of Jerusalem during this campaign, which he dates three and a half years after 25 Kislev 167 BC. This is only partly consistent with his other views (see above, n. 60).

76 *1Macc* 6.55–61, with Dąbrowa 2010, 25–28. Also see *2Macc* 11.22–26 for the amnesty under Antiochos V.

ic change was not even palatable to those who much later deployed apologetic strategies when writing or editing the surviving Maccabean accounts.⁷⁷

8) Summary and Outlook

I have tried to show that we need no longer complain about the vagueness of the time indications in the Seleukid prophecies of *Daniel*. There is now an alternative to speculating about their symbolic meanings (and admitting that these escape us) or positing repeated postponement of divine salvation (which would have counteracted the main purpose of the prophecies, namely to corroborate the trust in the salvation by Yahweh). The timeline for the final seven years underlying the various visions rather appear to be fully compatible with the chronology that can be established through independent evidence.

The crisis began with the replacement of the high priest Jason by Menelaos in 171/70 BC (Kislev 171 is a good possibility). The two worst events during the first three-and-half years were the pillage of the temple by Antiochos IV in the summer of 169 BC, and the reconquest of Jerusalem in the summer or fall of 168 BC after the revolt of Jason. The abysmal final half-year-week was inaugurated in May or June 167 BC with the arrival of Seleukid reinforcements under Apollonios in Jerusalem, which plunged the city into further bloodshed and stained, if not interrupted, the temple cult. 140 days later (September/November), Antiochos issued his notorious cult edict, which would be the legal basis for persecuting all traditionally-minded Judaeans and transforming the cult of Yahweh into one for Zeus Olympios. The idol was established in the sanctuary on 15 Kislev, and the first pagan sacrifice offered on 25 Kislev 167 BC, which is half a year after the arrival of Apollonios. Judas Maccabee reconquered the city and the temple nearly three years later, and purified it to resume the traditional rites for Yahweh on the third anniversary of the first pagan sacrifice, 25 Kislev (14 December) 164 BC. Probably another 45 days later, Judas finished his fortifications against the Seleukid garrison still stationed on the Akra. Around the same day early in Shevat (end of January) 163 BC, the last touch on the Seleukid prophecies was done, with the addition of *Dan* 12.12.

77 The problem does not play a role in the critical analyses of Lysias' campaigns by Parker 2006, Ehling 2008, 114–119 or Bernhardt 2017, 322–326, who date Lysias' second campaign to spring and/or summer 163 BC. They also follow Jos. *Bell. Jud.* 1.1.5 (45) (erroneously quoted as 1.5.45) for the view that Judas fled to the Gophna Mountains after his defeat at Beth-Zacharia. But Jos. *Ant. Jud.* 12.9.5 (375) has him retreat to Jerusalem, to continue resistance from there. This is compatible with the more strongly ideologized version in *2Macc* 13.18–24, where the king is first defeated at Bethsura, then negotiates a peace with the inhabitants to concentrate his troops on Judas, who, however beats him, too; no further siege is reported, but instead we hear of the threat of Philippos, who took Antioch and thus induced the king to seek peace with the Judaeans and then also to meet Judas. The replacement of the high priest Menelaos by Alkimos could have been part of the deal – yet another aspect that a pro-Maccabean tradition would want to cover up, since Alkimos later turned against Judas (*1Macc* 7.5–25, with Scolnic 2005). Finally, the reference to the Sabbatical year in *1Macc* 6.49, 53) is also apologetic. For a revision of the evidence, see Coşkun, in preparation (where I suggest dating the campaign from October 163 BC to February 162 BC).

The genesis of the *Book of Daniel* has not been the main concern of the present investigation, but the findings on the time frame of the Seleukid prophecies have some relevance for how we should reconstruct the production stages, and also how we should understand the time-sensitivity of Judaeen prophecy in the age of Judas Maccabee. While the textual analysis I envisage requires more research to be done,⁷⁸ a simplified outline may look as follows: I have suggested above that the author of chapters 10–12.3/4 did not yet know about Antiochos' death, whereas the author of *Dan* 7–9 and 12.4/5–13 did. This observation led to the conclusion that the younger Seleukid prophecies were drafted not to complement, but to replace the older ones shortly after the purification of the temple on 25 Kislev 164 BC. All of these new prophecies evoke the seven-year time frame, whereas *Dan* 10–12.3/4 does not. Only *Dan* 12.12 goes beyond this end date by 45 days. Most likely, the writing process had just been concluded, and verse 12 was added on day 45 after the purification of the temple, to commemorate another achievement of Judas. Thus the last of the Seleukid prophecies was finalized towards the end of January 163 BC.

This was long before Lysias would resume the war against the insurgents, but it must have been obvious to everyone that a Seleukid army would soon strike back. It was against this background that the author of the previous version of the Danielic prophecies decided to rewrite and re-edit his work, to enhance its ideological use in an ongoing crisis of his people. By emphasizing that divine support as foretold by Daniel had come true to the letter, all Judaeans loyal to the Torah should be inspired with hope, and encouraged to bravery and perseverance, when the future of their cult was in fact entirely uncertain.

References

All Biblical texts have been drawn from the online edition *The Greek Word*, which reproduces *Elpenor's Bilingual (Greek/English) Old Testament*, presenting the official Greek text of the Greek Orthodox Church and the translation of L. C. L. Brenton. Deviations from the translations have been accounted for in the notes. URL: <https://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/default.asp> (6 April 2018).

Baldwin, Joyce G. 1978: *Daniel. An Introduction and Commentary*, Leicester.

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel 1989. *Judas Maccabaeus*, Cambridge.

Barclay, John M. G. 2007: *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*, vol. 10: *Against Apion. Translation and Commentary*, Leiden.

Baslez, Marie-Françoise 2014. 'Réprimer, pacifier ou persécuter? La gestion des minorités durant la crise maccabéenne d'après le dossier des mesures d'Amnistie d'Antiochos IV et d'Antiochos V', in Christophe Feyel & Laetitia Graslin-Thomé (eds.), *Le projet politique d'Antiochos IV*, Nancy, 341–362.

78 For the time being, see above, ns. 4 and 40–43 for some explanations and references.

- Bernhardt, Johannes Christian 2017. *Die jüdische Revolution. Untersuchung zu Ursachen, Verlauf und Folgen der hebräischen Erhebung*, Berlin.
- Bickerman, Elias 1937. *Der Gott der Makkabäer*, Leipzig.
– 1980. *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London 1968; 1980.
- Bolyki, János 2007. “As Soon as the Signal was Given” (2 Macc 4:14): Gymnasia in the Service of Hellenism’, in G. Xeravits & J. Zsengellér (eds.), *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology – Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9–11 June 2005*, Leiden, 131–139.
- Bringmann, Klaus 1983. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa, Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte*, Göttingen.
- Bunge, Jochen G. 1971. *Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Makkabäerbuch*, Bonn.
– 1976. ‘Die Feiern Antiochos’ IV. Epiphanes in Daphne im Herbst 166 v. Chr.’, *Chiron* 6, 53–71.
- Clancier, Philippe 2014. ‘Antiochos IV dans les sources babyloniennes’, in Christophe Feyel & Laetitia Graslin-Thomé (eds.), *Le projet politique d’Antiochos IV*, Nancy, 415–437.
- Coffman, James B. 1989. *Commentary on Daniel*, Abilene TX.
- Collins, John J. 1993. *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Minneapolis.
- Coşkun, Altay ca. 2018a. ‘Der Ethnarchentitel des Simon (Makkabaios) und die Verleihung der Souveränität durch Antiochos VII. Sidetes’, forthcoming in *SCI*.
– ca. 2018b. ‘Friendship and Alliance’ between the Judaeans and the Romans under Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 8.17–32): A Response to Linda Zollschan’s *Rome and Judaea* (2017)’, forthcoming in *Electrum*.
– ca. 2018c. ‘Simon Maccabee, Friendship with Rome and Seleukid Disintegration: a Case-Study of Triangular Diplomacy’, forthcoming in Altay Coşkun & David Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleukid East*, Brussels.
– in preparation. *A Historical Analysis of 1 Maccabees: Urversion, Continuation, Ideological Layers and Chronology*.
- Dąbrowa, Edward 1999. ‘L’expédition de Démétrios II Nicator contre les Parthes (139–138 avant J.-C.)’, *Parthica* 1, 9–17.
– 2010. *The Hasmoneans and Their State. A Study in History, Ideology, and the Institutions*, Krakow.
- Del Monte, Giuseppe F. 1997. *Testi dalla Babilonia ellenistica*, vol. 1: *Testi cronografici*, Pisa.
- Doran, Robert 2012. *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*, Minneapolis.
- Efron, Joshua 1987. *Studies on the Hasmonean Period*, Leiden.
- Ehling, Kay 2008. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden (164–63 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart.
- Engels, David 2014. ‘Da richteten sie in Jerusalem ein Gymnasion her, wie es auch die Heiden hatten: Das Gymnasion von Jerusalem und der Aufstand der Makkabäer: Sport, Religion und Politik’, *Electrum* 21, 43–71.
– 2017. *Benefactors, Kings, Rulers. Studies on the Seleukid Empire between East and West*, Leuven.
- Fischer-Bovet, Christelle 2014. ‘Est-il facile de conquérir l’Égypte? L’invasion d’Antiochos IV et ses conséquences’, in Christophe Feyel & Laetitia Graslin-Thomé (eds.), *Le projet politique d’Antiochos IV*, Nancy, 209–259.
- Gleßmer, Uwe 2004. Art. ‘Zeitrechnung IV. Judentum’, *TRE* 36, 601–606.
- Goldingay, John E. 1989. *Daniel*, Dallas.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. 1976/79. *1 Maccabees. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, Garden City NY 1976, repr. 1979.
- Gorre, Gilles & Sylvie Honigman 2014. ‘La politique d’Antiochos IV à Jérusalem à la lumière des relations entre rois et temples aux époques perse et hellénistique (Babylonie, Judée et Égypte)’, in Christophe Feyel & Laetitia Graslin-Thomé (eds.), *Le projet politique d’Antiochos IV*, Nancy, 301–338.
- Grabbe, Lester L. 1991. ‘Maccabaeian Chronology 167–164 or 168–165 BCE?’, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110, 59–74.

- 2008. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period the Early*, vol. 2: *The Coming of the Greeks: the Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)*, London.
- Gruen, Erich S. 1993. ‘Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews’, in idem (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture*, Berkeley CA, 238–274.
- Grzybek, Erhard 1992. ‘Zu einer babylonischen Königsliste aus der hellenistischen Zeit (Keilschrifttafel BM 35603)’, *Historia* 41, 190–204.
- Habicht, Christian 1979. 2. *Makkabäerbuch* (= Historische und legendarische Erzählungen = Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1), Gütersloh.
- Hammer, Raymond: *The Book of Daniel*, Cambridge 1976.
- Kampen, John 2007. ‘The Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism’, in G. Xeravits & J. Zsengeller (eds.), *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology – Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 9–11 June 2005*, Leiden, 11–30.
- Hölbl, Günther 2004. *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches. Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Großen bis zur römischen Eroberung*, Darmstadt 1994, corr. repr. 2004.
- Koester, Helmut 1995. *History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age*, 2nd ed., New York & Berlin.
- LaCocque, André 1988. *Daniel in His Time*, Columbia SC.
- Lucas, Ernest 2002. *Daniel*. Apollos Old Testament – Commentary 20, Leicester.
- Ma, John 2012. ‘Relire les institutions des Séleucides de Bikerman’, in Stéphane Benoist (ed.), *Rome, a City and its Empire in Perspective: The Impact of the Roman World through Fergus Millar’s Research*, Leiden, 59–84.
- Ma, John 2013. ‘Re-Examining Hanukkah’, *Marginalia*, July 9, 2013. URL: <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/re-examining-hanukkah/> (6 April 2018)
- Millar, Fergus 2006a. ‘Hellenistic History in a Near Eastern Perspective: The Book of Daniel’, in idem, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. 3: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*, ed. by Hannah M. Cotton & Guy M. Rogers, Chapel Hill NC, 51–66.
- 2006b. ‘The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel’s “Judaism and Hellenism”’, in idem, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, vol. 3: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*, ed. by Hannah M. Cotton & Guy M. Rogers, Chapel Hill NC, 67–90.
- Mittag, Peter F. 2006. *Antiochos IV. Epiphanes. Eine politische Biographie*, Berlin.
- Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike 2000. *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (= Historische und legendarische Erzählungen = Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit VI – Supplementa), Gütersloh.
- Morgan, M. Gwyn 1993. ‘Response’, in Erich S. Gruen (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture*, Berkeley CA, 264–269.
- Nelson, William B. 2012. *Daniel*. Understanding the Bible Commentary Series, Grand Rapids MI.
- Nodet, É. 2005. *La crise maccabéenne: Historiographie juive et traditions bibliques*, Paris.
- Parker, Victor 2006. ‘The Campaigns of Lysias in Judaea: A Test of the Historical Worth of 2 Maccabees’, *Grazer Beiträge* 25, 153–179.
- Piotrkowski, Meron 2014. *Priests in Exile: The History of the Temple of Onias and Its Community in the Hellenistic Period*, PhD Diss. Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
- Regev, Eyal 2013. *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity*, Göttingen.
- Sachs, Abraham J. & Wiseman, Donald J. 1954. ‘A Babylonian king list of the Hellenistic Period’, *Iraq* 16/17, 202–212.
- Schürer, Emil 1973/1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C.–A. D. 135)*. A New English Version Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes et al., Parts I–III.2, Edinburgh (German Original, 3th–4th ed. 1901/1909).
- Schwartz, Daniel R. 2008. 2 *Maccabees*, Berlin.
- 2017. ‘1 Maccabees 14 and the History of the Hasmonean State’, in Friedrich Avemarie et al. (eds.), *Die Makkabäerbücher*, Tübingen, 69–84.

- Schwartz, Seth 1991. 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1Maccabees and Hasmonean Expansion', *JJS* 42, 1991, 16–38.
- Scolnic, Benjamin E. 2005: *Alcimus. Enemy of the Maccabees*, Lanham.
- 2007: *Thy Brother's Blood: The Maccabees and the Morality of Kinship*, Lanham.
 - 2010: *Judaism Defined: Mattathias and the Destiny of His People*, Lanham.
 - 2014a: 'Is Dan 11:1–19 Based on a Ptolemaic Narrative?', *JSJ* 45, 157–184.
 - 2014b: 'Seleucid Coinage in 175–166 BCE and the Historicity of Daniel 11:21–24', *JAH* 2.1, 1–36.
 - 2015: 'How Kittim Became 'Rome': Dan 11,30 and the Importance of Cyprus in the Sixth Syrian War', *ZAW* 127.2, 304–319.
 - 2016: 'Heliodorus and the Assassination of Seleucus IV according to Dan 11:20 and 2 Macc 3', *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 7, 354–384.
 - ca. 2018. 'Reading Backwards: Antiochus IV and His Relationship with Rome', forthcoming in Altay Coşkun & David Engels (eds.), *Rome and the Seleukid East*, Brussels.
 - ca. 2019. 'The Vocabulary of Desolation: Intertextual Allusions in Dan 9:25–27 and the Meaning of קָרָה'.
- Seeman, Chris 2013. *Rome and Judea in Transition. Hasmonean Relations with the Roman Republic and the Evolution of the High Priesthood*, New York.
- Stern, Sascha 2012. *Calendars in Antiquity: Empires, States, and Societies*, Oxford 2012.
- Tcherikover, Victor 1959/99. *Hellenistic Civilizations and the Jews*, Philadelphia 1959; repr. with a Preface by John J. Collins, Peabody MA 1999.
- Tilly, Michael 2015: *1 Makkabäer*, Freiburg i. Br.
- Toye, David L. *BNJ* 260. Art. 'Porphyry (260)', *Brill's New Jacoby Online*, ed. Ian Worthington, Leiden. (15 December 2013)

ALTAY COŞKUN

Department of Classical Studies, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1,
acoskun@uwaterloo.ca

