

ruler who will come will destroy the city and the sanctuary" apply particularly well to the fact that the attack was begun under the leadership of Vespasian and completed under his son Titus, since both men later became Roman emperors and each could thus aptly be called "a coming ruler." Perhaps the words "the people of" involve a hint of the fact that, according to Josephus, Roman soldiers burned the temple in spite of Titus' efforts to save it<sup>4</sup>

The wording of the last two-thirds of the verse is peculiarly adapted to describe the terrible catastrophies that befell the Jewish nation in the first century A.D. Yet two other views have gained considerable attention, views that relate the verse to one or other of the two great crises that loom so large in Daniel's prophecies: 1) the attempt of Antiochus IV to destroy the Jewish religion in the second century B.C., and 2) the similar crisis resulting from the activity of Antichrist at the end of the age.

This verse presents a serious problem to the holders of the Maccabean view, who try to relate the entire book to the outlook of a writer at the time of Antiochus IV. According to their view all predictions in the book of Daniel belong to one of two types: 1) predictions made after the fact, i.e., giving as a pretended prediction something that the writer knew to have already occurred; 2) predictions based on the unknown writer's guesses and hopes for the future. Although the first sentence of the verse could easily be construed as an alleged prediction of the killing of Onias, the deposed high priest, its remaining sentences are not easily placed under either of these categories.

Supporters of the Maccabean view hold that these sentences were an alleged prediction of the events listed in 1 Maccabees 1:21-23, 30-33, though the language of the verse goes far beyond any physical damage actually produced by Antiochus. Montgomery says that there was little physical destruction at this time<sup>5</sup> and suggests that the word be understood as "corrupt" rather than "destroy." Yet Scripture uses the same verb, *sahat*, in connection with the destruction of the human race by the flood<sup>6</sup> and in connection with the destruction of Sodom;<sup>7</sup> it is far too strong a word for the