A Monster without a Name: Creating the Beast Known as Antiochus IV in Daniel 7

HEATHER MACUMBER

A MONSTER WITHOUT A NAME: CREATING THE BEAST KNOWN AS ANTIOCHUS IV IN DANIEL 7

HEATHER MACUMBER
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

I. INTRODUCTION

The beasts of Dan 7 have long fascinated scholars who have tried to identify their origins in both biblical and ancient Near Eastern sources.[1] The purpose of this paper is not to add to the discussion concerning the religio-historical origins of the beastly imagery. Instead, I am asking a different series of questions regarding the author's creative use of monsters in writing an apocalypse. Specifically, I am arguing that the portrayal of Antiochus IV as a monstrous beast is part of a deliberate resistance to counter the current power of the Seleucid empire and its persecution of the Jewish community. The choice of using such imagery allows the author(s) to reshape and reorient the worldview of their community from a persecuted people to one that hopes for deliverance not from human militant actions but divine intervention.[2] In his essay "Mon-

---

[1] Scholars have proposed a variety of biblical and ancient Near Eastern sources as potential backgrounds for the beasts of Dan 7: H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895); A. Caquot, "Sur les quatre bêtes de Daniel VII," *Semitica* 5 (1955), 5–13; J. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JTS* 9 (1958), 225–42; T. Wittstruck, "The Influence of Treaty Curse Imagery on the Beast Imagery of Daniel 7," *JBL* 97 (1978), 100–2; H.S. Kvanvig, "An Akkadian Vision as Background for Dan 7," *Studia Theologica* 35 (1981), 85–9; P.A. Porter, *Metaphor and Monsters: A Literary-Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8* (CBOTS, 20; Lund: Gleerup, 1983); J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite-Myth in the Old Testament* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 35; Cambridge: University Press, 1985); H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen Verlag, 1988); A. Gardner, "Decoding Daniel: The Case of Dan 7,5," *Biblica* 88 (2007), 222–33.

[2] Discerning the community behind the visions of Daniel is a notoriously difficult task. The prevailing view among scholars is that the community responsible for the visions are the *maśkîlîm*; see J.J. Collins, "Daniel and His Social World," *Int* 39 (1985), 131–43 (132); P.L. Redditt,

ster Culture (Seven Theses)" Jeffrey Cohen outlines a way of reading texts and cultures through their use and portrayal of monsters. He states, "What I will propose here by way of a first foray, as entrance into this book of monstrous content, is a sketch of a new *modus legendi*: a method of reading cultures from the monsters they engender."[3] Monsters reveal what is considered other or taboo in a culture as they are a reflection of the society that creates and maintains them. Even more important for this essay, monsters act as boundary creatures that threaten the status quo by showing how permeable the boundaries are between human and divine realms. This method of analysis is applied to the use of monstrous beasts in Dan 7 for the purpose of understanding the response of the community to the persecution of Antiochus IV.

There are several different hypotheses regarding the etymology and subsequent use of the term monster. The Latin word *monstrum* in its earlier appearances is generally interpreted as "sign."[4] *Monstrum* is related both *monstrare* "to show, demonstrate" and *monere* "to warn." There is debate regarding how much influence these two words have on the evolution of the term *monstrum*. Although *monstrare* is typically understood as "to show," Émile Benveniste argues that *monstrare* is more nuanced and instead has the sense of teaching a correct path to follow or giving a lesson.[5] Thus, it is through understanding *monstrare* that Benveniste sees

---

"Daniel 11 and the Socio-Historical Setting of the Book of Daniel," *CBQ* 60 (1998), 463–74; S. Beyerle, "The Book of Daniel and Its Social Setting," in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception. Vol. 1* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 205–28; P.R. Davies, "The Scribal School of Daniel," in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception. Vol. 1* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 247–65. Older scholarship advocated for an identification with the Hasidim; see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in the Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 175–80; L.F. Hartman, and A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB, 23; New York: Garden City, 1978), 43. This circle of wise teachers appears in opposition to the "ones who have forsaken the covenant" in Dan 11:30. But as John Collins points out the focus for the community is the arrogance of Antiochus IV rather than divisions among the Hellenized Jews (Collins, "Daniel and His Social World," 137). Although this group of wise teachers and scribes did not choose to participate in armed rebellion as others in the larger community, they used their visions of a hidden cosmic reality to reassure and give hope that Seleucid power would not continue indefinitely.

[3] J.J. Cohen, "Monster Cultures (Seven Theories)," in J.J. Cohen (ed.), *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 3–25 (3).

[4] It is one among many Latin terms that designate a "sign from the gods" including *miraculum*, *omen*, *ostentum*, *portentum* and *prodigium*. In Greek, there is not the same abundance of terms as the only closest equivalent word is *teras* (E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes. Volume 2: pouvoir, droit, religion* [Paris: Les éditions de minuit, 1969], 255).

[5] For example, *qui tibi nequiquam saepe monstraui bene* "moi qui t'ai si souvent donné en vain de bonnes leçons" (Plaute, *Bacch.* 133). For further examples, see Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes,* 257.

monstrum less as a hideous beast and more as an extraordinary warning or a lesson from the gods.[6] This is the sense used by Festus who states, "on appelle *monstra* ce qui sort du monde naturel, un serpent qui a des pieds, un oiseau à quatre ailes, un homme à deux têtes."[7] These demonstrations or warnings often were supernatural in nature leading to an understanding that they were something out of the ordinary. C.L. Moussy also suggests that the Greek term *teras* (meaning "wonder" or "sign") has influenced the evolution of the word *monstrum*.[8] Likewise Moussy observes that the only common element the terms *monstrum* and *teras* share when applied to a monstrous being is that it is something "out of the ordinary."[9] This sense of monsters as signs or warnings continued in the Middle Ages in the writings of Augustine and Isidore of Seville who saw them as divine in origin.[10] This closeness to the divine is noted by David Gilmore who argues that ". . . the origins of the word reveal yet another aspect of monsters, which is the paradoxical closeness of the monstrous and the divine. For monsters contain that numinous quality of awe mixed with horror and terror that unites the evil and the sublime in one single symbol . . ."[11] Although modern usage of the term "monster" focuses more on these creatures as frightening, it is instructive to remember that it is not simply the size or appearance that induces fear.[12] Monsters embody and are products of specific cultural attitudes towards what is considered other or different. A monster is more than a frightening creature as it demarcates and signifies the boundaries of what human societies consider both other and extraordinary.

The use of the term monster in this article requires some qualification as the author(s) of Dan 7 do not use either the aforementioned *monstrum* or *teras*. Instead the Aramaic word חיוא "beast" is employed throughout the chapter.[13] This term typically describes

---

[6] Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 257.

[7] As quoted in Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 257.

[8] C. Moussy, "Esquisse de l'histoire de monstrum," *Revue des Etudes Latines* 55 (1977), 345–69 (351).

[9] Moussy, "Esquisse de l'histoire de monstrum," 362.

[10] Isidore of Seville also defined monsters on the basis of the word *monstrare*, "Monsters, in fact, are so called as warnings, because they explain something of meaning, or because they make known at once what is to become visible" (*Etymologies* 11.3.3 as quoted in L. Verner, *The Epistemology of the Monstrous in the Middle Ages* [New York: Routledge, 2005], 3).

[11] D. Gilmore, *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2003), 10.

[12] For a discussion on the evolution of the study of the monstrous, see G. Canguilhem, "Monstrosity and the Monstrous," *Diogene* 40 (1962), 27–42.

[13] For a discussion of the various terms used for monstrous creatures in the Hebrew Bible and their connection to ancient myths see D.L. Smith-Christopher, "A Postcolonial Reading of Apocalyptic Literature," in J.J. Collins (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 180–98 (188–94).

normal animals (Dan 4:21) but the use of hybrid beasts in Dan 7 goes beyond what is normally found in nature and allows one to speak of monstrous imagery. The related Hebrew word חיה is also used in Ezek. 1:5, 13, 22 to describe the four creatures that are also human-animal hybrids. In her study of mixanthropes (animal-human hybrid deities) in Greek religion, Emma Aston notes the variety of terms used for these creatures. They are typically described with the designations *teras* (something that is unnatural) and *pelôr* (unnatural bulk or excess). However, at other times the words *thêr* and *thêrion* meaning "wild beasts" are also used.[14] The mixed nature of the beasts in Dan 7 indicates that these are not "normal" beasts but that they are used by the author to describe something extraordinary and threatening.

As a starting point, this article employs the lens of "monster theory" to analyze how a culture is read through their use of monsters especially in literature and film. Admittedly, "monster theory" and the related "horror philosophy" tend to focus on modern preoccupations with monsters from Frankenstein to vampires and werewolves.[15] Other related genres such as gothic, fantasy and dystopian novels and films are also considered as monsters cross a variety of different works.[16] In his book, *Philosophy of Horror*, Noël Carroll demarcates the beginning of the horror genre with the publication of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. And yet he notes that earlier cultures like the Greeks and Romans also had a certain fascination with monsters.[17] Carroll lists three major characteristics of mon-

---

[14] E. Aston, *Mixanthrôpoi: Animal-Human Hybrid Deities in Greek Religion* (Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, 2011), 33–4.

[15] A significant corpus of books on the subject of monsters has emerged in the last few decades; see the following: J. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. L.S. Roudiez (European Perspectives; New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); N. Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror or Paradoxes of the Heart* (New York & London: Routledge, 1990); Huet, *Monstrous Imagination*; J.J. Cohen (ed.), *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); T.K. Beal, *Religion and Its Monsters* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Gilmore, *Monsters*; N. Scott (ed.), *Monsters and the Monstrous: Myths and Metaphors of Enduring Evil* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007); S. Asma, *On Monsters: An Unnatural History of Our Worst Fears* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[16] E.S. Rabkin speaks of a "continuum of the fantastic" where works not generally classified as "fantasy" share some fantastic element; see E.S. Rabkin, *The Fantastic in Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 135–40.

[17] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 13. Carroll points to examples in Petronius' *Satyricon*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*. Similarly Kirk Schneider notes, "Even in ancient times, biblical writers understood our fascination with the macabre" (K.J. Schneider, *Horror and the Holy: Wisdom-Teachings of the Horror Tale* [Peru: Open Court, 1993], xi). The designation of "monster" is ambiguous in ancient Near Eastern material since it does not necessarily indicate a separate category of beings. Rather, "monsters" are typically considered part of the divine realm and

sters that are pivotal to the genre of horror. Although he applies these characteristics to modern examples, each of these are instructive for understanding the use of monsters in Dan 7. First, a monster must be a dangerous or threatening entity either to one's physical person or even more generally to a society.[18] Secondly, these monsters are presented as impure beings as they cross normative categories either by fusing disparate characteristics like the zombie who is both living and dead or the werewolf who is both human and animal.[19] A third feature common to monsters is that they originate on the periphery of society or the known world. They are considered other and alien to the society that they infiltrate.[20] A final consideration raised by Carroll is how the use of monsters in a narrative affects the emotions of the audience. This point is particularly appropriate to the study of Dan 7–12 since the visionary's emotions are frequently apparent in his reactions to his monstrous visions (Dan 7:15, 28; 8:27; 10:8–9; 15–17). Both "monster theory" and "horror philosophy" have proven useful in studies on Jeremiah and especially the Book of Revelation.[21] By using these theories and applying it to the creation of Antiochus IV as a monstrous beast, I aim to demonstrate that the use of beastly imagery is not simply a symbol or the reuse of earlier mythic tradition. Instead it expresses both the fear of the community and their hope that restoration would occur from a cosmic perspective.[22]

---

are the offspring of the deities. It is their potential for violence and harm against humanity that sets them apart from other divine creature (Aston, *Mixanthrôpoi*, 35–6). For monsters in the ancient world, see A.E. Farkas, P.O. Harper and E.B. Harrison (eds.), *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* (Mainz on Rhine: P. von Zabern, 1987); C. Atherton (ed.), *Monsters and Monstrosity in Greek and Roman Culture* (Bari: Levante, 2002); Asma, *On Monsters*, 19–61; Aston, *Mixanthrôpoi*, 33–4; D. Ogden, *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[18] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 28.

[19] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 32–3.

[20] Cohen defines monsters as the following, "the monster is best understood as an embodiment of difference, a breaker of category, and a resistant Other known only through process and movement, never through dissection-table analysis" (Cohen, *Monster Theory*, x).

[21] See G. Aichele and T. Pippin (eds.), *Monstrous and the Unspeakable: The Bible as Fantastic Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); T. Pippin, *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999); A. Kalmanofsky, *Terror All Around: Horror, Monsters, and Theology in the Book of Jeremiah* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 390; New York and London: T & T Clark, 2008). Amy Kalmanofsky argues that Jeremiah uses a rhetoric of horror "to engage, to horrify, and ultimately to reform Israel" (Kalmanofsky, *Terror All Around*, 11).

[22] Mark S. Smith notes that this hope for divine help is indebted to older royal theology (M.S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2001], 173).

II. THE THREAT OF THE MONSTER

In classic horror stories, monsters are not only dangerous and threatening to one's person but they can also pose a danger psychologically, morally or socially.[23] According to Carroll they can even "destroy one's identity, seek to destroy the moral order, or advance an alternative society."[24] They are both physically threatening and additionally can induce psychological fears. Of all the beasts in Dan 7, it is the final one representing the Seleucid Empire that causes the most terror:

> After this I saw in the visions by night a fourth beast, terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong. It had great iron teeth and was devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping what was left with its feet. It was different from all the beasts that preceded it, and it had ten horns (Dan 7:7).

The identification of the four beasts representative of consecutive empires has a long history. The fourth beast stands apart from the others as it is described as "terrifying, dreadful and exceedingly strong." The portrayal of the previous three beasts primarily focuses on their physical descriptions and deformities while less attention is placed on their threat against the community.[25] Not only is the fourth beast described as terrifying but its destructive actions are emphasized. In the first description of the beast, its "great iron teeth" devour and break while the beast stamps what remains with its feet (Dan 7:7). As these beasts are representative of empires, the author is creating a vivid image of cultural cannibalism. The association of monsters and cannibalism is not surprising as such language is commonly attributed to monsters both ancient and modern.[26] The label "cannibal" is often applied to humans as a way of "dehumanizing" or justifying their oppression.[27]

---

[23] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 43.

[24] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 43.

[25] An exception can be made for the second beast, a bear raised on its side, who is given the command, "Arise, devour much flesh" (Dan 7:5). The bear is considered to represent the Medes who are called by God to attack Babylon (see Jer. 51:11, 28); see J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 298.

[26] Cannibalistic monsters are found in diverse cultures from Greek myths (Laestrygonians) to the Algonguin's Wendigo (Canada/USA). Modern preoccupations with cannibalism is apparent in the popularity of the recurring character Hannibal Lecter in both cinema (Silence of the Lambs) and television (Hannibal).

[27] The label of "cannibal" has a long history of being used to demonize other cultures especially in the context of colonialism. Gananath Obeyesekere notes, "It is for the most part an imputation of the Other, the Savage, or the Alien that he is engaged in a tabooed practice of man-eating. This in turn is a colonial projection providing a justification of colonialism, proselytism, conquest, and sometimes for the very extermination of native peoples" (G. Obeyesekere, *Cannibal Talk: The Man-Eating Myth and Human Sacrifice in the South Seas* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005], 1). One finds this tactic employed in narratives like Num 13

Even a well-known monster such as Grendel from the Old English poem *Beowulf* is never fully described and there is debate among scholars whether he is truly a monster or if the label "cannibal" serves to strip away his humanity. This debate seems almost superfluous as Jennifer Neville has noted that his nature ceases to matter as his actions effectively put him outside of human conduct earning him the moniker "boundary-walker."[28] Similarly, by labelling their oppressors as cannibals, the author of Dan 7 effectively establishes them as other and ultimately dehumanizes them for the targeted audience.

The first mention of the beast focuses on the threat to the human community while the following references reveal that the danger also extends to the cosmic realm. The threat of the fourth beast is reinforced with a second mention of the beast, especially the little horn, that now makes war against the holy ones (Dan 7:21).[29] This horn is said to speak arrogantly against the holy ones until the arrival of the Ancient of Days (7:21–22). I follow the interpretation that the term "holy ones" (Dan 7:21) and "holy ones of the Most High" (Dan 7:22) refers to angelic beings rather than the Jewish community.[30] The angelic mediator whom Daniel approaches tells him the following concerning the little horn, "He shall speak words against the Most High, shall wear out the holy ones of the Most High, and shall attempt to change the sacred seasons and the law; and they shall be given into his power for a time, two times, and half a time" (Dan 7:25). The beast threatens not only the normative social order of the earthly sphere but poses a risk on the cosmic level that requires direct divine intervention of God (Dan 7:26–27).[31] The author of Dan 7 has not only dehuman-

---

when the spies upon entering Canaan encounter "giants" and describe the land (and by implication the inhabitants) as cannibals; see L. Feldt, *The Fantastic in Religious Narrative from Exodus to Elisha* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014); I. Pardes*, Biography of Ancient Israel: National Narratives in the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 100–26.

[28] J. Neville, "Monsters and Criminals: Defining Humanity in Old English Poetry," in K.K. Olsen and L.A.J.R. Houven (eds.), *Monsters and the Monstrous in Medieval Northwest Europe* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 103–22 (117). According to Neville, "He is a monster, not simply because he has glowing eyes, but because he breaks those boundaries, intrudes into human society, performs acts forbidden by society, and thus threatens society's very existence" (p. 117).

[29] In the ancient Near East, horns are a symbol of earthly powers, especially kingdoms; see M.L. Süring, "The Horn-Motifs of the Bible and the Ancient Near East," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 22 (1984), 327–40. A similar use of horn imagery is also found in Jewish sources (Zech 2:1–4; 1 En. 90:9; 1QSb 5:26); see Collins, *Daniel*, 299.

[30] See J.J. Collins, "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 93 (1974), 50–66. For a different interpretation that sees the holy ones as representative of Israel see: V.S. Poythress, "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII," *VT* 26 (1976), 208–13.

[31] The cosmic threat of the horn is picked up again in the next chapter, "It grew as high as the host of heaven. It threw down to earth some of the

ized and therefore removed the beast from the realm of the human but more importantly has shown that the divine community is required to act against this threat.

The identification of the little horn that emerges from the fourth beast as Antiochus IV is standard among most biblical scholars. The representation of Antiochus IV using monstrous imagery is particularly appropriate in light of other Jewish works like 1 and 2 Maccabees that outline his destructive actions against the Jewish people. These include mass murder, abduction, theft of the temple and outlawing religious practices. Anathea Portier-Young argues that Antiochus IV sought not only the destruction of Jewish society but the recreation of it with him as its new leader.[32] This is accomplished through severe persecution of Jewish customs and the forced installation of new traditions. As noted earlier, monsters pose a threat not only to one's physical person but in their ability to destroy the social order or to impose a new reality upon their victims. Antiochus IV used tactics of state terror both to physically harm the populace and to destroy their religious worldview. This is seen particularly in his changes to the Jewish calendar and prohibition of religious practices.[33] The author's choice of using cannibalistic language to describe the fourth beast reflects Seleucid imperial practices of annihilating Jewish traditions. Though the fourth beast's destructive powers are described in physical terms, it is the threat of cultural annihilation that is of paramount importance for Daniel's audience. The author of Dan 7 ably strips Antiochus IV and his imperial policies of its humanity first by using animal imagery but more importantly by employing cannibalistic language.

Daniel's community is noteworthy as being non-militant in their response to Seleucid aggression.[34] Jews responded in a variety

---

host and some of the stars, and trampled on them. Even against the prince of the host it acted arrogantly; it took the regular burnt offering away from him and overthrew the place of his sanctuary" (Dan 8:10–11).

[32] A.E. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 138.

[33] Portier-Young states, "Inherent in the effort to change the calendar, halt regular, existing religious practices, and replace them with new ones was an attempt to forcibly deny the sovereignty of the God the Jews worshiped and to coopt their time-consciousness into an alternately constructed reality" (Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 181).

[34] This does not appear to be a community ready to take up arms but one in which the study of scripture and access to angelic revelation was paramount for their survival. Resistance through armed conflict is not encouraged, rather the expectation is that divine intervention will bring about the destruction of this fourth beast. It is through angelic revelation that the seer learns that judgement shall come from the divine council who will strip the horn of its power and destroy it (Dan 7:26). This intersection between the divine and earthly worlds is only continued in chapters 10–2 with the introduction of Gabriel and Michael as angelic warrior patrons. This differs significantly from the *Apocalypse of Weeks* where the righteous are armed by God to fight against the wicked (1 En. 91:12). For

of ways to the persecution of Antiochus IV including rebellion and escape to the desert and mountains (1 Macc 2:27; 2 Macc 5:27). Portier-Young argues that this escape to the wilderness is itself a form of rebellion as a symbolic rejection of the power of empire residing within the city.[35] The community behind the visions of Dan 7–12 differ significantly from other groups in that they chose not to participate in armed resistance. However, like other contemporary apocalypses, they too advocate for resistance against the policies of Antiochus IV. Portier-Young has noted that the *Animal Apocalypse* also uses beastly imagery to depict the actions of the Hellenistic kings.[36] These are not the hybrid monsters of Dan 7 but known predators such as eagles, vultures, kites and ravens pictured as tearing apart the lambs representative of Israel (1 En. 90:2–3).[37] The method of resistance featured in the *Animal Apocalypse* is armed rebellion led by the "great horn" Judas Maccabeus (1 En. 90:9–10, 12–16). Although Dan 7 uses similar beastly imagery for its Hellenistic oppressors, the community eschews military action in favour of focusing on the divine response to Antiochus' monstrous actions. The cosmic visions of the rise and destruction of the fourth beast allows the audience to transfer responsibility from the earthly to the divine realm. The monstrous portrayal of Antiochus in effect dehumanizes him and in the tradition of the chaos battle places the expectation upon the divine warrior to intercede. This is an important move by the author of Daniel to show that ultimately God was responsible for dealing with the threat of this fourth beast rather than the human community.[38]

The beasts of Daniel's vision are not simply folktales meant to entertain but are descriptive of a specific cultural moment. Although other contemporary Jewish communities also represented Antiochus and the Seleucids as threatening beasts, it is the repetitive focus on fear and terror in Dan 7 that gives insight into Daniel's community. In chapter 7, we are given two descriptions of Daniel's terror upon receiving his visions. First, after receiving his initial vision he states, "As for me, Daniel, my spirit was troubled within me, and the visions of my head terrified me" (Dan 7:15).

---

a thorough examination of resistance tactics (especially in Dan 9) by Daniel's community, see Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 243–54.

[35] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 169.

[36] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 170.

[37] See Portier-Young for a discussion of Antiochus IV described as a τεθηριωμένος τῇ ψυχῇ, "wild beast," in 2 Macc 5:11 (Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 171, n. 110).

[38] The visions of Dan 7–12 reveal the cosmic powers that are normally hidden to the community. This includes the following: a vision of the divine throne room and judgement (Dan 7:9–14); the punishment of the beast by the divine court (Dan 7:11); further visions of the horn (Dan 8:1–12); angelic revelation and interpretation (Dan 7:16–27; 8:13–14, 15–26; 9:21–27; 10:4–12:4, 5–13). The visions highlight the work of both the divine court and its divine emissaries to conquer and eradicate the power of Antiochus.

And later after receiving an angelic interpretation, he states, ". . . As for me, Daniel, my thoughts greatly terrified me, and my face turned pale; but I kept the matter in my mind" (Dan 7:28).[39] The terror that Daniel feels is palpable in this text as the visionary receives no relief and the chapter ends with this ominous note of fear. The visions of Daniel are not simply cerebral but induce a feeling of terror that is felt in the body. In her work on apocalypses, Tina Pippin has also noted this phenomenon both in Daniel and the Apocalypse of John in which the audience is meant to take its cue from the main protagonists who react in terror to their visions.[40] Of all the characteristics Carroll identifies as part of the horror genre, it is the experience of fear that accompanies the reader or the viewer that truly distinguishes it.[41] Additionally, the fear expressed by the protagonist is designed to elicit a similar emotional response from the audience. In Stoker's *Dracula*, the experience of horror and terror is induced by the mere presence of the monster, "As the Count leaned over me and his hands touched me, I could not repress a shudder. It may have been that his breath was rank but a horrible feeling of nausea came over me, which, do what I would, I could not conceal." Like Jonathan Harker in *Dracula*, the visionary Daniel is physically affected by the visions to the point of sickness.

In works like *Dracula* or Edgar Allan Poe's *Tell Tale Heart*, the audience reacts in empathy with the plight of the main character especially as they experience terror. Film theorists define the empathy of the viewer as the ability to identify imaginatively with a character and experience their thoughts and emotions.[42] With respect to horror films, Joanne Cantor and Mary Beth Oliver argue that "people experience fear as a direct response to the fear expressed by others."[43] This type of audience response is deliberately induced by film makers who devote significant amount of

---

[39] The fear motif emerges again in chapter 10 when an even more elaborate recitation of Daniel's fear is recorded; see J. Kaltner, "Is Daniel also among the Prophets? The Rhetoric of Daniel 10–12," in G. Carey and L.G. Bloomquist (eds.), *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse* (St. Louis: Chalice, 1999), 51.

[40] Pippin points to Dan 7:15, 28 and Rev 1:17 that detail the fear of the visionary and argues that "Both Daniel and John instruct the reader how to respond . . ." (Pippin, *Apocalyptic Bodies*, 103). Carroll speaks of it similarly, "The emotional response of the characters, then, provide a set of instructions or, rather, examples about the way in which the audience is to respond to the monsters in the fiction--that is, about the way we are meant to react to its monstrous properties" (Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 17).

[41] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 17.

[42] G. Currie "Cognitivism," in T. Miller and R. Stam (eds.), *A Companion to Film Theory* (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 105–22 (115).

[43] J. Cantor and M.B. Oliver, "Developmental Differences in Response to Horror," in J.B. Weaver and R. Tamborini (eds.), *Horror Films: Current Research on Audience Preferences and Reactions* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Press, 1996), 63–80 (67).

screen time to the fearful and agonized moments before the death of a protagonist (108 seconds for male characters and 218 seconds for female characters).[44] It is often the fear of the victims that is highlighted rather than their deaths.[45] Scholars have debated the reality of fear invoked by reading or watching horror media.[46] Carroll's theory of arthorror is helpful to demonstrate that an audience does not have to believe in the reality of something to generate an authentic experience of fear.[47] Using the example of *Dracula*, Carroll states, "We are not pretending to be horrified; we are genuinely horrified, but by the thought of Dracula rather than by our conviction that we are his next victim."[48] The writer of Daniel also seeks to horrify the audience by drawing attention to Daniel's physical and emotional state through his visionary experience. The repeated emphasis on Daniel's fear and nausea is not coincidental but is designed to draw the attention and empathy of the audience.[49]

---

[44] Cantor and Oliver also point to another common element in horror films (especially slashers) where the focus is on the terror and panic of a lone survivor (usually female) who attempts to flee her tormentor. She highlights the example of Jamie Lee Curtis in *Halloween* who hides in a closet only a few feet away from her pursuer. It is the reaction of fear and panic that is the focus of the narrative and not necessarily the demise of the character (Cantor and Oliver, "Development Differences," 67).

[45] In the case of Daniel, the repeated mention of fear is a similar technique designed to attract both the attention and sympathy of the audience.

[46] K. Walton, "Fearing Fictions," *The Journal of Philosophy* 75 (1978), 5–27; K. Walton, "How Remote are Fictional Worlds from the Real World?" *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 37 (1978), 11–23.

[47] The ability to induce fear in an audience is dependent on knowing what has the potential to frighten a collective body of people. Horror movies from the 1950's shifted away from depicting supernatural monsters to portraying giant bugs, aliens from outer space and mutants. Paul Meehan attributes these motifs to societal anxieties regarding space exploration, the Cold War and nuclear weapons (P. Meehan, *Horror Noir: Where Cinema's Dark Sisters Meet* [Jefferson: McFarland & C, 2011], 145). In addition, I would add that societies' fears are mitigated by a fear of the unknown or unfamiliar. In the 1950's, space travel beyond Earth's orbit was still on the horizon and thus the edges of space were much closer than the present day. Green Martians may no longer terrify modern audiences but other trends such as zombie apocalypses (*I am Legend*) and gory body horror (*Saw, Hostel*) dominate the box office.

[48] Carroll, *Philosophy of Horror*, 86.

[49] The focus of this article is on the original audience of Daniel or even the later redactors of his visions who would be living in the midst of Antiochus IV's oppression or in its immediate aftermath. However, modern audiences are not immune from the sense of horror or dread that results from reading these visions. The cultural divide is not so great that one does not sympathize with the visionary who cannot get the terrifying visions out of his head (Dan 7:28).

III. AN IMPURE BEING

A second identifier of horror is the presence of disgust as an emotional reaction to monsters in the narrative.[50] Today's preoccupation with zombies illustrates this point well. These monsters appear in a mutated human form as their bodies evidence signs of destruction and decay. They are walking corpses with open wounds, eyes protruding from sunken sockets and vacant expressions. Though one would expect this to repel modern viewers, in fact for many, it continues to attract their fascination. This paradoxical attraction to what is labelled monstrous makes frequent appearances in discussions of the horror genre.[51] Carroll argues that "the horror story is driven explicitly by curiosity."[52] It is the mystery behind the monster that fuels the protagonists' desire to know more about its appearance, powers and weaknesses while at the same time dreading the answers.[53] This type of fascination/revulsion is not only confined to literary and cinematic monsters but played a large part in the success of freak shows of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Individuals suffering from congenital or hereditary conditions were labelled monsters and freaks whose differences were highlighted to prove that they were other or even hybrid creatures.[54] Their differences were both alluring and threatening as Rosemary Garland Thomson notes, "By challenging the boundaries of the human and the coherence of what seemed to be the natural world, monstrous bodies appeared as sublime, merging the terrible with the wonderful, equalizing repulsion with attraction."[55] This fascination with extraordinary bodies is also found in many early horror movies such as *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1923) and *The Phantom of the Opera* (1920). In both movies, extensive use of makeup and costumes were used to achieve their iconic physical deformities.[56] Despite a feeling of revulsion at the physical appearance of these characters, audiences continue to find them fascinating as evidenced by numerous cinematic retellings of both these movies.

---

[50] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 30–2.

[51] Carroll, *Philosophy of Horror*, esp. 158–95; S.L. Feagin, "Monsters, Disgust, and Fascination," *Philosophical Studies* 65 (1992), 75–90 (esp. 79–84); A. Tudor, "Why Horror? The Peculiar Pleasures of a Popular Genre," *Cultural Studies* 11 (1997), 443–63.

[52] N. Carroll, "Why Horror?" in M. Jancovich (ed.), *Horror, The Film Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 33–45 (35).

[53] Carroll, "Why horror?," 35.

[54] These included bearded women, albino Africans, hermaphrodites, conjoined twins, Little People and those with physical disabilities (R. Thomson, "Introduction: From Wonder to Error—A Genealogy of Freak Discourse in Modernity," in R. Thomson [ed.], *Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body* [New York: New York University Press, 1996], 5).

[55] Thomson, *Freakery*, 3.

[56] D.J. Skal, *The Monster Show: A Cultural History of Horror* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1993), 66–74.

In the narratives where such monsters appear the feeling of disgust follows the initial curiosity and terror. Returning to the earlier example from *Dracula*, Jonathan Harker experiences not only terror but revulsion from the touch of the monster. He states, "a horrible feeling of nausea came over me, which, do what I would, I could not conceal." This feeling of sickness serves a specific purpose in the narrative to draw a line of separation from the human protagonist and the monstrous threat. In her work on abjection (disgust as bodily form of rejection), Julia Kristeva, speaks of the effect of impurity on the body.[57] When one is confronted by something impure (perhaps in the form of rotten food) the body immediately tries to reject it through gagging or even vomiting. She argues that this repulsion of the impure is a physical form of rejection and separation.[58] According to Kristeva, "It is thus not a lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite."[59] The use of disgust in both horror literature and cinema serves to demonstrate what is considered acceptable and taboo in a society.

The beasts of Daniel are threatening but they are also impure creatures that elicit disgust or revulsion from their readers. The beasts of Daniel are considered fusion beings as they incorporate a mixture of animal characteristics. The mixing of animal-animal features (the second and third beasts) and animal-human characteristics (the first and last beasts) would immediately signal to the community that these beasts are not only threatening but can potentially disturb the social order. Biblical tradition strongly upholds the separation and purity of kinds of animals (Gen 1:24–25; Lev 11) and even the mixing of different forms of materials is strictly forbidden in the Torah (Lev 19:19). In her book, *Purity and Danger*, Mary Douglas argues that the command to be holy is at the root of this phenomenon of order and differentiation. She states, "Holiness requires that individuals shall conform to the class to which they belong. And holiness requires that different classes of things shall not be confused."[60] If as Douglas argues, holiness requires the maintenance of order and boundaries then the disturbance of such boundaries results both in pollution and chaos.[61] The hybrid nature of the beasts would immediately signal their danger to the audience of Daniel. Monsters are considered impure beings because they defy the normal categories of the known world. Concerning this confusion of conventional boundaries, Cohen states, "This refusal to participate in the classificatory 'order of things' is true of monsters generally: they are disturbing hybrids whose externally incoherent bodies resist attempts to include them in any

---

[57] Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 3.

[58] Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 3.

[59] Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 4.

[60] M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London/New York: Routledge, 1966), 53.

[61] Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 53.

systematic structuration. And so the monster is dangerous, a form suspended between two forms that threatens to smash distinctions."[62] Such hybrid beasts are found throughout the ancient world as in the case of the griffin, a combination of a lion and an eagle.[63]

Moreover, it is the first and final beasts that would elicit the most disgust as they combine both human and animal features. The description of the first beast begins with an expected hybrid combination, that of a lion and an eagle. However, the vision suddenly shifts and this hybrid creature is changed from a four footed beast into a two footed being. The biblical text is explicit in describing his stature as "it was made to stand on two feet like a human" (Dan 7:4). But perhaps the most disturbing is that this human-like creature is also given a human mind. This animal-human hybridity continues with the fourth beast from which the little horn emerges that has "eyes like human eyes" and "a mouth speaking great things" (Dan 7:8). These two beasts effectively blur the boundaries between the human and animal worlds especially as they demonstrate signs of autonomy as they have the capacity to speak and think like humans. As mentioned previously, scholars have spent considerable time and space devoted to understanding the origins of these beasts. It is often suggested that Daniel finds inspiration from Hos 13:7–8 which lists three animals (lion, bear, leopard).[64] There is even the mention of a fourth animal, a wild beast that could lie behind the final beast in Dan 7:7. While I agree that this is likely the case, it should be noted that the author has expanded upon this template by taking known animals and mutating them into hybrid monsters. The effect of this transformation is to alert the audience that these are not only dangerous and unknown creatures but that their impure nature is even more of a threat. The author of Daniel strips away any pretenses that might remain regarding Antiochus' humanity and reveals the monster lurking underneath the surface.

This type of revolting hybridity between animals and humans is also found in modern horror literature and film.[65] In *The Island of Dr. Moreau* a survivor of a shipwreck named Prendick finds himself

---

[62] Cohen, "Monster Culture," 6.

[63] Hybrid creatures are not unknown to the Hebrew Bible as the cherubim who guard the ark are thought to be a winged sphinx (W.F. Albright, "What Were the Cherubim?," *BA* 1 [1938], 1–3 [2]; T.N.D. Mettinger, "Cherubim כרובים," in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst [eds.], *Dictionary of Deities and Demons* [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 189–92 [190]).

[64] Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 156–57; Collins, *Daniel*, 295.

[65] Books featuring hybrid creatures: *Island of Dr. Moreau* (Wells), *Metamorphosis* (Kafka). Movies that feature hybrid animal-human creatures include: *The Fly* (1958), *Island of Lost Souls* (1932), *Creature from the Black Lagoon* (1954), a dog with human face in *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1978), *Hulk* (2003, 2008), *Splice* (2009).

on an island inhabited by the Beast People. These hybrid animal-human creations not only simultaneously intrigue and terrify Prendick but also fill him with disgust. Throughout the novel he struggles to understand if they are more animal or human both in their behaviour and appearance. Although horror stories are often dismissed as pure entertainment, they have a long history as important works of social commentary or indicators of modern culture. H.G. Well's treatment of the Beast People and more importantly the questionable actions of their creator Dr. Moreau are often seen as a critique of human progression.[66] Regarding the painful creation of these beasts, E.E. Snyder notes, "It is a site of slippage, where the human can become 'worse than beasts' in causing deliberate pain, and where the beast can be humanized in its suffering and experience of pain."[67] Monsters play a similar role in the visions of Dan 7 as they are used to critique the actions of the Seleucid Empire and its treatment of the Jewish people. The hybrid nature of the beasts is designed to dehumanize Antiochus IV and to portray him as other. This is important for a community struggling to maintain order in light of the religious and social boundaries violated by Antiochus and his policies.

Though the beasts from the sea are the focus of this article, it is relevant to note that other monstrous creatures are also present in Dan 7. As noted throughout this article, the author of Dan 7 intentionally demonstrates that the downfall of Antiochus IV is only possible through divine justice (Dan 7:11) rather than human military action. The chief means of communication of this divine message is not only through visions but also through angelic interpretation (Dan 7:16–18, 23–28). The English term "angel" is commonly used in modern society without much reflection on what it implies about these heavenly beings. It assumes that all divine beings can be grouped under the larger umbrella of "angel" when in fact it most closely aligns with one class of divine beings, the *mal'ākîm*. However, there are numerous divisions of divine creatures including among others: the *mal'ākîm*, the seraphim, the cherubim and the ophanim. To use the term monster with regards to these divine beings might strike one initially as inappropriate. How-

---

[66] E.E. Snyder, "Moreau and the Monstrous: Evolution, Religion, and the Beast on the Island," *Preternature* 2 (2013), 213–39. More specifically, the novel is also seen as a critique of the attempt to reconcile evolutionary theory and natural theology. Rosalynn Haynes states, "Moreau, then, represents a nightmarish hybrid, the logical and inevitable outcome, as Wells saw it, of the desire to graft on to a deistic belief in an omnipotent Creator, the postulates of Darwinian theory including the assertion of a continuum of creation which acknowledged no gap, no essential difference in kind, between man and his forbears. Wells thus deliberately set out to destroy the hope cherished by liberal theologians, that some valid, if tacit, compromise was possible between religion and science" (R.D. Haynes, *H.G. Wells: Discoverer of the Future*, [New York: New York University Press, 1980], 34).

[67] Snyder, "Moreau and the Monstrous," 220.

ever, if one defines monsters not as evil but as "extraordinary" or "divine signs" or even as "warnings" then angels can also be considered monstrous to an extent. It is common for them to be greeted by fear and terror by humans (Gen 21:17; Jdg 6:22–23; 13:22) and their destructive actions are also recorded throughout the Hebrew Bible (2 Sam 24:16–17; 2 Kgs 19:35; 1 Chr 21:12). Although they are not described as "impure" in nature, they are represented in hybrid forms similar to other ancient monsters. The cherubim are hybrid creatures (winged sphinx) whose chief duty is to guard the tabernacle (1 Kgs 6:27; Ezek 10:2–20). The seraphim are divine winged serpent creatures with some human characteristics such as the ability to speak (Num 21:6; Deut 8:15; Isa 30:6; Isa 6:2). Another class of angelic beings, the ophanim found primarily in later texts are based on the wheels of the chariot in Ezek 1 and 10 (1 En. 61:10; 71:7; *2* En. 20:1; 4Q403 1 ii 15–16). Finally, these angelic beings like other monsters are gatekeepers to the boundaries between the human and divine worlds. They are able to pass from the heavenly world to the human realm relaying messages and acting as intermediaries (Gen 28:12). Though these angelic beings may not fit preconceived notions of "monster" this might reflect more the nature of the audience. Monsters like Dracula are seen as threats to humanity whereas angels are viewed in a positive light as protectors and helpers to humanity. And yet, to the Assyrians the Angel of the Lord who caused the death of one hundred eighty-five thousand soldiers, would no doubt have been viewed as a monster (2 Kgs 19:35). The same can be said for the angelic beings in Daniel's visions who are charged to protect God's people by terrifying and destroying their enemies (Dan 7:10-12; 10:13, 20). The line dividing the monstrous from the divine is a fine one indeed.[68]

IV. PERIPHERAL ORIGIN

A final key distinction about monsters is that they are not only dangerous but are considered alien to the normative world. According to Carroll, "That is, monsters are native to places outside of and/or unknown to the human world."[69] It is at the edges of the known world that one encounters monsters. They live deep in the dark forest, in the turbulent seas, in abandoned buildings and in isolated locations such as islands and deserts. This tendency to view the edges of the world as dangerous is a timeless impulse from the medieval cartographers[70] to modern fantasy novelists.[71]

---

[68] David Gilmore aptly calls this "the paradoxical closeness of the monstrous and the divine" (Gilmore, *Monsters*, 10).

[69] Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror*, 35.

[70] The term "Here be dragons" and its accompanying drawing of dragons and hydras are found in many corners of medieval maps.

[71] George R.R. Martin's fantasy book series (and subsequent TV series) has made the term "Beyond the Wall" part of everyday speech signifying the most remote and far reaching locales. One of his characters states, "Beyond the Wall the monsters live, the giants and the ghouls, the

Ancient writers also saw the edges of the world as dangerous and rife with creatures that threaten humanity.[72] A similar theme is present in the biblical material which features its own share of monsters relegated to peripheral locations. In Dan 7, it is the chaotic sea where the dragon is found but elsewhere it is the wilderness or desert that harbours beasts and monsters.[73] The case is no different when it comes to modern representations in both horror fiction and film. Dracula lives secluded in the Carpathian Mountains, the Beast folk of Dr. Moreau hide deep in the forest on a distant island and in movies like *Silent Hill* and *Grave Encounters* it is marginal sites like psychiatric hospitals where one encounters monsters. These peripheral spaces are important as boundary markers between what is known and familiar and that which is unknown and strange to humanity.[74]

---

stalking shadows and the dead that walk . . . but they cannot pass so long as the Wall stands strong and the men of the Night's Watch are true" (G.R.R. Martin, *A Dance with Dragons* [New York: Bantam Books, 2011], 70).

[72] In the *Gilgamesh Epic*, Gilgamesh travels from his home in Uruk to the distant land of Utnapištim. On this journey he must cross Mount Mašu inhabited by the scorpion men (W. Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* [Mesopotamian Civilizations 8; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998], 96). The 9th century BCE *Babylonian Map of the World* describes the various monsters that inhabit the ocean encircling the known world. These include among other beasts: "ruined gods" (line 4), *bašmu* "viper" and *mušhuššu rabû* "great sea-serpent" (lines 5–9); see W. Horowitz, "The Babylonian Map of the World," *Iraq* 50 (1988), 147–65. Monsters in ancient Greek myths typically were driven out or withdrew to more removed locations such as caves, mountains, seas and rivers (Aston, *Mixanthrôpoi*, esp. 153–92). This theme is not relegated to the ancient Near Eastern or Greek traditions as one also finds it among the Cherokee. They describe a snake-like creature with horns called the *uktena* that lives in the mountains and in the deepest rivers on the edge of the Cherokee world (Gilmore, *Monsters*, 2).

[73] The primordial or chaotic sea on the outskirts of the land is the habitation of various chaos monsters known as Leviathan, Rahab or the serpent (Ps 74:13–14; 89:9–10; Isa 27:1; 51:9–10). In other peripheral locations like the wilderness one finds references to wild and threatening beasts (Deut 8:15; Isa 13:21; 34:14; Jer 50:39; Ps 74:14). Demons and harmful spirits are also located in the wilderness removed from human society (Lev 16:8–28; Isa 13:21; 34:14).

[74] These peripheral locations are not fixed but are subject to change over time. In the ancient world, monsters were found typically in deserts and the sea but in the early 20th century they moved even further into outer space. Margaret Atwood addresses the progressive diminishment of unknown spaces or wilderness, "Maybe this emigration was also caused by a real estate problem. We filled the unknown spaces with us—with ourselves, and our names and our roads and maps. We tidied up, we gentrified, we put in streetlights; so the rowdy and uncontrollable bohemians of our imagination—always dwellers in the penumbras—had to move on" (M. Atwood, *In Other Worlds: SF and the Human Imagination* [Toronto: Signal, 2011], 70).

This sense of unfamiliar and liminal space is at work in Daniel's vision of the strange beasts rising from a chaotic sea. It is not always clear if these visions are in fact located on an earthly sphere or in a liminal cosmic boundary. A curious mixture of earthly and cosmic elements are combined which gives the sense of an otherworldly nature.[75] In Dan 7 the sea is stirred by the great winds from which emerge strange beasts:

> (2) In my vision at night,[76] I saw the four winds of heaven stirring up[77] the great sea. (3) Four mighty beasts different from each other emerged from the sea. (4) The first was like a lion but had eagles' wings. As I looked on, its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted off the ground and set on its feet like a human being and given the heart of a human. (5) Then I saw a second, different beast, which was like a bear but raised on one side, and with three ribs in its mouth among its teeth; it was told, 'Arise, eat much meat!' (6) After that, as I looked on, there was another one like a leopard, and it had on its back four wings like those of a bird; the beast had four heads, and dominion was given to it. (7) After that, as I looked on in the night vision, there was a fourth beast - fearsome, dreadful, and very powerful with great iron teeth - that ate and crushed, and trampled what remained with its feet. It was different from all the other beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns (Dan 7:2–7).

The only description we have of this sea is that it is the ימא רבא "great sea." Although this term might be interpreted as the Mediterranean Sea, this is unlikely since three of the four kingdom associated with the beasts are not located near it.[78] In the ancient world, the earth was commonly portrayed as a disc surrounded and sup-

---

[75] Susan Niditch states, "The distance between the mundane world of the seer and the otherworldly setting into which he is drawn is underlined, as the symbolic vision form serves as a medium which joins divine and human realms" (S. Niditch, *The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition* [HSM 30; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983], 216).

[76] This reading is attested in 4QDan[c] and in G "in my vision during the night" but is not found in Theodotion.

[77] Greek and Latin read as "attacking."

[78] Collins, *Daniel*, 295. For a detailed survey of the evidence, see A. Gardner, "The Great Sea of Dan. Vii 2," *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1999), 412–15. Additionally, Andrew Angel has pointed to the existence of the same term ימא רבא in the Qumran fragment 4Q541 7.3 that refers to the cosmic sea rather than the Mediterranean. He points out that the description in 4Q541 of this sea being silenced is a reference to the divine warrior that conquers the chaos waters that is found throughout the Hebrew Bible (Ps 65:8; 89:10). Moreover, the reference in this fragment to the books of wisdom being opened and the people's inability to understand them suggest an apocalyptic setting as is found in Dan 7. Thus, the use of ימא רבא in 4Q541 7.3 provides an example comparable to Dan 7 where the cosmic sea is in mind rather than the Mediterranean Sea (A. Angel, "The Sea in 4Q541 7.3 and Daniel 7.2," *Vetus Testamentum* 60 [2010], 474–8 [476–8]).

ported by a cosmic sea that constitutes the boundary of the known world.[79] It is a place where humans rarely frequent and where cosmic activity occurs. In both Mesopotamian and Greek traditions, sea monsters were said to inhabitant these waters and are pictured in chaotic terms that must be conquered for the proper ordering of the universe.[80] This image of a chaotic sea is found in numerous places in the Hebrew Bible and is likely Ugaritic in origin.[81] The author of Dan 7 immediately establishes the natural abode of the beasts as belonging to the marginal and chaotic spaces outside Jerusalem.

The narrative of Dan 7 is made even more terrifying when the reader realizes that the beasts are not relegated to the cosmic sea but have taken control over not only the city but the temple. The author of Dan 7 does not explicitly identify Antiochus IV as the fourth beast but has left enough clues to identify him as such. He is portrayed throughout the visions as a monstrous creature that threatens the survival of Jewish traditions. In the context of the Sixth Syrian War, Antiochus IV strived to assert his authority over the city using a variety of terror tactics including theft of the temple (1 Macc 1:21–24; 2 Macc 5:15–16, 21), wide-scale massacre of civilians (2 Macc 5:12–14) and occupation (1 Macc 1:29–40) among others.[82] In fact, the site of Seleucid occupation, the Akra, was known as an "abode of aliens" (1 Macc 3:45) and a place of "sinful people, men who were renegades" according to 1 Macc 1:34.[83] The monstrous imagery employed in Dan 7 is appropriate in capturing the sense of the four beasts as outsiders to the nation. However,

---

[79] J.S. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 12–6; P.H. Seely, "The Geographical Meaning of 'Earth' and 'Seas' in Gen 1," *WTJ* 59 (1997), 231–55. For references to the sea as encircling or supporting the earth see Gen 1:9–10; Ps 72:8; Prov 8:27b; Job 26:10.

[80] Romm, *The Edges of the Earth*, 24.

[81] Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 152; Collins, *Daniel*, 286–7. Gardner also points to other passages (Isa 51:9; Ps 74:13–14; 104:25–26) in the Hebrew Bible that blend the cosmic deep (תהום) with the sea (ים). She draws attention to Isa 51:9–10 which states, "Are you not the one who cut Rahab, who wounded the dragon? Are you not the one who dried up the sea (ים), waters of the great deep (תהום רבה), the one who made the depths of the sea, a way for the ransomed to cross over?" See Gardner, "The Great Sea," 413.

[82] A variety of reasons for Antiochus IV's repressive and brutal policies against the Jews have been proposed. For a helpful overview, see Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution," esp. 250–64. Gruen offers his own theory regarding Antiochus' change of attitude, "Eradication of the creed and forcible conversion of the faithful would send a message throughout the ancestral kingdom of the Seleucids—the message that Antiochus had accomplished what no ruler before had hoped to achieve: the abandonment of the Jewish belief at Seleucid command" (Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution," 263); see also Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire*, esp. 115–216.

[83] Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution," 248.

the most threatening aspect of the fourth beast and the little horn is that this outside threat has now become a reality at the very heart of their city. As Gruen states, "Installation of the physical presence of Seleucid force would be followed by direct interference in the spiritual realm."[84] The monster no longer threatened the nation from the periphery but now had taken control not only of the political and military spheres but of the temple itself. In 167 BCE, after gaining control of the city, Antiochus IV issued his decree outlawing the central tenants of Jewish faith and practice (1 Macc 1:44–51, 56). The invasion of the temple and dedication of it to Zeus Olympios and subsequent sacrifice of a pig on the altar would horrify the population and signal the victory of Antiochus IV not only over Jerusalem but the cosmic realm (2 Macc 6:2–9; 1 Macc 1:54, 1:59; Dan 11:3).[85] In Dan 7, the threat posed by the little horn is very real but the author clearly demonstrates that Antiochus IV is no match for the God of Israel pictured as the Ancient One (Dan 7:9–10). Despite the arrogance and destructive actions of the horn, the divine court quickly and effortlessly puts the beast to death and destroys its body by fire (Dan 7:11).

The common motif of monsters as outsiders both in ancient and modern sources speaks to a share sense of unease about difference and otherness. Monsters are scary not only because they are considered outsiders but also because they are unknown. As H.P. Lovecraft aptly states, "The oldest and strongest emotion of mankind is fear, and the oldest and strongest kind of fear is fear of the unknown."[86] In Daniel's visions, the last beast is not named and as a result it inspires the most fear since it can neither be identified nor classified. In both literary and filmic representations of monsters, the unnameable monster is featured prominently alongside the more familiar vampires, werewolves and zombies.[87] Maria Beville argues that the unnameable monster is more terrifying as it defies attempts to understand and systematize it.[88] As a result, soci-

---

[84] Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution," 249.

[85] A precedent for this line of thought had already been established during the Babylonian captivity when the prophet Ezekiel depicted the glory of the Lord leaving the sanctuary and allowing the Babylonians to destroy it (Ezek 10:18–11:25).

[86] H.P. Lovecraft, *Supernatural Horror in Literature* (Abergele: Wermod & Wermod, 1927), 1.

[87] Literary examples include: Grendel's mother in Beowulf, the monster created by Victor Frankenstein in *Frankenstein* and Stephen King's shape changing monster in *It*. Monsters lacking a name are also featured in the following films: *The Thing* (1982), *The Shining* (1980), *Poltergeist* (1982), *The Blob* (1988), *The Village* (2004) and *The Mist* (2007). For a more detailed discussion see M. Beville, *The Unnameable Monster in Literature and Film* (RIPL 21; New York: Routledge, 2014), 128–78.

[88] She notes, "This is the premise of my argument that the monster, once it has been categorised, is no longer a monster. Instead it is a 'werewolf,' a 'vampire,' a 'zombie,' or a 'cyborg.' Its excess, which is its monstrous nature, is sidestepped when it is classified, a position of safety and distance. When a monster is defined as a werewolf, it becomes part of a

ety is "powerless to contain it"[89] as not only the monsters' natures but more importantly their weaknesses remain a mystery. It is not only the lack of a name that is problematic but the inability to properly describe these creatures that renders them unknowable or understandable. Lovecraft was well known for his use of descriptors such as "unnameable" or "indescribable" in his fictional tales. His creatures often lacked a materiality to them as Lovecraft is hesitant to describe them fully, "The Thing cannot be described – there is no language for such abysms of shrieking and immemorial lunacy, such eldritch contradictions of all matter, force and cosmic order."[90] It is this indecipherable quality that inspires fear as monsters embody societies' anxieties of the outside and the unknown.[91]

The final beast of Daniel lacks both a name and a solid physical description especially when compared the more comprehensive explanations of the first three beasts.[92] The purpose behind this is not clear but some suggest that it serves to differentiate the final beast from the first three.[93] The preceding beasts are given not only

---

systematised site of fear. It enters a schema with rules for how the monster can be contained and repelled and which delineate its existence in a most basic way. The monster is thus reduced to the level of 'stock-type character.' Named, it is no longer unpredictable. Its Otherness is contained and managed and in its new form, as a label, 'the monster' is ready to be commercialized, marketed and sold" (Beville, *The Unnameable Monster*, 5–6).

[89] Beville, *The Unnameable Monster*, 8.

[90] H.P. Lovecraft, *The Call of Cthulhu and other Weird Stories* (Vintage Classics; London: Vintage Books, 2011), 95. Additionally, Chris Murray and Kevin Corstorphine note Lovecraft's lack of specific descriptors, "His monstrosities have form, and yet this is arbitrary. The mind imperfectly translates what it sees into a comprehensible image whose referent is beyond our scope" (C. Murray and K. Corstorphine, "Co[s]mic Horror," in D. Simmons [ed.], *New Critical Essays on H.P. Lovecraft* [New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013], 157–91 [160]).

[91] Modern depictions of monsters like their ancient counterparts also highlight the threatening nature of peripheral beings that invade and threaten "space". In particular, M. Night Shyamalan's *The Village* (2004) combines both "the idea of an unnameable monster and fear of the unknown" (Beville, *The Unnameable Monster*, 170). At the center of the film is a picturesque village that serves as a type of utopia for its inhabitants who have retreated from the rest of the world. While the outside world is kept at bay, the viewers quickly learn that the villagers live in fear of the monsters known as "those we don't speak of" who inhabit the surrounding woods. The film is particularly effective at creating fear in the viewer by only showing glimpses of the monster. In one scene, the viewer simply sees a distorted reflection of the creature and in another only the spiky back of the creature is glimpsed momentarily. Once the actual monster is fully revealed, the terror lessens as it is no longer an unknown terror but one which is more understandable.

[92] This is similar to Hos 13:5–6 where the fourth beast is also unnamed (Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*, 156–7).

[93] J. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC, 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 163.

names but physical descriptions. Each of the beasts are known entities such as eagles, leopards and bears though they are hybrid beings. They are at least familiar enough that the reader or hearer can visualize them. However, the final beast stands out due to its lack of name and specific corporality that hinders one's abilities to classify and identify it. Some physical descriptors are provided but they center around the beast's activity as expressed using a collection of active verbs.[94] This ten-horned creature is fearsome and strong possessing teeth and feet that can destroy anything in its path. The audience is given only a fragmentary view of the creature but fully alerted to its dangerous and destructive powers. Additionally, the author is purposeful in differentiating the fourth beast from the three that precede it. The Aramaic word שנה normally translated as "different from" indicates a degree of separation from the other beasts in terms of threat and danger. But this word is more often translated as "to change, or to alter" and is found at least seven times in Dan 7. In fact, it is used four times to refer to the distinctiveness of the fourth beast (Dan 7:7, 19, 23, 24). This use of vocabulary alerts the audience that this final beast is not only monstrous in its own right but that it exceeds the threat of the three previous beasts. This language of deviation or change is continued in verse 25 when the same verb שנה is used to describe the fourth beast's attempt to change the times and seasons. The repeated use of the term שנה is appropriate in relation to the figure of Antiochus IV whose actions have been described as inexplicable.[95] His brutal actions and policies towards the Jews lack any known precedent in the ancient world and highlight how different his policies were from both his Ptolemaic and Seleucid predecessors.

V. IMPLICATIONS

Monsters are used by authors and society for a number of purposes whether as warnings or expressions of unease. Cohen aptly states that monsters are "an embodiment of a certain cultural moment."[96] The monsters of Dan 7 emerge from a specific time of cultural persecution and anxiety as experienced by the rule of Antiochus IV. The author demonstrates not only the fear of the monster but the very instability of Jewish society that threatens to crumble under the threat of a monstrous regime. In most narratives, the monster threatens and harms the populace but then disappears

---

[94] Goldingay, *Daniel*, 163.

[95] F. Millar states, "There seems no way of reaching an understanding of how Antiochus came to take a step so profoundly at variance with the normal assumptions of government in his time" (F. Millar, "The Background to the Maccabean Revolution. Reflections on Martin Hengel's 'Judaism and Hellenism,' " *JJS* 29 [1978], 1–21 [16–7], quoted in E.S. Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution: Anctiochus IV and the Jews," in P. Green [ed.], *Hellenistic History and Culture* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993], 238–64 [262, n. 79]).

[96] Cohen, "Monster Culture," 2.

again into the forest or the wilderness.[97] Daniel 7 differs dramatically as it is revealed in the visions that the monsters pictured rising from the sea have in fact moved from the periphery to the center and have assumed power over all aspects of Jewish life. A helpful way to understand Daniel's visions is a comparative look at other works using monsters as social commentary. Monsters or monstrous language in modern discourse is often used to comment upon societies' false notions of security and order. Although much of this article has used examples from horror fiction and movies, monstrous language and imagery also appears in the related genre of dystopias. Dystopian literature and films do not usually feature traditional forms of monsters but instead whole governments or a ruler can assume monstrous qualities.[98] A classic example is the systematic mind control exerted by the Inner Party in George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* onto its victims. This invasive practice is symbolized by the life-sized posters of Big Brother that are plastered throughout the city. Orwell describes this invasive presence as the following:

> The hypnotic eyes gazed into his own. It was as though some huge force were pressing down upon you—something that penetrated inside your skull, battering against your brain, frightening you out of your beliefs, persuading you, almost, to deny the evidence of your senses. In the end the Party would announce that two and two made five, and you would have to believe it.

This is an important avenue to consider as a being is considered monstrous not only on account of their physical appearance but also due to their behaviour. In Orwell's dystopian world, it is not an individual monster that preys on its victims but an institutionalized government machine that seeks to victimize and control its populace.[99]

The issue of justice is paramount in dystopian narratives as a means to criticize the excesses or injustice of the ruling elite.[100] This

---

[97] Cohen, "Monster Culture," 4.

[98] However, in the related genre of post-apocalyptic fiction and movies one also finds humans who have become monstrous. The cannibalistic bands of humans in Cormac McCarthy's book *The Road* (2006) and the infected/mutant humans of the movie *I am Legend* (2007) take on monstrous qualities and prey on other humans.

[99] Gottlieb states, "We are faced here with societies in the throes of a *collective nightmare*. As in a nightmare, the individual has become a victim, experiencing loss of control over his or her destiny in the face of a monstrous, suprahuman force that can no longer be overcome or, in many cases, even comprehended by reason" (E. Gottlieb, *Dystopian Fiction East and West: Universe of Terror and Trial*, [Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001], 11).

[100] According to Gottlieb, "In *We, Brave New World, Nineteen Eighty-Four, Fahrenheit 451, Player Piano*, and *The Handmaid's Tale* this deliberate miscarriage of justice, represented by the protagonist's trial, becomes the essential theme that, in turn, also determines the symbolic structure of the

is also apparent in the visions of Dan 7–12 where the tyrannical practices of Antiochus IV over the populace are highlighted. Second Maccabees remembers Antiochus IV as one who commits impurities and who crosses sacred boundaries:

> Not content with this, Antiochus dared to enter the most holy temple in all the world, guided by Menelaus, who had become a traitor both to the laws and to his country. He took the holy vessels with his polluted hands, and swept away with profane hands the votive offerings that other kings had made to enhance the glory and honor of the place (2 Macc 5:15–16).

Antiochus' actions are not simply impure because he is a Gentile but more specifically due to his policies against the community. Christine Hayes notes that the term μιαροῖς translated as "polluted" is better understood as "blood-stained" or "blood-defiled."[101] Thus, the condemnation against Antiochus IV stems not primarily from his Gentile identity but from his immoral and threatening behaviour towards the Jews and their way of life.[102] This crossing of boundaries is not only relegated to the temple but also the private sphere of the community when Seleucid soldiers invaded and slaughtered citizens in their homes (2 Macc 5:12). Portier-Young notes, "In similar fashion, by violating and erasing boundaries Antiochus began to unmake the order God had ordained for Israel, and in so doing to replace security with horror. Murder in the home made this horror nearly inescapable, as cosmos reverted to chaos."[103] While the visions of Daniel focus more on Antiochus' defilement of the temple, it is important to note that his influence became impossible to escape raising the threat of impurity for the whole community. In this way, Antiochus' monstrous conduct toward the Jewish community is reminiscent of dystopian narratives as his threat is no longer located on the borders of their world but at the very heart of the city.

---

dystopian novel" (Gottlieb, *Dystopian Fiction*, 267).

[101] C.E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 51.

[102] The visions of Daniel do not mention Antiochus IV by name but the list of actions by the little horn fit well with 1 and 2 Maccabees' descriptions of Antiochus' persecution of the Jews. Dan 7 speaks of the arrogance of the little horn (vv. 20–21) which is expanded upon in Dan 8:9–14. Additionally, both Dan 7:25 and 8:11–14 describe the little horn changing the times and seasons of the temple offerings which align with Antiochus IV' suspension of Jewish festivals and holidays in 2 Macc 6:7 (see J.C. VanderKam, "2 Maccabees 6,7A and Calendrical Change," *JSJ* 12 [1981], 59–63; Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 179–82). Finally, in Dan 9:27 the angel Gabriel reveals that the temple will be violated by the "abomination that desolates." The exact meaning of "abomination that desolates" is not clear but elsewhere Antiochus' pollution of the temple is described (1 Macc 1:54, 59; 2 Macc 2:6).

[103] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 146.

The use of monstrous language in Dan 7 serves as a warning and is used to instill a response from the audience. Gottlieb describes dystopia's as "political literature" with the main purpose of providing "social criticism."[104] The author of Dan 7 impresses upon the audience the danger of Seleucid imperial practices that threaten the stability of every aspect of Jewish life. However, the larger purpose of this narrative is not to abandon the audience to terror but to impress upon them hope of justice and restoration. It is important to note that the chapter culminates in a divine council scene where the heavenly court is summoned to deal with the threat imposed by Antiochus IV. The legal connotations are evident as throne room vision begins with a description of the court seated before the Ancient of Days with the books opened before him (Dan 7:10). Upon the order of the court, the fourth beast is destroyed and the power of the other beasts is taken from them (Dan 7:11, 19–25). Throughout Dan 7, the threat posed by the beasts dominates the thoughts of the visionary; however, the purpose of the chapter is to demonstrate that judgment is imminent. The solution is pictured in cosmic terms as dominion is taken from the beasts and restored to the Son of Man (Dan 7:13–14). Thus, it is not human militant action that will bring about the downfall of Antiochus IV but divine judgement. Kathryn M. Lopez also notes that this lack of violent resistance does not equal passivity or inactivity on the part of the audience.[105] Quite the contrary, as she states, "These include faithfulness to the practice of their religion, and the willingness to die if necessary rather than forsake their beliefs."[106] Resistance to imperial domination can take many forms as evidenced by the differing responses of Jewish communities. For Daniel's community, the monstrous visions and subsequent judgment scene allows the unveiling of their present earthly world in order to understand the larger cosmic significance of their struggles.[107]

VI. CONCLUSION

The use of monster theory and horror philosophy allows one to ask a very different set of questions. Rather than focus on the origins of Daniel's symbolic imagery, it instead questions why the

---

[104] Gottlieb, *Dystopian Fiction*, 271.

[105] K.M. Lopez, "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment," in J.L. Berquist and C.V. Camp (eds.), *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces* (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 138–55 (148).

[106] Lopez, "Standing before the Throne of God," 148.

[107] Lopez employs Foucault's paradigm of heterotopias to describe the manner in which apocalypses create a "thirdspace" as an alternative to the imperial occupation of First- and Secondspaces. She states, "Apocalypses do not represent utopian understandings of God's ultimate purposes, but rather they are better described in terms of heterotopias, a very real space representing an alternative religious and political reality (Lopez, "Standing before the Throne of God," 154).

imagery was first employed. The depiction of Antiochus IV as a monstrous entity is a deliberate choice by the author as it transfers responsibility from the human community to the divine one. It is not simply a reuse of earlier mythological traditions but is a creative act with subversive motivations. In this paper, I argue that the author intentionally embodies Antiochus IV as a monstrous being who defies moral and cultural boundaries in order to dehumanize him. This is done not only to assure the community that divine intervention is at hand but to convince others that armed resistance is futile. A key component of horror and monster theory is that monsters are presented as unnatural entities that cross not only physical but cognitive boundaries. Antiochus IV's attempt to recreate his identity as Antiochus Epiphanes "God Manifest" is representative of his desire to break traditional boundaries and recreate the world in his own image. Jewish sources record that his arrogance went so far as to challenge the very moral order of Jewish life not only by outlawing traditional practices but replacing them with rituals honouring himself. A closer look at the creation of the monster in Dan 7 reveals less about Antiochus IV and more about the audience of Daniel. I argue that the monstrous depiction of Antiochus IV is a deliberate construct to show the community that the Seleucids' use of terror has violated earthly boundaries resulting in a response from the divine realm. This allows the writer of Daniel to project a divine punishment for the fourth beast rather than encourage armed resistance in his community.