

# DANIEL CHAPTERS 11 AND 12

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:1-15</b> .....	<b>3</b>
SECTION 1, PART 1 (vs.2) .....	4
SECTION 1, PART 2 (vs's 3-4) .....	4
Verse 3 .....	4
Verse 4 .....	4
SECTION 1, PART 3 (vss. 5-15) .....	4
Verses 5-9 .....	5
In vss. 7-8 .....	5
Verses 10-13 .....	5
Verses 14-15 .....	5
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:16-22</b> .....	<b>7</b>
VERSE 16: .....	8
VERSE 17 .....	8
VERSE 18-19 .....	8
VERSE 20 .....	8
VERSE 21: .....	8
VERSE 22 .....	8
RELEVANCE .....	9
SIGNIFICANCE .....	9
ACCESSIBILITY .....	10
<b>HISTORICIST APPLICATIONS OF VSS 1-22</b> .....	<b>11</b>
REF HISTORICAL APPLICATION .....	11
REF THREE OBJECTS OF ATTENTION .....	11
REF TWO SUCCESSORS .....	11
REF ONE PRINCE .....	11
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:23-28</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>HARMONY OF EVENTS DISCUSSED IN DAN 11:16-22 AND 23-28</b> .....	<b>14</b>
EVENT IN HISTORY .....	14
VERSE .....	14
<b>CHIASTIC OUTLINE IN FIVE PARTS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:29-35</b> .....	<b>15</b>
DANIEL 11:29-30B .....	15
DANIEL 11:30C-32 .....	16
VERSE 32 .....	16
VERSES 33-35 .....	16
VERSE 34 .....	16
VERSE 35 .....	17
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:36-39</b> .....	<b>17</b>

Vs. 36C-D.....	17
Vs. 38 .....	18
<b>DANIEL CHAPTER 11:40-45.....</b>	<b>18</b>
VERSE 40 .....	20
DISCUSSION .....	20
VERSE 41 .....	21
DISCUSSION .....	21
VERSE 42 .....	21
VERSE 43 .....	22
VERSE 44 .....	22
VERSE 45 .....	23
<b>DAN CHAPTER 12:1-3 IN RELATION TO DAN CHAPTER11:44-45 .....</b>	<b>28</b>
REPETITION IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL .....	28
WHAT DO THE TWO PASSAGES SAY? .....	29
DISCUSSION .....	31
<b>DANIEL 11 AND THE TIME PERIODS IN DANIEL 12 .....</b>	<b>31</b>
1260 AND 1290 DAYS.....	32
THE 1335 DAYS.....	33
CONCLUSION.....	33

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1 Verses and Application .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Table 2 Verses by Section.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 3--HOW SUCCESSIVE KINGS OF THE NORTH RELATED.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 4 SUMMARY OF PROPHETIC WORLD EMPIRES IN DANIEL .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 5 CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN VERSES OF DAN 11 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Table 6 GREAT CONTROVERSY THEMES FOR FURTHER STUDY .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 7 HISTORICAL REPETITION ACROSS BLOCS .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Table 8 COMPARISON DAN 11:40-45 AND 12:1-3 .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Table 9 COMPARISON OF DAN 11:44-45 AND 12:1-3.....</b>	<b>30</b>

## Daniel Chapter 11:1-15

To make it easier I will divide the verses for discussion purposes--

**Table 1 Verses and Application**

Section	Verses	Application
1	2-15	Persia and Greece
2	16-22	Rome(State)
3	23-28	Rome(State)
4	29-45	Rome Church/State)

**Table 2 Verses by Section**

<b>Part</b>	<b>Section 1</b>	<b>Section 2</b>	<b>Section 3</b>	<b>Section 4</b>
1	2	16-22	23-28	29-35
2	3-4			36-39
3	5-15			40-45

### **Section 1, part 1 (vs.2)**

**Verse 2** deals with events in the Persian period of history and speaks of Xerxes' unsuccessful campaign against Greeks in 478 BC--one which at a later time would figure in Alexander's plans for a united Greek/Macedonian campaign against Persia.

### **Section 1, part 2 (vs's 3-4)**

**Verse 3** speaks only of the outcome of the Macedonian campaign against Persia, begun in 334 BC with Alexander's crossing into Asia Minor. In the campaign that followed Alexander the Great(355-323BC) would achieve unchallenged success. He would "do as he pleases."

**Verse 4** describes the division of power among Alexander's generals following their leader's untimely death at the age of 32 in the year 323 BC. There were a number of highly qualified generals ready to claim whatever part they could of Alexander's newly conquered empire, but not all were equally successful. The four main divisions of the empire soon became recognizable--the Greek and Macedonian homeland, Anatolia, Syria with the territory it controlled in the east, and Egypt with its holdings in Africa.

Notice that verse four indicates the Greek period would be one of political disunity. This is an important point. One outcome of Alexander's conquest of Persia was that Greek culture and especially the Greek language became widely known, but the vehicle for spreading them e\was the importation of soldiers from the homeland--needed in order to fight other Greek kings. As regards culture and language Greek rule would have a unifying effect, but as regards civil administration and government, "his empire will be broken up and parceled out toward the four winds of heaven." (vs4) Throughout vss. 5-15 the Greek kings of the South and North are constantly bickering with each other.

### **Section 1, part 3 (vss. 5-15)**

Overview. Verses 5-15 deal with the rival Greek dynasties of Egypt, to the south of Judea, and Syria, to the north of Judea. Although a four-fold division of the empire is mentioned in vs. 4, only two of the four parts are of interest in the prophecy because they were the only ones that would come into direct contact with God's people. Verse 5 introduces the term ~'king of the South' and shows that before the end of the section in vs. 15 the king of the North would be the stronger of the two. Between the beginning and end of the section is an account of the attempted alliance between North and South (vs. 6), a southern initiative against the north (vss. 7-9), a northern initiative against the south (vss. 10-13), and finally an unexpected initiative by God's people against the religious abuses of the king of the North (vs. 14).

**Prolepsis in vs. 5.** Verse 5 indicates that while South was stronger than North at first, this situation would eventually change and in the end North would become the stronger of the two. This is important for one reason

in particular. The buffer territory between Egypt and Syria was called Coele-Syria and included Jerusalem. Both countries were intent on controlling the district which lay between them. Initially it was controlled by Egypt. Then later it changed hands and was controlled by Syria. So, while it is true that North eventually did become stronger than South in a general sense within the time period covered by vs. 5-15, the point to notice is that North would be stronger than South with respect to God's people living in and around the city of Jerusalem.

**Verses 5-9.** The proleptic statement of vs. 5 states the agenda for vs. 5-15 as a whole. Following it, there is an attempted alliance in vs. 6 between Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285- 246) and Antiochus II Theos (261-246) involving the former's daughter Berenice. In 246 s.C., however, Antiochus' wife Laodice poisoned Berenice, along with her son by Antiochus and Antiochus himself. The attempted alliance was a failure.

**In vs. 7-8** the Egyptian response to these events was such that Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221) went to war against Seleucus II Callinicos (246-225). The title "Euergetes," which means Benefactor, refers to the booty that Ptolemy III brought back from his successful campaign during the Third Syrian War (245- 241). The war ended when Seleucus II Callinicos (246-225) expelled the Ptolemaic army of occupation in 241 B.C. and the former's son retreated to his own country (vs. 9). Subsequently there was a period of peace between Egypt and Syria that lasted some twenty years until the death of Ptolemy III in 221 B.C.

**Verses 10-13.** We start with vs. 10-12, which describe the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.), in which Antiochus III the Great (223-187)--a son of Seleucus II and brother of Seleucus III Ceraunos (225-223)--attacked Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-203). Egypt did win the battle of Raphia, but as early as vs. 12 we begin to see the truth of the prediction in vs. 5 that the king of the North would eventually be stronger than the king of the South. Verse 12 states that the king of the South (Ptolemy IV) "will not remain triumphant." As the historian F. E. Peter's has put it, "Egypt never recovered from the victory at Raphia."

The victory at Raphia in B.C. 217, it turned out, had been dearly bought. Antiochus III had been held at bay, and for the rest of his reign Ptolemy IV Philopator had nothing to fear from the otherwise distracted Seleucid. But the price exacted by the vizier Sosibius, calculated in terms of cash and as a lien on the future, sealed Egypt's doom. An independent Egypt dragged on its existence for nearly two centuries after Raphia. During most of that time, however, it was sheltered by the power of the Romans, who would eventually annex it. Freed of foreign tampering by Rome's nervous benevolence, Egypt was free to orchestrate her own downfall with the twin discords of financial disintegration and dynastic quarreling.

Next vs. 13 refers to the battle of Panium (200 s.c.). Panium had more significance for the Jews than Raphia. After the battle of Raphia the Jewish homeland had remained under Egyptian control, as it had been before, and this arrangement was generally acceptable. But after Panium, Coele-Syria including Jerusalem and Judea, was ruled by Syria. Not many years after Syria's victory the Jews would be severely persecuted for their religious beliefs and practices. The change from Ptolemaic to Seleucid control was an important turning point for God's people in the history of the period under discussion.

The rival armies clashed in B.C. 200 at Panium near the Jordan's source, and the issue of who was to possess Coele-Syria, contested since the settlement after Ipsus a century earlier, was finally decided in favor of the Seleucids.<sup>25</sup>

**Verses 14-15.** Verse 14 is of special interest here, because for one group of historicist writers a new section begins at this point, while for another group it begins at vs. 16.

It is significant that vs. 14 speaks of a vision (hazon). Although the NIV rendering "'in fulfillment of the vision'" is not grammatically impossible, the word is best translated with a purposive sense, i.e., "'in order to fulfill the vision'" (lit. "a vision). It would be very helpful to know what the vision here referred to was about.

With that knowledge we would be in a better position to identify the group that was motivated by it so forcefully.

This problem may not be so difficult as it seems. The key word in the passage is ha-zon "vision" (vs. 14). Daniel uses the same word elsewhere. Three notable parallels to the key word in question are found in Dan 2:19 (Aramaic behezwa-' dl-lelya- , lit. "in a vision of the night"), 7:1 (Aramaic wehezwe ~3 ~ lit. "and visions of his head"), and 8:13 (Hebrew heha-zon, lit. "the vision"). The first vision had to do with a metal image, the second with a series of wild beasts, and the third with domesticated beasts used in worship. In addition the third vision had to do with a sanctuary, which would undergo a period of defilement and then be cleansed, or set right.

Of the three available parallels to the word hazon in Dan 11:14 the one of greatest interest is Dan 8:13, taken together with vs. 14 which immediately follows it. There is no historical record of a major uprising among Daniel's own people, i.e., the Jewish people, during the second century B.C. based on the need to settle an issue having to do with metal images or wild beasts. But there is a well documented record of a Jewish uprising which had as its purpose to cleanse a sanctuary. This uprising, which occurred in 164 B.C., was led by Judas Maccabeus during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-163).<sup>27</sup>

When the problem is approached exegetically before it is approached historically, the '~violent men among your own people'~ can be confidently identified as the Jewish Maccabean freedom fighters and the vision they set about to fulfill can be identified with equal confidence as the one in Dan 8:13-14, which says in part, "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (vs. 14, KJV).<sup>28</sup> As for its outcome, the Maccabean uprising was a great success, resulting in the political independence of the Jewish nation for more than a century. The Maccabees, however, did not initially set out to establish an independent state. They set out to fulfill the prophecy of Dan 8:13-14.<sup>29</sup> "The men of violence among your own people shall lift themselves up in order to fulfil the vision; but they shall fail" (Dan 11:14, RSV). It may seem puzzling that Dan 11:14 should say the Maccabean uprising was "without success" (NIV), or that they would "fail" (RSV), in light of their obvious successes. But the text does not imply that the Maccabees failed to establish an independent state for Jews or to cleanse the temple in Jerusalem. It says they would fail in their attempt to fulfill the vision of Dan 8:13-14. The sanctuary they cleansed was not the one mentioned in the prophecy they thought they were fulfilling.<sup>30</sup> They did not accomplish what they set about to do.

Another factor to consider in identifying the "violent men"~ of Dan 11:14 has to do with the immediate context of the chapter. In Dan 11 most of the actors are violent. It is not necessary for the prophet to state that the king of the North is violent. That is obvious without being said. But as regards the individuals in vs. 14, an explicit statement that they are '~violent'~ is necessary. Whatever makes that description apply is unusual enough to require the comment on it that we find in the text. The unusual feature here is precisely that the persons involved are Jews at a time when the Jewish nation is nothing more than a temple state with its center in Jerusalem. The Jews were not normally violent on a scale that would justify a comparison with their powerful neighbors to the north and south. They were unable to be violent on that scale, or at least that was the common perception. But on the occasion described in vs. 14 they did indeed assert themselves aggressively. That fact is note-worthy and deserves the special comment it receives.

There is also a spiritual dimension to the violence referred to in Dan 11:14. The primary meaning of the verb root pr is to break through, not break down. The idea in context is one of knowing no restraints.<sup>31</sup> Judas Maccabeus fought on the Sabbath and solicited the friendship and support of the Romans, who would eventually crucify Christ and destroy Jerusalem. His Hasmonean successors would establish a dynasty of priest-kings based on a family from the tribe of Levi. This development shows a surprising lack of regard for the traditional separation of powers. The Maccabees had fought bravely to uphold the law of their ancestors, but in that law priests and kings never came from the same family. What started so well ended badly, if moral sensitivity is the basis for our evaluation.

Verse 15 refers to the successful invasion of Egypt by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 168 B.C. Antiochus attack was not an initiative but a response. In 170 B.C. Ptolemy VI Philometor had sent an expedition of his own into Judea.

Both they [the Egyptians] and Antiochus sent embassies to Rome to present their claims but Rome was occupied with Perseus, and Antiochus defeated the Egyptian army and followed it into Pelusium and then Memphis. It was the first successful invasion of Egypt since that of Darius III one hundred and seventy-three years earlier, for Alexander had not invaded but merely occupied.

In this way Antiochus IV accomplished what Antiochus III had not. He successfully invaded Egypt, fulfilling the prediction of vs. 5 that, even within the Greek period, the king of the North would become stronger than the king of the South. But Rome had been invited to intervene and in 168 B.C. finally did so.

At the beginning of summer (~168) he [Antiochus IV Epiphanes] was camped in front of Alexandria. But the Senate had sent out Caius Popillius Laenas as a special envoy. As soon as the news of the Roman victory over Perseus at Pydna came, Laenas hurried to Antiochus and, dramatically drawing a circle around him in the sand, demanded an immediate reply, whether for obedience or war. Antiochus knew that the Romans did not jest, and withdrew his forces both from Egypt and from Cyprus, but he kept Syria and Palestine, and can hardly be thought to have lost by the episode. As a matter of fact, there may have been Egyptian booty in the great triumph which he conducted at Daphne near Antioch soon after, in imitation of the Roman practice.

It is perhaps characteristic of Antiochus IV that he could return home and celebrate a triumph after being forced out of Egypt by a single Roman.<sup>36</sup> We will encounter this ruler's irrational ego again.

## Daniel Chapter 11:16-22

"Put these three paragraphs at beginning also"

**The Prince of the covenant's death in Dan 11:22 is the central focus of Daniel's last prophecy. Faith is required to understand the significance of this event, but it is an objective fact of history all the same. While Christ's atoning sacrifice has no precedent or parallel, it does have a context. We need to understand what that is. And when we have studied the events surrounding the crucifixion it is clear that they in turn have contexts, and so on outward in broadening circles until all history is brought within the scope of what Christ did as He allowed Himself to be lifted up on a Roman cross on a low and rocky hill outside Jerusalem almost two thousand years ago.**

**As we begin to approach the history prophesied in Dan 11 from this perspective, what appears at first to be little more than a catalogue of isolated facts takes on a depth of meaning we had not anticipated. If we take it as an article of faith that the cross is central to Scripture and indeed to the history of our planet, there's nothing innovative in saying that it is also central to Dan 11.**

**Here then is our claim: from a historicist point of view the cross of Christ is the point around which the prophecy of Dan 11 revolves. It is the organizing principle for historicist exegesis of the chapter and, if followed through, offers more powerful controls and safeguards against unwarranted conclusions than those available to any other school of interpretation. If this model is flawed, one would expect the historical applications that follow from it to be forced and unconvincing. Important facts about the text should remain unaccounted for and the result should be devoid of any special insight. If, on the other**

**hand, it really is true that Christ is the center and theme of Dan 11, then the prophecy reflects a perspective which will not be content with trivial matters. The issues raised will be broad, inclusive, and germane and the historical details mentioned at each point will have a significance that derives not only from the depth of their subject matter but also from the synergy of a unified focus. I submit that the historicist model is not flawed. One can approach the prophecy of Dan 11 with high expectations and have no fear that they will be disappointed if the question raised at each point is, What does this have to do with Jesus?**

**Verse 16:** Jews and the Roman Republic. The invasion and conquest of the territory of the king of the North by the Roman armies under Pompey. After conquering Syria and making it a Roman province, Pompey invaded Palestine designated as the 'glorious land.' Judea was consumed, 10,000 were slain, the walls were demolished, and a heavy tax was levied. Judea was consumed by Pompey in 63 BC and made a province in 6 AD.

**Verse 17:** The angel quickly passes from the Roman Republic to the Roman Empire which was established by Julius Caesar, who sets his face to enter 'by force the whole kingdom' of Alexander. Egypt, the last to be occupied, was subjected to Roman rule with the help of the Jews, 'the upright ones.' Ptolemy Auletes and his sister, Cleopatra, were rulers of Egypt under the protection of Pompey. A quarrel arose between Pompey and Julius Caesar and Pompey was defeated at the battle of Pharsalia. Pompey fled to Egypt and was murdered by Ptolemy. Julius Caesar followed him to Egypt and took over its guardianship and eventually sided with Cleopatra. Caesar and Cleopatra were involved in an immoral relationship which is indicated by this verse. Later in the war between Octavius and Mark Anthony, Cleopatra sided with Anthony against Rome and thus fulfilled the last part of verse 16.

**Verse 18-19:** After 'corrupting' the daughter of women' Julius Caesar did 'turn his face to the isles.' In 50 battles and 1000 cities captured and slain 1,192,000 men, Julius Caesar brought down the republican form of government and installed the single man rule empire motif to Rome. 'But a prince (Brutus) shall cause the reproach offered by him (Caesar) to cease; yea, moreover, he (Brutus) shall cause his (Caesar's) reproach to turn upon him (Caesar). March 14, 44 BC, Brutus and the others killed Julius Caesar.

**Verse 20:** Julius Caesar had named his nephew, Octavian, as his successor, otherwise Mark Anthony would have gotten it. Cleopatra seduced Anthony and he went with her to Egypt. She turned him against Rome and she joined with him in the great naval battle of Actium on Sept. 2, 31 BC, but they were defeated. Octavian went on to defeat all other opponents and became supreme ruler of the Roman world. He called himself, Augustus Caesar and named one of the months of the year after himself.

He was the one who was the 'raiser of taxes.' Also see Luke 2:1. Augustus reigned 'in the glory of the kingdom,' which has been called by historians the 'golden age,' of Roman history. The 'Augustan Age.' Augustus died a natural death which was not true of his predecessors. This fits with the last part of the verse.

**Verse 21:** When Augustus died in 14 AD, Tiberius succeeded to the throne. He was the son of Augustus's wife by a former husband. Augustus did not want Tiberius to succeed him but his wife by flattery talked him into it. Augustus knew that Tiberius was a vile man. He was so wicked that when he died the whole Roman empire rejoiced. He was never given the 'honor of the kingdom,' nor the respect of historians.

**Verse 22:** Thus he whose cruelty had deluged the empire with crime and bloodshed was himself to be broken and receive what he had given to others. He died in 37 AD, suffocated with pillows by his attendants.

**The prophecy declares that Christ, 'the prince of the covenant,' would be broken or crucified during the reign of Tiberius. (Dan. 8:25; 9:25,26) According to Luke 3:1-3, Jesus was baptized in the 15 year of the reign of Tiberius. This is reckoned from the time that Augustus placed Tiberius on his throne as a**



joint-ruler in 12 AD. Jesus was crucified in AD 31, and six years later Tiberius was murdered and Caligula took the throne. Verse 22 brings us down to the first advent of Christ as the Messiah and to His crucifixion, and also to the end of the 70 prophetic weeks of Daniels's vision. After giving a detailed account of the 70 weeks of years, the angel Gabriel goes back to the league formed between Rome and the Jews and carries us down in an unbroken line to the end of the 2300 prophetic days and the second advent.

Notice that the event during Augustus' reign which receives most attention in the prophecy has to do with Christ's birth in Bethlehem. The tranquility of Augustus' death is mentioned and also the unusual circumstances of Tiberius' accession. The event during Tiberius' reign that receives greatest attention has to do with the death of Christ under Pontius Pilate. Augustus is the Caesar of Christ's birth, while Tiberius is the Caesar of Christ's death. The events of their respective reigns that are singled out for attention in the prophecy are those that occur during the span of Christ's life.

The " prince of the covenant" in Dan 11:22 is the Messiah, Jesus Christ. With so vast an expanse of history to deal with the angel has identified with surgical precision the one moment of greatest import-- the moment when our Savior, nailed to a Roman cross on a rocky hill outside Jerusalem almost 2000 years ago, breathed His last. The death of the Prince is referred to with a marvelous economy of means in only three Hebrew words "and also [the] Prince of [the] covenant." But these words occur at the center of a prophecy which spans the last fourth of the book of Daniel. They are the great fulcrum around which the entire structure revolves and point to the event which, more than any other, has riveted the church's attention ever since.

Everything else in Dan 11 leads either up to or away from the crucifixion of Christ at the prophecy's center.

**Relevance.** If the angel had said nothing more in this section than, Your Messiah will die on a Roman cross, which is in fact the point he was making, Daniel would be left with a number of unanswered questions: How could Rome--half way across the Mediterranean--accomplish, not the covert assassination, but the criminal execution of a Jewish Prince living in Judea? Twenty five years earlier Rome established complete and total control over Judea. But how could a single city like Rome take over an entire country like Judea? Rome was not just a city; it was the seat of a powerful empire. But even so, Judea is a considerable distance from Rome. Approximately sixty-nine years before annexing Judea Rome had annexed Judea's northern neighbor, Syria, an act which brought Judea directly within its sphere of influence. So Judea was already on the empire's doorstep as it were. But all these things happened gradually. How?

Instead of opening himself to the above sort of exchange the angel started at the beginning. He began with an introductory formula that had been used previously in reference to Persia and Greece--second and third respectively on the earlier list of four world powers--and in this way alerted Daniel that a power comparable to but different from them was now coming into prominence. Its strength among nations would be supreme, like that of iron among metals. The last of the Greek Seleucids and Ptolemies would be powerless to resist. Judea itself would share the fate of her former overlords and become engulfed by the Empire.

Certain individuals are singled out as contributing to this process in a notable way. The emperor at the time of Christ's birth is mentioned in particular. His peaceful death and the unusual nature of the succession is pointed out. So is the brooding and austere personality of the next emperor, which would eventually bring together all the elements of a reign of terror.

**Significance.** All this is merely context and background. Having developed the context so fully the angel is now in a position to make his point. What he says about the Prince of the covenant can now be

seen in perspective. This messianic Prince would not ascend David's throne in triumph as expected but would be put to death under a false accusation of treason against a foreign king. Moreover His Roman judge would be influenced to invoke the death penalty in this case because he himself was in danger of being brought under a similar charge.

We need to know more about the crucifixion of Christ than that His judge's name was Pilate and that the Jews told Pilate, "If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar" (John 19:12). This sentence from the gospel of John can be understood at one level by recognizing the words used within it, but knowing fully what they mean involves realizing what point the Jews were trying to make by saying them and understanding the circumstances that gave their statement such force. I submit that the angel who so patiently explained these things to Daniel provides a basis for understanding this other narrative about the Prince of the covenant--the one preserved by John--more clearly than would have been possible otherwise. It makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the crucifixion.

**Accessibility.** This chapter that seems so obtuse on a first reading is therefore immensely significant. It has value that cries out to be recognized. But while it is not a mere report on the squabbles of petty kings, it is not so weighty that we cannot understand it either. The angel was trying to explain something to Daniel here. He intended his words to be understood.

## HISTORICIST APPLICATIONS OF VSS 1-22

### REF Historical Application

11:1 Persia

11:3 Greece

11:16 Secular Rome

11:36 Religious Rome

### REF Three Objects of Attention

11:16b Beautiful Land (Pompey)

11:18a Other distant places (Pompey)

11:19a Homeland (Julius Caesar)

### REF Two Successors

11:20a Augustus (at Christ's birth)

11:21a Tiberius (at Christ's death)

### REF One Prince

11:22b Christ on a Roman cross

**With all we have said, there are some things about vss. 16-22 that cannot be fully appreciated until after we study the rest of the larger section (vss. 23-28) to which these verses belong. There is a reason for this. Dan 11 is in the form of a chiasm and a chiasm is like a mirror image. So far we have studied the first half of the image. We have gotten as far as its center, and this is the most important single element. But the chapter divides into three parts of approximately equal length. What this means is that, at vs. 22, we are half way through a section as well as being half way through the chapter. We will now consider those verses that complete the larger section of vss. 16-28 and bring us through the middle third of this remarkable chapter.**

## Daniel Chapter 11:23-28

**Dan 11:23-28** deals with roughly the same period of time as that discussed earlier for vss. 16-22. Verse 23 applies to events that occur earlier than those in vs. 22. The continuous flow of events appears to be broken, but there is more than one reason for this. It is no mistake.

What are the verses saying?

The first part of Dan 11:23 says, "After coming to an agreement with him, he will act deceitfully, and with only a few people he will rise to power." The most obvious sense of this passage is that a beginning point of some sort is in view. So our first task is to determine what begins when the above agreement is reached. If it is the relationship called into existence by the agreement, which would be a reasonable assumption, then who are the signatories and when did they first come into relationship with each other?

We must both raise and answer the above questions within the context of the book of Daniel. This one passage cannot be interpreted in isolation from all the rest. A prominent feature of the book is its recurring motif of four world empires. In the case of Babylon, Persia, and Greece the Jews had little to say about the

relationship that was thrust upon them. But with Rome the Jews solicited a treaty on their own initiative. The "agreement" of vs. 23 is the formal alliance between the government of Judas Maccabeus and Rome, ratified in 160 B.C. That is where our story begins.

A fact that might seem so obvious that it does not need to be stated, but which does need to be stated, is that the above treaty had two signatories. In vss. 16-22 the ensuing relationship is traced from the perspective of the first or initiating party. Jerusalem would be completely dominated and eventually engulfed and destroyed by her former ally. But what about the other party to the agreement--the treaty's other signatory? Would Rome enjoy success indefinitely? Verses 23-28 show that this would not be the case. Rome would succeed and would rule, "but only for a time" (vs. 24).

Both halves of the larger section (vss. 16-22, 23-28) have a reason for being exactly where they are and for saying what they do. In the first half section (vss. 16-22) Jerusalem loses its ability to function as the capital of a Jewish state (vs. 17). In the second half (vss. 23-28) Rome meets a similar end. The capital of the Roman Empire is not destroyed. Under Constantine, however, it is moved elsewhere. After A.D. 330 Rome no longer functions as capital of the Empire (vs. 24). By whatever means, both cities cease to rule.

Notice that the destruction of Jerusalem is not portrayed as the most important fact about Judea during this period, nor is Constantine's move to Byzantium the most important fact about Rome. Both of these events are relegated to proleptic preview statements found toward the beginning of their respective subsections. The focus of the one subsection (vss. 16-22)--the event to which it leads--is not the fall of the Jewish capital (vs. 17) but the death of the Jewish Messiah (vs. 22). Similarly, the focus of the other subsection (vss. 23-28) is not on the point when Rome would quit being capital of the Empire (vs. 24) but the point when it would quit trying to destroy Christianity (vs. 28). In both subsections the prolepsis comes in the second verse (vss. 17, 24), while the clause of greatest importance comes in the last verse (vss. 22, 28).

There is a question what it means for Rome's status as capital of the world to end. In terms of the contrast being developed between Jerusalem and Rome, it means that the roles of two major protagonists in the chapter are eventually reversed. In A.D. 70 Rome won and Jerusalem was defeated. For almost three centuries after that victory the Empire fought a war against the Christian church, which eventually turned into a life or death struggle for survival. This time it was Rome that went down in defeat. Rome had clearly lost a major struggle but who had won? Not an army but a set of ideas and beliefs. The state had been defeated by a church. The new capital at Byzantium would be just as Christian as Rome had been pagan.

Answering the one question about the end of Rome's supremacy in vs. 24 raises another that corresponds to it. When Constantine moved the capital of the Empire from Rome to Byzantium in A.D. 330 that was the end of an era. But exactly what era was it and when did it begin? This additional matter is discussed in vss. 25-28.

The angel's discussion is a study in economy of means. It includes all the essential facts, the importance of each event relative to the others is indicated, the church's role as the believing Israel of God is captured nicely, greater emphasis is placed on the spiritual dimension of events than the secular, and the fulcrum around which the entire narrative revolves is the crucifixion of Christ at the center of the section. The special interests of Jerusalem and Rome are both discussed in a half section each. And this entire fund of information and insight is compressed into only thirteen verses. The result is a carefully developed contrast between the Jewish state and the Roman state, between the people of God and the dominant world power. But where would the contrast be if the narrator had gone on to other things after vs. 22 with only half of it in place? There might be ways to get around the seeming repetition in this section, but to the extent that we succeed we must correspondingly fail to grasp the points it was designed to convey.

The angel's emphasis is on the cross of Christ in vs. 22 which is to come through at the center of everything--section, chapter, and narrative--with all the simplicity it was intended to have. Whenever this happens we can be very sure that we are not proceeding on wrong principles.

**When the two half sections making up vss. 16-28 are compared clause by clause the events they portray are indeed interlaced, but there is no repetition. No event is presented twice. Let me illustrate the**

**relationships that follow from this arrangement with an analogy. When a picture is printed in full color the same piece of paper is run through the press three separate times. In each part of the picture there is some red, some yellow, and some blue, so that an outline of the entire picture can be seen when only one color is there. And yet in another sense we do not see the whole picture until all three colors are present together. A casual observer might assume that the pressman is merely repeating himself as he works, but there is a reason for what he does.**

We as Seventh-day Adventists should stop trying to pick the colors out of Dan 11:16-28.

## HARMONY OF EVENTS DISCUSSED IN DAN 11:16-22 AND 23-28

<u>Event in History</u>	<u>Verse</u>
Rome orders Antiochus Epiphanes to leave Egypt in 168 B.C.	16a
Pompey's settlement - Roman taxes but no Roman governor	16b
Judea annexed as a Roman province in A.D. 6	17a
Jews rebel against Rome on various occasions	17b
Julius Caesar in conflict with Pompey	18
Julius Caesar's assassination in 44 B.C.	19
Quirinius census under Caesar Augustus (Octavian)	20a
Augustus' nonviolent death	20b
Tiberius' rise to power in A.D. 14	21
Tiberius reign of terror	22a
Christ's crucifixion in A.D. 31 (midway through terror)	22b
Rome's treaty with the Jews in 161 B.C. and rise to power	23
Pompey enters the temple in Jerusalem	24a
Julius Caesar's largess to the Jews after Pompey's death	24b
Rome no longer the capital of the Empire	24c
Octavian's war with Mark Antony at Actium in 31 B.C.	25
Octavian's victory accounted for	26
Octavian's early association with Mark Antony	27a
End of the Republic	27b
Octavian's return to Rome after Actium	28a
Rome persecutes the church	28b
Rome under Constantine quits persecuting the church	28c

## CHIASTIC OUTLINE IN FIVE PARTS

Comparisons	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4	Block 5
Verses	16-19	20-21	22	23-24	25-28
Number of vss.	4	2	1	2	4
	Pompey	Octavian	Christ	Pompey	Octavian
	Caesar	Tiberius		Caesar	Antony
Motifs . . . .			Violence		
		Peace		Peace	
	Violence				Violence

**Alternating roles.** Notice that in table 6 the same people appear in contrasting roles. Pompey and Caesar(Julius) are shown in conflict with each other in the first bloc (vss. 16-19) but separately in the third (vss. 23-24). Similarly Octavian(Augustus) is shown in peaceful relation to Tiberius in the second bloc (VSS. 20-21) but in violent conflict with Antony in the fourth (VSS. 25-28).

The fact that there is an alternating sequence in the violence/peace motif is one point. The fact that the same people appear in different roles is a second point. Notice also that the sequence of their appearance is reversed in the following manner. Caesar and Pompey are portrayed in a violent role (bloc 1) before they are portrayed in a peaceful role (bloc 3). Octavian is portrayed in a peaceful role (bloc 2) before he is portrayed in a violent role (bloc 4). When these facts are all taken together, with the violence to the peaceful Prince of the host at the center of the section, there is an exquisite, even awe inspiring, symmetry that runs through the section.

## Daniel Chapter 11:29-35

**Daniel 11:29-30b.** The fall of the Roman Empire in the west. King of the North and King of the South are fighting again. For quite a few years after Augustus defeated Antony at Actium, there was peace in Rome. A civil war broke out in 68 AD after the death of Nero and Vespasian became emperor. Many different men would rule Rome over the years but Rome was secure until something changed. New activity against the King of the South is brought to view in these texts.

In the fourth and especially the fifth and sixth centuries of the Christian era Rome began crumbling under the pressure of barbarian attacks. The prophecy mentions a challenge from the south which would mean the sea.

The important part is the ships not the phrase Chittim.

The Vandals after entering Africa in 429 AD and capturing Carthage in 439 AD, proceeded to build a powerful navy. By June 455 they were sufficiently confident of their naval power to attack Rome. They landed unopposed and removed all the movable wealth that they were able to transport which included the treasure and vessels of Solomon's temple, formerly brought to Rome by Titus. The Vandals persecuted the Catholics.

In 533 AD, Justinian's general Belisarius entered Carthage and defeated the Vandals and they were never heard from again. The Vandals were the only barbarian force to attack Rome from the sea and to persecute Catholicism in a notable manner.

**Daniel 11:30c-32.** The rise of Papal Rome in the west. Rome was captured five times during Justinian's rule in Constantinople. It had never seen reverses like this in the past and they would never occur again (vs. 29). Before this Rome had been the capital of the empire. Afterward it would rise to a similar level of prominence again as the seat of western Christianity. But for a brief moment it was left defenseless.

The papal system of states gradually extended itself, till in the thirteenth century it reached its culminating point. Force was used as an instrument of papal compliance. Crusades were used to try and drive out all the enemies of the papacy. Verse 31 describes the union of church and state. Not only would the state "have indignation against the holy covenant" or genuine Christianity, but the ruler of Rome would unite with or, 'Have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant,' that is the apostate church. The 'arms' of the state were used in behalf of the Papal hierarchy.

'Pollute the sanctuary.' It was the continual service of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary that was taken away from the people by the substitution of a false system called 'the abomination that maketh desolate.' Christ and His ministration in heaven was the true succession and antitype of the Levitical. But the Papacy made their bishops, priests, deacons to be the succession of the high priest, priests, and Levites. They also made literal the Jewish sacrifices and victims and even corrupted the Lord's supper.

**Verse 32.** 'corrupt by flatteries' 'To conceal the real facts, motives, intentions.' The papacy used deceit and flattery to advance its aims.

All during the Dark Ages when the corrupt apostate church ruled the world and persecuted the saints, there were those who remained loyal to God.

**Verses 33-35.** The protestant reformation. Verse 33. Those who are 'wise' come to prominence after the high point of the Dark Ages. This applies to the great reformers of the sixteenth century. They were wise to bring people back to the scriptures as the only rule for faith and practice. They were persecuted by the Catholic church.

**Verse 34.** During the sixteenth century the fires of the reformation were kindled in different countries of the Old World where the fires of persecution had been raging. One source of help was the discovery of the New World which drew attention of some of the most bitter persecutors and also opened up a new place of refuge for the oppressed. Also, princes and nations took up the cause of the Reformation and millions rejoiced to see the papal power broken and freedom of worship restored.

But something happens to this new movement. 'but many shall cleave to them with flatteries.' 'Many joined them under false pretenses.' The most dangerous period of any movement is when its success is assured and the great and rich of the earth and the officials of the state together with the masses rush into it because of its popularity. This is what ruined the early church in the third and fourth centuries. The prophecy indicates that Protestantism would succumb to popularity and cease to protest. It would compromise with the world and the Papacy, and finally 'speak as a dragon.' (Rev.13) THE POWER THAT WAS USED BY THE LORD TO WOUND THE PAPAL HIERARCHY WOULD EVENTUALLY BECOME THE PHYSICIAN WHO WOULD HEAL THE WOUND AND RESTORE PAPAL SUPREMACY. Protestantism which was the



prophet of God during the Reformation would become the 'False Prophet' and the spokesman of the dragon at the end of time.

**Verse 35.** Here is a forecast of the martyrdom of some of the leaders of the reformation. But the persecution would be a blessing. It always has been. The church has always been in its purest and most spiritual state during periods of persecution and martyrdom.

'Even in the time of the end.' This is a good way to translate this text. It is a prophecy of the final persecution of God's remnant people which will take place in the last generation or during 'the time of the end.' (Rev. 3:10,11; 6:10,11; 7:9,13,14; 12:17; 13:11-17)

'It is impossible to give any idea of the experience of the people of God who shall be alive upon the earth when celestial glory and a repetition of the persecutions of the past are blended.' 9T 16. 'Romanism in the Old World, and apostate Protestantism in the New, will pursue a similar course toward those who honor all the divine precepts. The people of God will then be plunged into these scenes of affliction and distress described by the prophet as the time of Jacob's trouble.' GC 616.

**NOTE: Daniel 11:29-35 has some parallels. Here is one. The letters to the seven churches in Rev. 2-3. We can apply these churches to different eras in the history of the church. Verses 29-30b would correspond to Pergamum(You did not renounce your faith in me Rev. 2:13), verses 30c-31 to Thyratira(You tolerate that women Jezebel, Rev. 2:20), verses 32-35 to Sardis(you have a reputation of being alive, REv. 3:1). The letter to Pergamum describes the church in the period when Christianity was accepted as a legal religion in the empire. The letter to Thyatira describes the period starting with the establishment of the papacy in a combination of both religious and civil power. And the letter to Sardis describes the period of the Protestant Reformation.**

## Daniel Chapter 11:36-39

The king whose policies are discussed there is said to have to regard for any god at all(vs.37). And yet he honors "a god unknown to his fathers"(vs38) and receives help from a "foreign god"(vs. 39). How can any god be simultaneously honored and disregarded? But this paradox is fundamental to the passage. The king's aloofness toward all higher authority is in itself precisely what honors the "foreign god."

Daniel 11:36 begins with a formula that has been used before in the book of Daniel "and the king will do as he pleases." Persia, 8:4; Greece, 11:3; Pagan Rome, 11:16; Papal Rome, 11:36. Each new occurrence of the formula makes a new statement and has reference to a different historical entity.

"The king" tells us that, whoever this is, he has been introduced before. It is not a new king. It is the same king that was talked about in vss. 29-35. There is no gap between verses 35 and 36. the events of vss. 29-35 were to continue "until the time of the end"(vs. 35). The king "will do as he pleases"(cs. 36) throughout vss 36-39 until we come to the "time of the end" in vs. 40. Vss. 29-35 extends "until the time of the end"(vs. 35) and vs. 40 begins at the time of the end. Vss. 36-39 go back over the same ground as vss. 29-35, showing us the same period of time from a different point of view. In the present case the angel speaks in two sections (vss. 29-35, 36-39) of religious Rome. There is no redundancy but both occur during the same era prior to the 'time of he end."

**Vs. 36c-d.** What the "time of the end" is the end of is the "time of wrath." During the "time of the end" the circumstances facing the church are more favorable than before. "The time of the end" begins as the cessation of wrath ends.

The references to gods in vss. 36-39 do not refer to the same deity. The "god of fortresses" is not the "God of gods." This king has his own self-interest in mind. On the one hand the king will "exalt and magnify himself above every god"(vs. 36; Ezek. 36:17) and on the other he delights in the holding of fortresses, in the possession

of power, to the extent of making it for all intents and purposes into a god. The possession of power is what the king idolizes. These texts do not mean that he is an atheist. It means he is self-centered. Nor does the fact that he makes a god out of the possession of power mean that he worships it in an literal sense.

**Vs. 38.** "Instead of him" not "instead of them." And "him" refers back to a deity in verse 37. It refers to "the one desired by women." This is the only one that is grammatically allowable. The king as regards his own public claims worships "the one desired of women"(vs. 37). He does not however, honor "the one desired by women" but does worship him in a religious sense. There is a distinction between worship and honor. The king professes to worship Christ in his capacity as the head of the Christian church on earth. By pursuing a wholly willful and self-centered course of action, however, he deprives Christ of honor. It is the disparity between what the king claims to do and what he does that fills the passage with contradictions, not from the way in which the prophecy was written. One can worship without giving honor. (1 Sam. 2:29-30) Eli correctly professed to worship the Lord, the God of Israel. He is not criticized for his profession, but for the way he carried out his responsibilities. This is how he dishonored the Lord.

But if Christ is dishonored, who is honored? There is a god who is not dishonored by it. Who is this other god? When we read "a god unknown to his fathers he will honor with gold and silver, with precious stones and costly gifts"(vs, 38), we are not reading about a god that the king worships. We are reading about a god that the king honors. This is important. The possession of wealth and power preoccupies the king and this fact is what brings honor to this mysterious god. These things divert his attention from the 'one desired of women.'" It is not necessary for the enemy of Christ to be worshipped in order to be honored. On the contrary, this result is obtained by default whenever Christ is deprived of honor.

Let's see if vs. 39 will hold up to this test. The word "acknowledge" should read "recognize." The difference is one of knowing and, assuming that one knows, admitting the fact. The two concepts are not the same. E.g., Isaac did not recognize Jacob. It is not the case that Isaac knew it was Jacob but refused to acknowledge it.(Gen. 27:23) When Joseph's brothers came to buy grain, Joseph recognized his brothers but he did not acknowledge them(Gen, 42:8) . The willful king does not in any way acknowledge the "god" who delights to see his love of power and wealth and abuses of authority. He might even be horrified at the thought of doing so. And yet he knows in his heart when he does these things that what he is doing is wrong. He is not entirely deceived.

Parallel scriptures relating to vss. 36-39. Isa. 10:13-14; Ezek. 35:13; Jer. 50-51; Ezek. 21,24; Ezek. 27,28. The New Testament writers moved by the Holy Spirit gave them messages that are so clear we wonder if they can really mean what they say. 2 Thess. 2:1-12. I believe Paul had Daniel 11:37 in mind when he wrote 2 Thess. 2:3-4. I guarantee you, Paul was not writing about Antiochus Epiphanes. His villain did not live in the past. Nor was Paul writing about Nero of his day. Verse 4 gives the same characteristics as found in Dan. 11:36. Paul is not saying here that the largely Gentile church he is preaching to in Macedonia would be deluded by a Jewish pretender who sets himself up in the Jerusalem temple during the few years remaining before the Roman armies would destroy it. He is writing to the church about the church. His villain arises from within the church. Acts 20:29-31 say so in these texts also. Both Paul and Daniel had in mind an apostasy among God's people that would occur on an immense scale after Paul's lifetime.

In the book of Revelation we have a different figure but it portrays the same historical realities and has the same things to say about them. Instead of a king of the North we are shown the queen of Babylon(Rev. 17:3-6). Daniel 11:36-39 applies to the Church during the dark ages. The king in these verses is not a single person but a figure representing the leadership of that church.

## **Daniel Chapter 11:40-45**

**Jesus' presence at three different points in the second half of Dan 11 places the entire narrative in perspective and gives us a useful framework for interpreting it. The reference to Christ in Dan 11:22 shows that the middle third of the chapter has its setting in and around the time of the crucifixion during the first century A.D., not in the second century B.C. The reference to Christ in Dan 11:37 tells us that**

the last third of the chapter takes place during the Christian centuries. And the reference to Christ in Dan 12:1 shows that the "time of the end" immediately precedes the second coming.

These are major facts about the prophecy of Dan 11. But after we have located vss. 40-45 in the right era of world history and have done so on the basis of an essentially unbroken line of historical argument, where do we go from there? Is there a method for explaining the passage that is as sound as the one we have used to establish its general timeframe in history? Our resources for interpreting Dan 11:40-45 are more than abundant and that in drawing on them there are clear biblical principles to guide us.

For one thing--and it is a fact so obvious that we might overlook its significance--we have the text of the passage. It has not been lost over time through malice or historical accident.

A second resource is the rest of Scripture--all those parts of it that are not in the passage under review. The recommended approach here is typological. There do not need to be other prophecies saying the same things as Dan 11:40-45 in order to have biblical parallels to work with, although in fact there are such other prophecies. Biblical history is what I have in mind and this has much to teach us concerning biblical prophecy. There is no reason at all why the sacred text cannot be its own interpreter here, just as it is in other passages. A period of history that will be of special interest in this regard is that of the exile, with special reference to Nebuchadnezzar's role in bringing it about. The body of material dealing with Babylon in general and with Nebuchadnezzar in particular is extensive. Literal Babylon figures prominently in the Old Testament and spiritual Babylon is almost equally prominent in the New. All such material is germane to the present discussion.

A third resource is the Spirit of Prophecy. Ellen G. White has given us a surprisingly rich fund of information concerning Dan 11:40-45. This information is not hidden away somewhere in a bundle of unpublished manuscripts but is available in one of her most popular and widely distributed books--one which has been sold by literature evangelists all over the world for more than a century. I say that this fund of information is surprisingly rich because the initial impression one gets from scanning the Comprehensive Index to her writings is that she wrote almost nothing about these or any other verses from Dan 11. She appears to be almost totally silent on this chapter. But on closer examination, six of the last eight chapters of Great Controversy (chaps. 35-40) provide what is tantamount to a verse by-verse and clause-by clause commentary on Dan 11:40-45. And if this is not enough, the contextual strength of these six chapters is further enhanced by their position relative to the rest of her book.

No writer, ancient or modern, has ever given Dan 11:40-45 more attention than Ellen White. And when we have finished pondering this fact, it also means that there is no portion of Scripture to which Ellen White gives more attention than Dan 11:40-45.

Thus, where before we had seen nothing but mysterious language and cryptic allusions and had feared that the only exegesis possible would be based on current events and historical dead reckoning, there is a rich fund of material that can be brought directly to bear on Dan 11:40-45 if we will only acknowledge that it is there and avail ourselves of it. There is no need to invent an interpretation of these verses. The Bible provides one for us. The angel's message to Daniel moves in the broadest current of biblical revelation concerning last events and our conclusions, arrived at on this prior basis, are confirmed at length in the Spirit of Prophecy. There is nothing here that is in any way secret, or hidden, or obscure.

Nor is any of this unimportant. God never speaks aimlessly. The last verses of Dan 11 are intended to prepare us for what lies ahead. The message is therefore simple, practical, and unadorned. The angel has a definite purpose in view and is speaking in order to be understood. If prophecies were men, this one would be John the Baptist. But do not be put off by the simplicity or directness of the material being discussed. It is simple in proportion to our need to understand and direct in proportion to the seriousness of not understanding.

**Verse 40** has the most immediate interest for a reader today because it is the most recognizable from both recent and current events. Its main features are the Southern provocation (which I identify with the rise of scientific secularism) and the Northern response (the opposite counterpart of secularism) carried over into vss. 41-43. These latter verses form a more or less indistinguishable whole.

In vs. 44 there is a distinction between tidings coming to the king (44a) and the king going to the source of the tidings(44b). In vs. 45 the distinction is between the king first establishing himself (45a) and then becoming disestablished by forces outside his control (45b). The dramatic contrast between the king's mild treatment of Egypt on the one hand (vs. 43)--the country that provoked the campaign of vss. 41-43 in the first place--and his extremely harsh treatment of the "beautiful holy mountain" on the other hand (vs. 44) should be carefully noticed.

## **Verse 40**

[a] "At the time of the end the king of the South will engage him in battle, [b] and the king of the North will storm out against him with chariots and cavalry and a great fleet of ships. [c] He will invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood." (Dan 11:40)

There are three clauses in Dan 11:40 (a, b, and c). In the first clause the king of the South attacks the king of the North. In the second clause the king of the North responds by setting out to attack the king of the South. This is the beginning of the king's last campaign. And in the third clause we have a preview of his march through other countries en route to Egypt, the territory historically associated with the king of the South.

More details of this march are given in vss. 41-43.

**Discussion.** The same things were revealed to John in Rev 13:1-3 as to Daniel in Dan 11:40-45. John begins by saying, "And I saw a beast coming out of the sea" (Rev 13:1).

Later we will return to the similarity between John's symbols and those of Daniel. Here, however, notice that, "One of the heads of the beast seemed to have had a fatal wound, but the fatal wound had been healed. The whole world was astonished and followed the beast" (Rev 13:3). The two passages merit comparison. In the first clause of Dan 11:40 the above wound is inflicted. In the second clause it is healed. And in the third clause we have a beforehand overview of those events which would astonish the whole world and cause it to start following the beast again once it had recovered from its wound.

The three clauses of Dan 11:40 and the three clauses of Rev 13:3 are exactly parallel to each other. See the text exhibit below.

## Text Exhibit

<b>Dan 11:40</b>	<b>Rev 13:3</b>
<p>"At the time of the end the king of the South will engage him in battle,</p> <p>and the king of the North will storm out against him with chariots and cavalry and a great fleet of ships.</p> <p>He will invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood."</p>	<p>One of the heads of the beast seemed to have had a fatal wound,</p> <p>but the fatal wound had been healed.</p> <p>The whole world was astonished and followed the beast.</p>

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Verse 41**

"He shall come into the glorious land. And tens of thousands shall fall, but these shall be delivered out of his hand: Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites." (Dan 11:41, RSV)

**Discussion.** In the NIV rendering, "many countries will fall," the word "countries" is supplied. (The word ba arasot, is used in vs. 42, but not vs. 41.)

Those who hold that the king of the North in Dan 11:40-45 is Russia assume that Russia will come down from the north and attack Israel. More than this, they assume that the resulting battle will be Armageddon. I submit that alongside the real Armageddon a conflict such as the one futurists envision would deserve little mention. Even granting the use of atomic weapons, it would still be just a human war. The passage has no such scenario in view, nor is history currently moving in that direction. Throughout Dan 11 the opponent of the king of the North is the king of the South. The king of the North is fighting the king of the South here--or will as soon as he gets where he can. Throughout the chapter God's people have been caught in the middle of this recurring North/South conflict. But they have never been its primary focus. Nor are they the primary focus of the king's attack in vss. 41-43. In vss. 44-45 they will be, but that comes later and represents part of a dramatic change in policy on the king's part, as we shall see.

### **Verse 42**

"He will extend his power over many countries; Egypt will not escape." (Dan 11:42)

The expression, " Egypt will not escape, " is of special interest--not because it contains any unusual words but because it is considered necessary to make such a statement at all. Why does the angel assure Daniel on this occasion that " Egypt will not escape"? One reason might be that under Nebuchadnezzar--the only king of the North of which Daniel could have had any personal knowledge--Egypt did indeed appear to escape. Jeremiah had prophesied that Nebuchadnezzar would attack Egypt (see Jer 43:8-13) and eventually he did, but the issue was less decisive than one might expect on the basis of Jeremiah's prophecy. In Dan 11:42 Egypt is completely and thoroughly overrun.

## Verse 43

"He will gain control of the treasures of gold and silver and all the riches of Egypt, with the Libyans and Nubians in submission" (Dan 11:43)

The king not only sweeps down into Egypt but marches through its length and breadth. Egypt had no neighbors on the east (the Red Sea) or the north (the Mediterranean). In antiquity the term "Lybia" was used very broadly to denote the area nearest to Egypt on the west and "Nubia" (lit., "Cush") was the area nearest to Egypt on the south. Thus, the king masters not only Egypt but the territory surrounding it on every available side.<sup>19</sup> There is nothing more to conquer. This fact distinguishes the last king of the North from Nebuchadnezzar. And there is no one to take away his victory before it is fully consolidated. This fact distinguishes the last king of the North from Antiochus.

Notice that in Dan 11:41-43 Egypt is not attacked as an afterthought on a campaign otherwise directed against the " Beautiful Land " (vs. 41). On the contrary, " the Beautiful Land " is attacked as part of a campaign otherwise directed against Egypt. This is a significant fact. One of the most obvious facts about Dan 11 is that the king of the North fights the king of the South. God's people are not the king of the South. They are not the primary object of this attack by the king of the North in vss. 41-43. In vss. 44-45 the king's priorities do undergo a change. He retraces his steps and at that point, having defeated all else, the " beautiful holy mountain " becomes his primary objective. Until then the " beautiful holy mountain " is not his primary objective.

## Verse 44

"But reports from the east and the north will alarm him, and he will set out in a great rage to destroy and annihilate many." (Dan 11:44)

Notice that the reports which provoke such responses come from " the east and the north " (vs. 44). This is the only verse of the Bible where two direction terms are brought together in the above manner. Notice that the king is in Egypt when the reports arrive. So " the north and the east " must mean north and east from Egypt. That is one thing to consider. Another is that there are either two sets of reports corresponding to the two directions they come from (the Mediterranean [north] and the Red Sea [east]?) or there is one set of reports and the two terms refer jointly to one direction on the compass.

With these alternatives in mind, notice that wherever the reports come from, the place where the king goes in response to them is Jerusalem--" the beautiful holy mountain " (vs. 44, lit. "mountain of the beauty of holiness"). It is also a fact that Jerusalem is northeast from the only part of Egypt where the king could lead his army back to it--the narrow strip of land separating the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. Thus, using context to elucidate syntax, we conclude that the expression " the north and the east " should be taken together to mean "northeast."

As the king retraces his steps from his newly conquered territory in the South, he is not in good humor. After experiencing an initial flush of terror he flies into an uncontrollable rage and sets out " to destroy and annihilate many " (vs. 44). This represents a distinct change. Recall that the king of the North made no effort to harm the Egyptians in vs. 43 but merely availed himself of their wealth.

There are a number of contrasts between vss. 40-43 and 44-45. One of them has been mentioned. Notice also that the direction of the campaign was originally from North to South. Now, we have a campaign in the opposite direction--from South to North. He cannot march due north because that would take him into the sea but must angle eastward as well in order to get to Jerusalem, where there is word of lingering resistance.

Just as the Jews were put under a decree of universal extermination during Esther's time, God's people find this part of history repeating itself in Dan 11:44. And just as God wished to lead Israel into full possession of the land of promise during the time of Joshua, the king of the North now wishes to lead his hosts into full and unchallenged possession of the earth. So here we can add exodus imagery to the exile imagery already

mentioned.

## **Verse 45**

"He will pitch his royal tents between the sea and the beautiful holy mountain. Yet he will come to his end, and no one will help him." (Dan 11:45, margin)

At this point in the narrative the king leads his campaign from the South northward in an assault on the "beautiful holy mountain" (Dan 11:45) where God rules. There is a question what makes this particular mountain "beautiful"; there is also a question what makes it "holy."

It would seem incredible if it were necessary to prove to enlightened Seventh-day Adventists that Jerusalem, today, could not possibly be designated by the Lord "the glorious holy mountain": "the sacred hill so fair" (Moffatt's Translation). The prophecy does not state that Jerusalem which was anciently "holy" will be where the king of the north comes to his end. The prophecy refers to that which will be glorious and holy at the time the king of the north comes to his end. In the prophecy of Dan. 8 and 9, 70 weeks, or 490 years, were allotted to the Jewish nation and to "the holy city" (Dan. 9:24). At the expiration of that period, the Jews and Jerusalem were rejected as the people and city of God.

In Dan 11:45 the king of the North plants his "royal tents" either "between the sea and the beautiful holy mountain" (margin) or "between the seas at the beautiful holy mountain". The marginal reading "sea," represents an alternative rendering of the English rather than an alternative reading of the Hebrew. According to Joyce G. Baldwin, "The word for sea is plural, as in the poetry of Deuteronomy 33:19 and Judges 5:17, but the meaning is the Mediterranean." If the word yammim is taken in a plural sense ("seas"), the seas in question would be the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. In any event the place where the king pitches his "royal tents" is around Jerusalem.

Notice that the angel prefaced his narrative in vs. 1 with the words, "(And in the first year of Darius the Mede, I took my stand to support and protect him.)" He now brings this section of it to a close that stands in direct contrast with his earlier statement: "Yet he will come to his end, and no one will help him" (vs. 45).<sup>39</sup> In this respect the narrative has come full circle. This is ironic in view of the religious claims made so prominently by the king of the North in vss. 36-39. The last king should be closer than any other to the source of divine aid.

**The best argument against interpreting the passage literally is a consistently literal interpretation. If there is no room in the angel's language for figures, symbols, types, or whatever, the king of the North does his fighting now--in the twentieth century, during the "time of the end"--with "chariots and cavalry" as well as "a great fleet of ships" (vs. 40). He can be impeded by a body of water the size of the Dead Sea. His attack is survived by Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites--peoples who no longer exist (see vs. 41). And the object of his final attack is not "Israel" but "the beautiful holy mountain" (vs. 44), located in "the Beautiful Land" (vs. 41) This is literalism.**

Reading "chariots" and understanding "tanks" is not literalism but merely a different form of figurative usage. Reading "Moab" (or "Edom," or "Ammon") and understanding those words to mean "Jordan" falls in the same category. (What the angel says is "Ammon," not "Amman.") No one fights with chariots any more. There is no country--at least none with membership in the United Nations--called "The Beautiful Land." And indeed, no one denies these facts. But that is my point. No one--no dispensationalist no matter how committed he may be to literalism in principle--interprets Dan 11:40-45 literally. So there is nothing unusual in my adopting a position that is similar to theirs in at least in this one respect. The real question is not whether to interpret in some non-literal manner but how to achieve trustworthy results.

**There is no need to look elsewhere for Old Testament parallels to the last king of the North in Dan 11 until we have looked in Dan 11 itself. The most fundamental (and therefore most easily overlooked) fact about the king of the North in vss. 40-45 is that he is a king of the North--not the first one but the last.**

**There have been others before. Who were they? And before we answer that question, Who is this king of the North?**

I believe that the kings of the North in Dan 11 represents different historical entities over time. This does not mean, however, that their number is made up of a list of individual kings. The last third of the chapter refers to religious Rome (iron mixed with clay in Dan 2), the middle third to secular Rome (iron alone), the first third to Greece (brass), and at the beginning of the chapter Persia (silver) is also mentioned. In view of these facts I suggest that we expand the scope of what we mean by a king of the North to include more than those individuals who are said to occupy such a role in Dan 11:6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 40, and 44. The individuals in question only qualify as kings of the North because they represent one of Daniel's world empires.

The various kings of the North, starting with vs. 5, all consider Egypt their foremost enemy. The whole narrative framework for this prophecy is built around the idea that there are kings of the North who fight kings of the South. So we can study the various kings of the North by examining each one's relationship to Egypt. This much concerns vss. 40-43.

**But the kings of the North and kings of the South are not the only characters present in Dan 11. If it were not for their impact on the people of God, not one of these kings or kingdoms would be mentioned anywhere in Scripture. So another way to study the kings of the North, in their successive manifestations through history, is in relation to God's people. This relationship becomes especially significant in vss. 44-45.**

We will consider each of Daniel's world empires in relation to Egypt. Babylon tried to conquer Egypt but did not succeed. Persia conquered Egypt and ruled it from Persia by means of satraps. The Greeks (Macedonians) conquered Egypt and ruled it from Egypt under circumstances that closely resembled those of a native dynasty. Under Rome Egypt lost its separate identity as a nation and became--until the Arab conquests--the personal possession of Augustus and his successors.

Table 3 compares successive kings of the North as they related to the worship of God and to His people.

**Table 3 HOW SUCCESSIVE KINGS OF THE NORTH RELATED TO THE WORSHIP AND PEOPLE OF GOD**

Empire	Temple	People
Babylon . . .	Destroyed	Exiled
Persia . . .	Rebuilt	Massacred
Greece . . .	Desecrated	Massacred
Rome (phase 1)	Destroyed	Exiled
Rome (phase 2)	"Thrown down"	"Given over"

Tables 4 gives a summary of the prophetic world empires.

**Table 4 SUMMARY OF PROPHEPIC WORLD EMPIRES IN DANIEL**

Empire	Identity	Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8	Dan 11
1 . . .	Babylon	Gold	Lion	---	---
2 . . .	Medo-	Silver	Bear	Ram	2



	Persia				
3 . . .	Greece	Bronze	Leopard	Goat	3-15
4a . . .	Rome part 1	Iron	Beast	---	16-28
4b . . .	Rome part 2	Iron/Clay	Horn	Horn	29-39
4b . . .	Rome part 2	Iron/Clay	Judgment	Sanctuary	40a
4b . . .	Rome part 2	Iron/Clay	Horn	---	40b-45

**In view of all the other rich biblical insights we have received from the Holy Spirit through Ellen White, one aches to discover some lost manuscript or other form of instruction that had been previously overlooked, which would give us detailed instruction concerning the events at the end of Daniel's last prophecy.**

**I would here like to announce just such a discovery. It does not fall within the category of lost manuscripts--far from that--but in the present context it has indeed been previously overlooked. What I am talking about is six of the last eight chapters of Great Controversy. I do not mean that in some general sense the two sources discuss a similar topic. I mean that verse by verse and clause by clause they discuss identically the same things and should be brought together as text and commentary. See table 4.**

**Table 5 CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN VERSES OF DAN 11 AND CHAPTERS OF THE GREAT CONTROVERSY**

Dan 11	Great Controversy		
	Chap	Title	Pages
40b . . .	35	Liberty of Conscience Threatened	563-81
40c . . .	36	The Impending Conflict	582-92
41-43 .	37	The Scriptures a Safeguard	593-602
44a . .	38	The Final Warning	603-12
44b . . .	39	The Time of Trouble	613-34
45 . . .	40	God s People Delivered	635-52

There is ample material to inform and constrain our interpretation of Dan 11:40-45. Such material comes from both the Old and New Testaments and is confirmed by the Spirit of Prophecy. It is not enough to accept them separately. They are talking about the same things and should be allowed to speak with one voice.

**The first king of the North is Nebuchadnezzar, that the four world empires of Daniel should be studied from the viewpoint of their increasing dominance over Egypt as well as their varied opposition to God's people, and that chaps. 35-40 of Great Controversy provide a verse-by-verse and clause-by-clause commentary on Dan 11:40-45.**

The claim made here which will be most subject to discussion is that the last verses of Dan 11 are illuminated in detail by the last chapters of Great Controversy.

I associate the revival of the papacy and other forms of politically militant religion in Great Controversy chap. 35 with the Northern resurgence of Dan 11:40b, which in Rev 13:3 is described as the healing of a fatal wound. Chapter 36 shows what point of Scripture is most at issue in the ensuing conflict (the Sabbath), thus providing an overview of what would follow similar to that found in vs. 40c.

Chapter 37 corresponds to vss. 41-43 and reveals the basis on which some would stand and others fall as the king marches through (personal Bible study).

Chapter 38 describes the message growing out of that study which so infuriates the king (vs. 44a, the loud cry). He responds violently in chap. 39 (vs. 44b, the time of trouble).

In chap. 40 the persistent rejection of his authority over that of God by a small minority leads to a death decree against them (vs. 45), similar in many ways to the one in Esther 3:8-15. Christ does not lead a vast army of angels back to the earth for no purpose but because if He did not do so the lives of His people would be forfeited. The response is proportional to the threat.

Below I summarize these and other themes for further study. They are not confined to just one of Ellen White's books but permeate her writings. We are dealing with familiar themes here that have been discussed separately for some time. They have been drawn into lists and mapped onto time by any number of students. But to my knowledge they have not previously been related to Dan 11:40-45. See table 5.

**Table 6 GREAT CONTROVERSY THEMES FOR FURTHER STUDY**

Dan 11	Great Controversy	
<p><b>Verse 40a</b> "At the time of the end the king of the South will engage him in battle, . . . . .</p> <p>Fatal wound inflicted Secularization of science and society</p>	-----	Rev. 13:3 One of the heads of the beast seemed to have had a fatal wound,
<p><b>Verse 40b</b> and the king of the North will storm out against him with chariots and cavalry and a great fleet of ships. . . . .</p> <p>Fatal wound healed Revival of politically militant religion (Catholic and Protestant)</p>	<p><b>Chap.35</b> <b>Liberty of Conscience Threatened</b></p>	Rev. 13:3 but the fatal wound had been healed.
<p><b>Verse 40c</b> He will invade many countries and sweep through them like a flood." . . . . .</p> <p>The three-fold union (the above plus spiritualism) The Sabbath (main point at issue in what lies ahead)</p>	<p><b>Chap. 36</b> <b>The Impending Conflict</b></p>	Rev. 13:3 The whole world was astonished and followed the beast.
<p><b>Verses 41-43</b> . . . . .</p> <p>The shaking The sealing The basis for both in individual Bible study</p>	<p><b>Chap. 37</b> <b>The Scriptures a Safeguard</b></p>	Rev 16:16
<p><b>Verse 44a</b> . . . . .</p> <p>The latter rain (cause) The loud cry (effect)</p>	<p><b>Chap. 38</b> <b>The Final Warning</b></p>	Rev 18:1-4
<p><b>Verse 44b</b> . . . . .</p> <p>The time of trouble</p>	<p><b>Chap. 39</b> <b>The Time of Trouble</b></p>	
<p><b>Verse 45</b> . . . . .</p> <p>The death decree (see Esth 3:1-15) The second coming</p>	<p><b>Chap. 40</b> <b>God s People Delivered</b></p>	Rev 12:17 Rev 16:12-16 ; Rev 19:11-21

Last events only happen once. There is only one set of them to describe. Thus, if Dan 11:40-45 and Great Controversy chaps. 35-40 both deal with last events, their topic is the same and it is necessary to show how the two accounts relate to each other.

Another potentially controversial matter involves applying the military language of the passage in a nonmilitary way. It might seem that I have spiritualized the prophecy away. But this is not the case. Instead I have developed a typological application of it. A type, by contrast with a symbol, has independent existence. The angel uses types because his words are reminiscent of real men and real events. His use of types is unusual, however, because he does not confine his attention to only one set of past events. No one set could convey the full force of the comparison he has in mind. And so he speaks more allusively in terms that remind us of Nebuchadnezzar's first attack on Jerusalem, of the death decree during the time of Esther, of Antiochus' first Egyptian campaign (along with the massacre perpetrated at Jerusalem on his way back from it), of pagan Rome's destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and of Christian Rome's crusades and inquisitions.

What the angel is saying in all of this is that, having studied the hostilities of Babylon, Persia, Greece, pagan Rome, and Christian Rome against His people, they provide only a frame of reference. Last events themselves will take place on a scale larger than anything that has preceded them. Otherwise those

earlier events would themselves have brought about the end.

The angel's point is not that the same events which happened before would happen again. That is just what he is not saying. Instead they will exceed anything that has gone before and therefore differ from them in some way. I submit that one difference is that, while many of the historical facts mentioned above were military in nature, those that he wishes to teach us about by means of them are not. Instead of a war between this human king and that one we have a war of truly cosmic proportions between Christ and Satan. The issue of which side receives our loyalty and allegiance reverberates into eternity. The contested territory is not a hill or a city but a planet. The thrusts do not involve swords but ideas and beliefs. None of this takes anything away from the types or from the prophecy. If the great controversy between Christ and Satan is what the angel wants to tell us about, what words could he have found that would do this any more effectively than the ones he used?

## DAN Chapter 12:1-3 in Relation to DAN Chapter 11:44-45

The first clause of Dan 12:1, should lead us to ask what time "that time" refers to and also who Michael is.

Who Did Daniel See and Speak With in Dan 10? He spoke with the preexistent Christ. Christ is the Archangel in the sense that He is the Commander over all the angels. The reason why He commands these mighty creatures is that He called them into existence. He is their Creator. Thus, in its fullest sense the term "archangel" (see 1 Thes 4:16; Jude 9) can apply to no one but Christ. Within canonical Scripture the term is used only in the New Testament. The nearest Hebrew equivalent to the Greek term archaggelos is sar-hassaba "the Prince of the host" (Dan 8:11) or, equivalently, sar-seba'-YHWH "commander of the army of the Lord" (Josh 5:14) ("commander of the Lord's army" in vs. 15). Notice that the same Being who calls Himself "'commander of the army of the Lord'" in Josh 5:14~is also called "the Lord" (YHWH) a few verses later in Josh 6:2. Archangel means archon (Ruler) over angels. The name associated with this title is always Michael.

The second question--about time--was discussed briefly when we covered Daniel 11:40-45. There we learned that Michael, or Christ, delivers His people (at the beginning of chap. 12) when their need for deliverance is greatest (at the end of chap. 11). The two chapters overlap in time.

### Repetition in the Book of Daniel

Repetition is characteristic of the book of Daniel generally. In Dan 11, for example, whole sections deal with the same time period. See table 7.

**Table 7 HISTORICAL REPETITION ACROSS BLOCS OF TEXT IN DANIEL 11**

Period	First Bloc	Second Bloc

1. Babylon . . . . .	...	...
2. Persia . . . . .	2-4	...
3. Greece . . . . .	5-15	...
4. Rome 1 . . . . .	16-22	23-28
5. Rome 2a . . . . .	29-35	36-39
6. Southern challenge	40a	...
7. Rome 2b . . . . .	40b-45	12:1-3

The same kind of overlapping or double treatment of a period that we find in Dan 11:16-22 / 23-28 and 29-35 / 36-39 is evident also in Dan 11:40-45 / 12:1-3. Notice that all three of these examples have to do with Rome and that each time the prophecy discusses Rome--in Dan 10-12 and also in Dan 2, 7, and 9--it does so twice.

In this context notice that Ellen White begins chap. 39 ("The Time of Trouble") of her book, The Great Controversy, by quoting Dan 12:1-3. I believe that chap. 39 of Great Controversy corresponds to Dan 11:44b. Is there a conflict in associating Ellen White's chapter entitled "The Time of Trouble" with both passages? Not at all. Doing so merely illustrates the principle of repetition in Daniel. To describe the events of Dan 11:44b is to describe those of Dan 12:1-3. The two passages are substantially the same. They certainly have the same time of application. When Dan 12:1 says, "At that time Michael, . . . , will arise," the reference is to the timeframe of Dan 11:44-45. Thus, it is especially appropriate that Ellen White should use just the quotation she does.

I take Ellen White's use of Dan 12:1-3 at the beginning of her chap. 39 as supporting evidence for the proposed overlap. The claim is not that she uses Dan 12:1-3, therefore the passages must be assumed to overlap, instead I submit that her usage is especially appropriate and significant because Dan 11:44-45 and 12:1-3 can be shown by other evidence to overlap.

## What do the Two Passages Say?

We now examine in more detail the content of the two passages under comparison. What we are really talking about is not all of Dan 11:40-45 (or 40b-45) but the last two verses only. The outline of Dan 11:40-45 is largely determined by three facts: First, at the beginning of the section there is a period during which the king of the South is strong enough to challenge the king of the North (vs. 40a). Second, when the king of the North responds, he sets out from the North marching Southward. Contrary to all expectations, his treatment of Egypt is benign (vss. 40b-43). No one is hurt. The king merely appropriates Egypt's wealth to himself. And third, after achieving his original objective, the king responds to a much smaller challenge behind him from the people of God and sets out from the South to retrace his steps, marching Northward. His treatment of Jerusalem, as the imagery of the passage has it, is extremely severe (vss. 44-45).

The parallel with Dan 12:1-3 does not involve all of Dan 11:40-45 or the entire subsection labeled "Rome 2b" in table 1 (vss. 40b-45) but only that portion which has to do with the king's final attack on spiritual Jerusalem (vss. 44-45). See table 8.

**Table 8 COMPARISON DAN 11:40-45 AND 12:1-3**

Period	First Bloc	Second Bloc
Southern challenge	40a	...
Rome 2b (N/S) ..	40b-43	...
Rome 2b (S/N) ..	44-45	12:1-3

With this much as background, let us consider in greater detail the correspondences between the four clauses of Dan 11:44-45 and the five of Dan 12:1-3. See table 9.

**Table 9 COMPARISON OF DAN 11:44-45 AND 12:1-3**

Dan 11		Dan 12	
Vs.	Topic	Vs.	Topic
44a	Reports come to the king	-	.....
44b	The king sets out to destroy	1a	Michael stands to protect
45a	Royal tents established	1b	Time of trouble
45b	The king comes to his end	1c	God's people delivered
-	.....	2	Resurrection
-	.....	3	Glory

The reports that alarm the king in the first clause of Dan 11:44 are the same as the messages repeated so forcefully in Rev 18:1-3 and particularly the call that follows them in vs. 4: "Come out of her, my people, so that you will not share in her sins, so that you will not receive any of her plagues; . . ." This is the loud cry of the third angel.

When the king, enraged by what he has heard, sets out to destroy earth's last remnant who "keep God's commandments and hold to the testimony of Jesus" (Rev 12:17), Michael stands up. Or rather, when Michael stands up at the end of the judgment, which sat in Dan 7:9-10, the king is allowed for a short time to vent his anger. As the king establishes his royal tents around spiritual Jerusalem, the people of God go through the time of Jacob's trouble. During this time Michael is en route coming to their aid. When He arrives, with all the angel's of heaven "following him, riding on white horses and dressed in fine linen, white and clean" (Rev 19:14), that is the second coming. It is then that earth's last king of the North "will come to his end, and no one will help him" (Dan 11:45). The saints he had thought to annihilate are raised to life and escorted to heaven, where "they will be priests of God and of Christ and will reign with him for a thousand years" (Rev 20:6).

## Discussion

The object of vss. 40-43 is to show that in the end the last king of the North swallows up all who have opposed him (see Dan 7:7). He annexes the territory of the king of the South, together with that of the South's allies or enemies as the case may be, and the countries traditionally serving as buffers between North and South. All people everywhere--with one small but significant exception--are finally gathered under the control of earth's last king of the North. In this regard notice that the only verb used in Rev 16:16 is one which means "to gather" (sunegagen): "Then they gathered [sunegagen] the kings together to the place that in Hebrew is called Armageddon." It is either significant or not that the only verse in the Bible which uses the word "Armageddon" makes no reference to fighting, but rather to the opposite of fighting--i.e., gathering.

The kings who gather in this way unite to oppose the saints, not each other. Although, having once rejected the law of God, it is a small additional step to reject all law whatever and we can be sure that society appears to be crumbling into anarchy under such leadership. The gathering of Dan 11:40b-43 and Rev 16:16 does not imply that those involved will get along any more amicably than they had before. But however this may be, the North with its false religion and the South with its secularity are finally joined. Any differences between opposing God in this way and opposing Him in that way no longer apply. The only distinction which remains at this point is between those who obey God and those who do not, corresponding to the sheep and the goats in Christ's parable (see Matt 25:31-46).

To understand the battle of Armageddon in its biblical rather than popular context, we must understand the nature of the issues being contested. The first battle in the war between "Michael" and "the dragon" (Rev 12:7), i.e., between Christ and Satan, is not named. In Rev 16:16, however, the last battle is called Armageddon. The end of the war must be related to its beginning. We must understand the connection between these two passages or we will not understand either one of them correctly, which implies we will understand both of them incorrectly. And whereas this last battle is named in Rev 16:16 (see vss. 12-16), it is described elsewhere--in Rev 19:11-21. It is imperative that these three passages be studied together.

It is also imperative that Dan 11:44-45 be studied together with 12:1-3 and with the above passages from Revelation. Earth's final battle cannot be joined until both parties to it are present. The one side consists of "the beast and the kings of the earth" (Rev 19:19). They are here already and can gather and oppose Christ in the person of His saints (as in Dan 11:44b / 12:1a and 11:45a / 12:1b), but they cannot fight the battle of Armageddon until the other army arrives. When it does arrive, that is the second coming (as in Dan 11:45b / 12:1c). The result of that encounter is that "the lawless one" will be destroyed "with the splendor of his coming" (2 Thess 2:8). Those who are not destroyed by Christ's splendor, now reflect it in a way they had not before. The narrative of Dan 10-12 ends in 12:3 with the angel's assurance to Daniel that those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever.

## DANIEL 11 AND THE TIME PERIODS IN DANIEL 12

While we are here we will make a few remarks about the rest of Daniel 12.

I believe that the time periods in Daniel 12 are integral parts of the prophecy of Daniel 11 and belong to it.

It is not so unusual to have dates given after the main body of a prophecy in Daniel. At least as far as the apocalyptic portions of the book are concerned, that is where they logically and usually belong. There is a reason for this. The prophet is shown some scenes in vision, of symbolic beasts or whatever. Then the angel interpreter explains to the prophet what he has seen. One cannot "see" dates or time periods, only actions, and then one must be told by some interpreter how long these things will go on or last and when they will stop.

This is the way it is in Dan 7. The prophet was shown a vision, described in vss. 1-14. Then the vision stops

and the explanation begins. This explanation goes through three cycles and the date, which is found in vs. 25, is present in the third and last cycle. In other words, the date was given after the vision and as a matter of fact it was also given toward the end of the explanation.

The same type of thing happens in Dan 8. The vision there covers vss. 1-12. Then after the vision ends Daniel listens to a conversation between two heavenly beings and he hears their dialogue of questions and answers back and forth. It is in the answer to the question of vs. 13 that the time period of vs. 14 is given. Daniel did not see the 2300 days. He overheard two angels talking about them and he heard them talking after the vision had ended. Once again the date comes after the vision.

There is an exception to this rule in Dan 9, but for good reason. The reason is that there is no vision there. The angel Gabriel appears to him there and points him back to the previous vision (Dan 9:23). Thus, what we really have here in Dan 9:24-27 is a continuation, long-delayed, of the explanation of the vision given in Dan 8:1-12. Seventh-day Adventists have long noted and emphasized this connection. Thus, when the prophecy starts right off with a time period in Dan 9:24 it does so as the explanation to a vision, a vision which was given earlier. Once again the location of the time periods can be nicely accounted for on the basis of the present model.

So when we come to the prophecy of Dan 11 and find the dates or times for some of its events given after the main body of the prophecy, this is not unusual for Daniel's writings. It is a standard mode of operation for the interpreting angel, who has been sent to him previously. He is following the same pattern as before.

The second point to notice about the time periods in Dan 12 is that they are inextricably tied to the prophecy of Dan 11 by the words used to express them. The context and even the content of these time periods ties them by means of a very specific vocabulary directly to events described in Dan 11. If linguistics means anything in the study of prophecy, and it must because words are the only way (apart from the vision) to convey thought or communicate propositional truth, then the links forged in the following manner are too tight to be broken. Dan 12 cannot be severed from Dan 11.

## 1260 AND 1290 DAYS

The time period in Dan 12:7 (the three and a half times) explains the persecution of Dan 11:32-35 and the time period in Dan 12:11 (the 1290 days) explains the taking away of the "daily" that is mentioned in Dan 11:31. These time periods in chap. 12 and the corresponding events in chap. 11 cannot be separated. The final date, in Dan 12:12 (1335 days), should also be linked with the above periods, even though it does not time the actions of the king of the North or the little horn. There is a progression from 1260 days (three and a half times) in 12:7, to 1290 days in 12:11, to 1335 days in 12:12. This progression links the three time periods not only to earlier passages but also to each other.

The two main differences between Daniel 11:31 and 12:11 are that the one passage shows who does the things mentioned, while the other shows the time when he does them.

Dan 12:7 (the three and a half times) 1260 Days	explains the persecution of Dan 11:32-35
Dan 12:11 (the 1290 days)	explains the taking away of the "daily" that is mentioned in Dan 11: 31. The one passage shows who does the things mentioned, while the other shows the time when he does them.
Dan 12:12 (1335 days)	They add nothing new but bind together what has already been presented in regard to the 1260 and 1290 days. There is a progression from 1260 days (three and a half times), to 1290 days , to 1335 days. This progression links the three time periods not only to



	earlier passages but also to each other.
--	--

## **The 1335 days**

The angel says nothing more about the 1335 days than to pronounce a blessing on those alive at the end of that period. So parallels such as the ones that link the three and a half times (1260 days) and the 1290 days to events already described in chap. 11 are unavailable. No one has argued, however, that the 1335 days are to be set off from the 1290 days. All schools of interpretation agree at least on this much, that the time periods of chap. 12 must be studied together with each other. Thus, if it can be shown that two of those periods are indissolubly linked to chap. 11, what has really been demonstrated is that the class of passages which includes the two periods in question are so linked. In regard to the third passage no further demonstration is necessary.

One reason why the 1335 days do not have their own set of parallels with Dan 11 may be that they have already been related to earlier passages through their association with the other two time periods. They add nothing new but bind together what has already been presented in regard to the 1260 and 1290 days.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the verbal parallels documented above we have to conclude that Dan 11:31 and 12:11 are talking about the same defilement and that Dan 11:32-35 and 12:7-10 are talking about the same persecution.

Therefore the date for the persecution in Dan 12:7 should be applied to the description of the persecution in Dan 11:32-35 and the date for the taking away of the "daily" in Dan 12:11 should be applied to the description of that event in Dan 11:31. Notice that both events mentioned take place before the time of the end in Dan 11:35b and 40.

The time periods and the events they date cannot in any way be separated from each other.