

Materials for a Paper on Daniel 11:40-45

Frank W. Hardy

Part 1: Introduction

Dan 11:40-45 divides naturally in two parts (vss. 40-43, 44-45), and the first of these also divides in two (vss. 40, 41-43). In vs. 40 the aggressor is the king of the South, whereas in vss. 41-43 and 44-45 the aggressor is the king of the North. In vss. 41-43 the king of the North marches from the North and his opponent is "Egypt"; in vss. 44-45 he marches from the South and his opponent is "the glorious holy mountain."

This division of the text reproduces a sequence we have seen before. In 11:25-28 the king of the North opposes first the king of the South (25-28a), then the holy covenant (28b). And again in 11:29-35 the king of the North opposes first the king of the South (29-30a), then the holy covenant (30b-39). North/South conflict followed by North/covenant conflict is also what we see here, where the term is "the glorious holy mountain," rather than "the holy covenant," but the intent is the same. Both terms reser to God's people. The same North/South then North/covenant sequence of events can be traced in all three passages.

It will be significant for our exegesis that the king is confronting different opponents when he marches from the North (vss. 41-43) and then from the South (vss. 44-45). Confronting different opponents, from different directions, and at different times is widely different from confronting one opponent (Jerusalem) from two directions simultaneously. The idea of a cataclysmic war against Jerusalem in the end time may match one or more popular models, and it may eventually match the events as they occur, but it does not match the text of Dan 11:40-45.

Part 2: The Passage

Dan 11:40-43: Attack and Response Against "Egypt"

The angel's use of prepositions is unusual in Dan 11. In vs. 40, where ESV suggests, "shall come into countries" (vs. 40), the Hebrew *ûbā' ba'arāšôt* is better translated as, "shall come against countries." This same construction occurs four times in the chapter, but ESV gives it an adversarial sense only twice. Thus, in vss. 30 and 42 ESV correctly translates *ûbā' û bô*, "shall come against him," and *wēyīšlah yādô ba'arāšôt*, "shall stretch out his hand against the countries." But in vs. 29 *ûbā' bannegeb* ("and come into the south" ESV) should be, "and come against the South"; and in vs. 41 *ûbā' bē'ereš haššēbî* ("shall come into the glorious land" (ESV) is more correctly, "shall come against the glorious land"). The correct meaning in each case is "against."

Verse 40

Verse 40 contains three metaphors. In the first of these, the king of the South is one animal goring another. In the second, the king of the North is a windstorm. And in the third, the king of the North is an overwhelming flood. Each image is more forceful than the previous one. The first metaphor is used to describe events as they occur, while the second and third are proleptic, giving an overview in advance of events that would occur in vss. 41-43.

First metaphor: animal imagery. The first metaphor above is *yitnaggah 'immô* ("he will butt with him," emphasizing *'immô*; or "he will gore him," emphasizing *yitnaggah*). This example of animal imagery is reminiscent of Dan 8:5-8, where Greece attacks and conquers Persia in the same way that a goat with a prominent horn would attack a ram, entirely defeating his opponent. One difference in 11:40 is that the king of the South does not conquer the king of the North. The latter is injured, but not defeated; just as the king of the North in vs. 29 becomes "afraid" (ESV) or "discouraged" (*w^enik'â*), but not defeated.¹ In both cases we know that the king of the North wins because he is the one who dominates the rest of the section.

The clause *yitnaggah 'immô* contains within it a certain tension. On the one hand, *'immô* ("with him") requires the assumption that two parties are active. On the other, *yitnaggah* requires the assumption that one party is active, because the verb is singular. On this basis I conclude that "gore" is a better translation than "butt." What vs. 40a describes is not a butting match, but a one-sided mauling. The interesting thing about this attack is that it could occur at all, because in vss. 30b-39 the king of the North was the only power in evidence. His power was supreme. But in vs. 40a he is weak and vulnerable. This represents an important change.

Second metaphor: a windstorm. The second metaphor is *w^eyištā 'ēr 'ālāyw* ("will rush upon him like a whirlwind"). Here the comparison is not with animals, but with a windstorm. The idea is one of expanding conflict. What begins as one animal goring another (occupying a few square feet), now broadens in a way that suggests a larger contest (occupying a much broader area).

In vs. 40b, there is a question why the king marches South – at all. There are two possible reasons for this. First, because the attacker is from the South. To fight a Southern king, it is only natural that one would march toward the South. And yet, a second reason is that his opponent is no longer present. Thus, to reach him requires travel. The king of the South leaves the king of the North for dead and returns home. This requires time. The attack occurs in the North at one time, and the response occurs in the South at another time. Otherwise, why would the king of the North have to pass

¹ The situation here is similar to that in vss. 29-30a, where the king of the North "loses heart" (*w^enik'â*), but is not defeated. We know he is not defeated because the rest of the section is about the king of the North; in vss. 30b-35 and 36-39 the king of the South is nowhere mentioned. The power that drops out is not the one that wins, but the one that loses.

through "countries" in order to reach his opponent? If the attack occurs in Northern territory, one would expect the response to occur in Northern territory. But it doesn't.

A notable feature of vss. 41-43 is how many verses are devoted to the king's progress as he marches Southward toward "Egypt." Half the material in the section (three of six verses) describes the process by which the king comes to the South, eventually making himself at home there.

Third metaphor: an overwhelming flood. The third metaphor is *wešāṭap we'ābar* ("shall overflow and pass through"). Here the comparison is not with wind, but with water. Again the conflict expands. A flood is potentially more damaging than a windstorm.

The second metaphor and the third look forward proleptically to the events of vss. 41-43. What begins as a Southern attack, quickly turns into a major Northern offensive, which results in all of "Egypt" being overcome, and now the figure of a flood prefigures the response as it expands and overflows beyond "Egypt" itself to include its near neighbors, "the Libyans and the Cushites" (vs. 43). Overflowing is an appropriate figure with which to describe the king's going beyond "Egypt" into the territory that lies beyond – to the West (Libya) and the South (Cush).

Discussion. The progressive nature of the imagery in vs. 40 is also appropriate as a way of capturing the fact that, while the king is badly wounded and possibly left for dead, he revives and begins mounting a response, and then a still greater response. This is consistent with the idea of going in the first clause of the verse. The king recovers from his wound gradually and progressively. The king sets out (vs. 41), overtakes "Egypt" (vs. 42), and goes beyond it into Libya and Cush (vs. 43). The result of his response to the king of the South is that he conquers everything there is to conquer. Nothing remains outside his control.

Only vs. 40a reports events as they occur. Clauses 40b-d provide a proleptic overview of what would happen later in vss. 41-43 – vs. 40b in a general sense, vss. 40c with specific reference to the king's travel to and entry into "Egypt," and vs. 40d with specific reference to his subsequent expansion into Libya and Cush. The windstorm metaphor of vs. 40b does not apply before the king arrives in "Egypt" in vs. 42. Similarly, in vs. 40c we learn that the king would enter "countries," but he does not actually enter them until vs. 41. Intervening between this prediction and its fulfillment is the flood metaphor of vs. 40d. This metaphor does not apply before the king starts entering countries in vs. 41. It applies only afterward, when he has already entered "Egypt" and then goes beyond it, coming into contact with "the Libyans and the Cushites." Verses 40b-d offer an overview of how things will unfold, but the unfolding takes place in vss. 41-43. When the king is attacked, vs. 40b is not what happens next; it is what happens eventually.

Verses 41-43

The places mentioned in vss. 41-43 come in pairs. The first pair is "the glorious land," and with it, "Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" (vs. 41). In a Babylonian context, before Nebuchadnezzar, the above countries were in Egypt's sphere of influence; after Nebuchadnezzar, they were in Babylon's sphere of influence. In a Greek context, before Panium, Judea, Edom, Moab, and Ammon were in Egypt's sphere of influence; after Panium, they were in Syria's sphere of influence. There is a question which set of historical antecedents Dan 40-45 has in view.²

The second pair of places is "Egypt," and with it, "the Libyans and the Cushites" (vs. 43). No Northern king after Ptolemy I Soter (d. 282) ever conquered Egypt, and certainly not its near neighbors along with it. So while the first pair of places was Northern depending on circumstances, the second pair is consistently and unrelentingly Southern.

Another pairing of clauses is, "but these shall be delivered out of his hand: Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" (vs. 41), "and the land of Egypt shall not escape" (vs. 42). The one group of countries escapes, while "Egypt" does not. The fact that those delivered are mentioned in vs. 41 and those which do not are mentioned in vs. 42, speaks to the idea of a progressively forceful, growing, expanding response.

Nothing is said in vss. 41 and 42 about how "Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" escape, or the process by which "Egypt" fails to escape. We know only the result.³ In vs. 43 the absence of such information is important, because not only is nothing said about violence in the course of Egypt's overthrow; nothing is said about conflict of any kind. "Egypt" shows no awareness that an invasion is taking place. The only information we have is that the king "shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt" (vs. 43a). There is a question who is being taken over by whom.

One contextually reasonable way to understand the relationship between vss. 42-43 is that the angel's words in vs. 43 explain his intent in vs. 42, i.e., "Egypt" falls to the king by reason of his taking over its wealth. Similarly, Libya and Cush fall to the king

² John J. Collins, *Hermeneia: Daniel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), 338-339; John E. Goldingay, *Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 30: *Daniel* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), 305; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *Anchor Bible*, vol. 23: *The Book of Daniel* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 303-304; Tremper Longman III, *NIV Application Commentary: Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 381; Earnest Lucas, *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*, vol. 20: *Daniel* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 290; Carol A. Newsom with Brennan W. Breed, *The Old Testament Library: Daniel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2014), 356-357; C. L. Seow, *Westminster Bible Companion: Daniel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 184; Andrew E. Steinmann, *Concordia Commentary: Daniel* (St Louis, MO: Concordia, 2008), 536. One commentary in my sample applies Dan 11:40-45 to the antichrist, which removes the need for historical precedent: Stephen R. Miller, *New American Commentary*, vol. 18: *Daniel* ([Nashville, TN], Broadman & Holman, 1994, 2001), 309.

³ The word *liplēṭâ* ("escape") is a noun. The idea is that no means of escape would be available for "Egypt."

by reason of his taking over their loyalties. These are the only factors explicitly mentioned in the text.

"Gold and silver." There is a precedent for what vs. 43 says about the king's relationship with wealth. See table 1.

Table 1
Comparison of Dan 11:38 and 11:43

Dan 11:38	Dan 11:43
A god whom his fathers did not know he shall honor with gold and silver [<i>b^ezahab ûb^ekesep</i>],	He shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver [<i>b^emiḥmannê hazzahab ûb^ekesep</i>],
With precious stones [<i>ûb^e'eben y^eqārâ</i>] and costly gifts [<i>ûbah^amūdôt</i>].	And all the precious things [<i>ûb^ekol ḥ^amūdôt miṣrayim</i>] of Egypt.

I suggest that the passages in table 1 represent shared contexts. However, there is a subtle difference between them. On the one hand, the king gives gold and silver to honor what he wants to honor; on the other, he gets gold and silver for himself. One possible explanation for this is that in the second passage he is replenishing his supply of what he had given away in the first passage. In vs. 38 the topic is what the king already has and is lavishing on others, while in vs. 43 it is what he is in the process of recouping to himself. The contrast is between what he gives, and what he gets. Before the wound he has an abundance; afterward, he needs more. The things the king had in the verses before the Southern attack of vs. 40, he is regaining when we see him vs. 43. This fact also is consistent with the idea of a gradual restoration.

It is interesting that the "gold and silver" and the "precious stones and costly gifts [*ûbah^amūdôt*]" of 11:38 are described in an almost entirely spiritual context, while the "gold and silver" and "precious things [*ûb^ekol ḥ^amūdôt miṣrayim*]" of 11:43 are described in an almost entirely military context. This raises the question whether we are to understand the spiritual language of 11:36-39 militarily, or the military language of 11:40-43 spiritually. There is a question what message is being conveyed once we get beyond any outer layers of meaning. The close similarity between 11:38 and 43 does not in itself supply an answer, but does require that we raise the question.

"Glorious land" and "glorious holy mountain." The word "glorious" is used 33 times in the Old Testament, where it refers to YHWH, His name, His deeds, His people, His land, His throne. These things are not glorious because they are what they are; they are glorious because He is what He is. Only four verses of Scripture use the word in other ways.⁴ See table 2.

⁴ See Prov 25:27; Isa 22:18; 28:1, 4.

Table 2
Occurrences of "Glorious" in the Old Testament

YHWH	Exod 15:6, 11; Psa 76:4; 145:5; Isa 3:8
Name	Deut 28:58; 1Chr 29:13; Neh 9:5; Psa 72:19; 145:12
Deeds	Psa 78:4; 90:16; Isa 63:12, 14
People	Psa 45:13; Isa 66:11
Land	Psa 87:3; Isa 4:2; 9:1; 11:10; 60:13; Jer 14:21; 17:12; 48:17; Ezek 20:6, 15; Dan 8:9; 11:16, 41, 45
Throne	Jer 14:21; 17:12

It is true that "the glorious land" refers to literal Judea in vs. 16, but referring to literal Judea by means of this particular term gives the reference spiritual meaning. With few exceptions, when the word "glorious" is used we expect some connection to YHWH. If "the glorious land" is glorious because of Him, that can only mean that the land is not glorious at all. He is not present in rocks and dirt (that is pantheism), but in people by His Holy Spirit. He is present not in their bones and marrow, but in their minds and hearts. Referring to YHWH is therefore not a direct reference, but one involving His relationship with people. This is the sense in which we should understand "the glorious land," whether it refers to literal Judea (vs. 16), or the end time people of God (vs. 41). The same concepts would apply to "the glorious holy mountain" in vs. 45. These are not secular terms.

"Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites." In this set of three terms, the first two could refer to places or people, but with the addition of "the Ammonites," the reference throughout the set can only be to people. If we did not know this intuitively, the plurality of the word would tell us. There was only one land of Ammon, so a reference to the land would be singular. Since this term is plural, it cannot have the land primarily in view. One land, many inhabitants. The problem is, there are no longer any Ammonites.⁵ One could argue that someone in western Jordan might have a lingering Ammonite gene. But this does not give the passage its required sense. By naming these lands, the angel is pointing to the people who inhabited them. At issue is not genes, but national identity, which passed from history some two millennia ago. We can have a reference to literal Ammonites in antiquity, or to spiritual relationships in the end time. Since the passage begins "At the time of the end" (vs. 40), the latter alternative is required. The reference must be to people, and cannot be literal.

Having established this principle with the term "Ammonites," it must be applied to the otherwise ambiguous terms "Edom and Moab." All three terms must be applied comparably, i.e., to people groups, i.e., not literally.

"The Libyans and the Cushites." For ease of exposition we skip forward at this point to vs. 43 and the terms "Libyans" and "Cushites." Libya and Cush both retain their

⁵ There are historical references to the Moabites until the exile (VI BC); to the Ammonites, until the Hellenistic period (perhaps III BC); and to the Edomites, until the destruction of Jerusalem (AD 70). For discussion see the respective articles in John D. Barry, ed., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

national identity in the end time, so here a literal application to Libyan and Cushite people would be possible. But the most flexible term must be compatible with the least flexible, i.e., "the Ammonites." Although a literal application would be possible in the present case, sound exegetical method would indicate not invoking that alternative. "The Libyans and the Cushite" are ancient people groups as seen from an end time point of view. Thus, the terms are ethnonymic and the intended application is not literal.

"Countries." Saying "countries" is a general term in vs. 42, as also in vs. 40. The Hebrew word is *'arāṣōt* ("lands"). Again, our application should be to modern relationships based on ancient people groups.

"Babylon and Egypt." The term "Babylon" is not used in Dan 11, but I include it here because it is the natural counterpart of "Egypt," which does appear in the passage (vss. 42, 43). If there is a context for the term "Egypt" and we do not consider it, any explanation we give will be incomplete. Similarly, the term "Egypt" is not used in Dan 1, but the one passage takes us back to the other. See table ***

Table ***
"Babylon" and "Egypt" in
Dan 1:1 and 11:40-43

	Dan 1:1	Dan 11:40-43
Babylon		Not used
Egypt	Not used	

After Pharaoh Neco marches north and either plants or reinforces the Egyptian garrison at Carchemish (2 Kgs 23:29; 2 Chr 35:22; Jer 40:2), Nebuchadnezzar defeats them there, and defeats the stragglers from Carchemish again at Hamath. He then marches southward down the coast to secure the loyalties of any Egyptian vassal kings north of the Egyptian border and ensure that no Egyptian force remains operative anywhere north of Egypt. The result is that "the king of Egypt did not come again out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken all that belonged to the king of Egypt from the Brook of Egypt to the river Euphrates" (2 Kgs 24:7).

The above statement in 2 Kgs 24 tells us a number of things. First, that before Carchemish Egypt had possessions and dependencies north from Egypt along the coast as far as the Euphrates; second, that after Carchemish Nebuchadnezzar marched south along this same coast as far as "the Brook of Egypt," commonly identified as Wadi el 'Arish, about 25 miles west of the modern Israeli border; and third, that this is the reason why he came south. "As far as the Egyptian border, hostages were taken as pledges to the new regime, among them Daniel and his companions from Judah."⁶

⁶ Donald J. Wiseman, "Babylonia 605-539 B.C.," in John Boardman; I.E.S. Edwards; N.G.L. Hammond; E. Sollberger; C.B.F. Walker, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History: III Part 2: The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and Other States of the Near East, from the Eighth to the Sixth Centuries B.C.*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 229-231.

Just as "king of the south" is the opposite counterpart of "king of the north," so "Egypt" is the opposite counterpart of "Babylon" in the above narrative, which represents the opening scene in the book of Daniel. The factor that makes "the king of the north" the king of the North in Dan 11 is not his relationship with Syria, but his relationship with Babylon. Alexander the Great died in Babylon. The Seleucid empire was born in Babylon, with Seleucus I Nicator (d. 281) ruling his initial satrapy from Babylon. Later the capital was moved to Seleucia on the Tigris (305 BC), and then to Antioch on the Orontes in Syria (300 BC). Babylon was itself Babylon, Medo-Persia conquered Babylon, Alexander died in Babylon, and Seleucus ruled from Babylon. This sequence, however, ends with Greece. Rome does not have an adversarial relationship with Babylon. Instead, it has an identity relationship.

In the New Testament "Babylon" is a code word for secular Rome (1 Pet 5:13), while in Revelation it refers six times to spiritual Rome (Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21). "Babylon" and "Egypt" in Revelation are directly comparable to "king of the north" and "king of the south" in Dan 11:40-45. The only difference between the two sets of terms is that they sound different; their meanings are the same. There is a literal Egypt today, but to apply the term literally in vss. 42 and 43 in the face of all that has just been pointed out would be exegetically inappropriate. The "Egypt" mentioned in Dan 11:42, 43 is the spiritual "Egypt" of Rev 11:8.

Dan 11:44-45: A Message and the King's Attack on "the Glorious Holy Mountain"

Verses 40-43 and 44-45 are separate from each other in some ways. Marching South (40-43) is not the same as marching North (44-45). In the one case, the king's opponent is "Egypt," and everything about the passage speaks of gradual progress; in the other, his power and influence are fully restored and the fact that persecution breaks out again is the proof this has happened. Absent persecution, any recovery the king experiences must be considered incomplete. We speak of the king marching first from the North, then from the South, but this is only one point to notice. The real point is that he attacks first "Egypt," then "the glorious holy mountain."

We have encountered this same sequence in earlier verses: in 11:25-28a (opponent = South) and 28b (opponent = "the holy covenant"); then again in 11:29-30a (opponent = South) and 30b-35/36-39 (opponent = "the holy covenant"). As the pattern unfolds in the final verses, we see the king opposing "Egypt" in vss. 40-43, and "the glorious holy mountain" (a counterpart to "the holy covenant") in vss. 44-45.

In vs. 43, the fact that the king receives Southern submission indicates he has entered Southern territory, including not only "Egypt" but, beyond that, "the Libyans and the Cushites" (vs. 43). Each clause of vs. 40 after the Southern attack offers proleptic insight into what will happen later in vss. 41-43. Now his powers are fully restored and in vss. 44-45 he is the one launching a great Southern attack – but not against his own

former territory. By now the North is his and the South is also his. The attack is not against the North, but against God's people.

"News from the east and the north"

Notice that, not only is "Egypt" West and South from Judea, but Libya and Cush are respectively West (Libya) and South (Cush) from "Egypt." This is where the king is when he hears "news from the east and the north," which means the "news" comes from a location East and North of his current location. The word *šēmū'ôt* is literally "things heard" (pl.), so there is no difference between saying "news," or "messages." The point is that whatever the king hears comes from "the glorious holy mountain." The king's Southern campaign has been wildly successful, but that's over and done. He now retraces his steps in order to locate the exact source of the messages he is hearing.

There is a precedent for what happens next. In vs. 30 the king of the North is the one being attacked and he becomes, first afraid, then angry. Now the same thing happens again, despite the fact that this time he is the attacker. His first response to what he hears is first "alarm," and then "fury." See table 3.

Table 3
Comparison of Dan 11:30 and 11:44

Dan 11:30	Dan 11:44
For ships of Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be afraid and withdraw [<i>wēnik'â</i>], ⁷	But news from the east and the north shall alarm him [<i>yēbah^alūhū</i>],
and shall turn back and be enraged [<i>wēzā'am</i>] and take action against the holy covenant. He shall turn back and pay attention to those who forsake the holy covenant.	and he shall go out with great fury [<i>bēhēmā' gēdōlā</i>] to destroy and devote many to destruction

Just to point out, in vs. 30 there is nothing about withdrawing. The word is *wēnik'â*, which simply means to be afraid. The king of the North is being confronted by a force which has the potential to destroy him, and his first response is fear. In vs. 44 he is responding to something he hears, but the response is the same. He responds initial with "alarm," or fear. Notice the contrast between a literal navy and a formula of words – "messages," "news." The one passage comes to us in a context of literal military activity, the other seems to, but there are differences. If the alarm/rage response can be invoked by a message, that should tell us the king is asserting himself in the realm of

⁷ Just to point out, there is nothing in the word *wēnik'â* about withdrawing; saying "and he shall be afraid" would be entirely adequate. Adding the words "and withdraw" is both gratuitous and misleading. At issue is who wins in vss. 29-30a. The king of the North is clearly the winner. We can know this because the king of the North is the focus of attention throughout the rest of the section. If the king of the South had won, we would be reading about him.

ideas. An army opposes an army; an idea opposes an idea. When we press the parallel between vss. 30 and 44, the main thing to emerge – after all the similarities – is the striking contrast between what is military and what is verbal. This fact is consistent with the idea that in vs. 44 we are not talking about literal military forces.

"The glorious holy mountain"

There is an extended geographical metaphor that runs throughout Dan 11:40-45. In this metaphor, directions have meanings and terms like "the glorious land" (although used literally before in vs. 16) and "the glorious holy mountain" do not lead us to expect a literal interpretation of the passage. Let directions and geographical relationships have their meanings; let us learn from them what we can. But using geographical terms is not the same as requiring that the application be literal.

Consider an example. In vs. 44 we have the intriguing circumstance that a king of the North, who has always before marched from the North, now marches from the South. When he came from his own country, he had nothing more than his own chariots, horsemen, and ships. Now he controls these plus all the wealth of "Egypt" and, over and above these considerable resources, "the Libyans and the Cushites" follow in his train (vs. 43). He has conquered everything there is to conquer – everything a king of the North could have dreamed of – and commands all the forces there are to command. His mastery is complete. He is now a king, not of the North, or the South, but of the world. The imagery is global. Confining the application to literal Egypt, or to literal Libya and literal Cush, would be to confine the angel's intent to a caricature.

"The glorious holy mountain" is coded language for God's people wherever found. Ever since Acts 8 the church has been scattered and has now been taken to almost every country around the circle of the earth. From this I draw that, if terms such as "the glorious land" (vs. 41) and "the glorious holy mountain" (vs. 45) have only local significance, they cannot refer to God's people; if they refer to God's people, as I suggest, they must be universal in scope.

This is night and day difference. Under the first alternative, "the glorious holy mountain" is Jerusalem in literal Israel. There are four quarters in Jerusalem (Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Armenian). So if there is any connection between "the glorious holy mountain" and the end time remnant, that remnant would consist of whoever maintains the shrines located in the Christian quarter, Jews, Muslims, and Armenian Christians. Remember, that the reference is to a place ("the glorious holy mountain"), so under this interpretation, the remnant are those associated with that place. Saying that the battle is local, but the principles are universal, simply means trying to have it both ways. The reference is to a place, or it is not. One problem with interpreting literally is that there is no longer a direct connection between the remnant and Christ (all four quarters of Old Jerusalem are part of the above place). In this paragraph I hope to have demonstrated that accepting a literal interpretation and exploring its implications is one of the best arguments against that position. If we want literal, this is literal.

Emphasizing the importance of a literal place (Jerusalem) raises a question as to how global our interpretation of vss. 40-43, and with them 44-45, should be. This question is best answered by posing another: How global is the second coming? The angel does not come to the second coming suddenly in Dan 12:1, but incrementally over the course of the section. In doing this he is drawing material from earlier verses to build a context for understanding the king's ultimate downfall.

Part 3: Near Context

Daniel

I mention earlier verses. Some of these will be discussed below, with special emphasis on the relationship between the beginning of the book and its end, and on passages which link the immediately preceding section (11:29-39) to the "time, times, and half a time" references of both Dan 7 and Dan 12. Establishing a timeframe for vss. 29-39 is imperative if we wish to understand the words, "At the time of the end" (vs. 40a), and we must get these words right if we wish to have a correct understanding of the rest of the passage (vss. 40b-45).

Dan 11:40-45 / Dan 1:1

The end of the book of Daniel takes us back to chap. 1. The background for chap. 1 is that Pharaoh Neco has sent troops to protect his interests in the Levant and help Assyria protect itself against Babylon, as mentioned above. Neco's forces were garrisoned at Carchemish.⁸ Nebuchadnezzar attacked and defeated the Egyptian garrison there, and then destroyed the stragglers at Hamath.

As for the rest of the Egyptian army which had escaped from the defeat so quickly that no weapon had reached them, in the district of Hamath the Babylonian troops overtook and defeated them so that not a single man escaped to his own country.⁹

This explains why Nebuchadnezzar was in the area of Jerusalem "in the third year of Jehoiakim king of Judah" (Dan 1:1). He had systematically dismantled Egyptian influence all the way south to the Egyptian border, which would include the Philistine cities of Gaza, and then returned to the area of Jerusalem. At about this time, Nebuchadnezzar learned that his father had died, he went to Babylon by the quickest route, and, on rejoining the army, took hostages at Jerusalem. The death of his father

⁸ 2 Kgs 23:29; 2 Chr 35:22; Jer 46:2. Notice especially the last reference: "Concerning the army of Pharaoh Neco, king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates at Carchemish and which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon defeated in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah" (Jer 46:2). Babylonian sources continue the story: "[24] The army of Egypt, which was in Karchemiš, crossed the Euphrates and [25] against the army of Akkad, which was camped in Quramatu, [26] it marched. They pushed the army of Akkad back so that they withdrew," ABC 4 (Late Years of Nabopolassar) - Livius, 24-26.

⁹ ABC 5 (Jerusalem Chronicle) - Livius, obv. 5-7.

and the events that follow argue against reversing the sequence (going first to Jerusalem, then to Gaza). My hypothesis is that he approached the borders of Egypt, then turned back toward Jerusalem. As we compare these events with those described in the final verses of chap. 11, there are similarities and differences, but I wish to emphasize the similarities. This, I believe, is what the angel is doing in the final verses of Dan 11.

In this way Dan 1:1 provides a context for the narrative of 11:40-45. This context includes Pharaoh Neco marching North, Nebuchadnezzar marching South in response, and the first attack on Jerusalem in 605 BC, without which there would be no book of Daniel. The issues raised by comparing the way the book starts with the way it ends are in every way fundamental to our exegesis of Dan 11:40-45.

Dan 11:29-35/36-39 / Dan 7:25

In Dan 7:25 the little horn says proud words ("He shall speak words against the Most High"; 7:25a) and performs violent actions ("and shall wear out the saints of the Most High"; 7:25b). In 11:29-39 the same power, now called the king of the North, attacks God's people violently (30b-35) and utters proud words against God (36-39). If the sequence in Dan 7 is words, then actions (AB); the sequence in Dan 11 is actions, then words (BA), i.e., AB:B'A'. In these two passages the little horn and the king of the North are doing the same things, but in inverse order. And importantly, in Dan 7 all of this takes place within a single bloc of time, identified as "a time, times, and half a time" in the four clause of the verse (7:25d). The proud words of 7:25a occur at the same time as the violent actions of 7:25b. It is my position that the same relationship holds true in Dan 11:29-35/36-39. The king's violent actions and his proud words all occur within one bloc of time, and it is the same bloc in both cases. Verses 36-39 are parallel to 29-35. These two groups of verses follow each other in the sequence of narration, but not historically. Historically they are simultaneous.

The above facts represent an all-important bit of context for the expression "until the time of the end" in vs. 35. As applied – not as narrated – the end of vs. 35 is immediately adjacent to vs. 40. The latter leads on into the time of the end from the moment of history to which the former has brought us. In practical terms, what this means is that "At the time of the end" (vs. 40) does not have the flexibility of referring to any randomly chosen moment within the time of the end, but refers specifically to the beginning of that period in 1798.

Dan 11:35-36 / 12:6-7

There is another reason for associating Dan 11:29-39 with the "time, times, and half a time." The same period is mentioned twice in Daniel (chaps. 7 and 12), and there are textual links within 11:29-39 to both references. The link connecting 11:29-39 back to Dan 7:25 is thematic, while the link connecting 11:35-36 forward to 12:6-7 is verbal. See table 3.

Table 3
Verbal Parallels Linking Dan 11:29-39 with 12:7

11:35	11:36	12:6	12:7
<u>'ad 'ēt qēs</u>		<u>'ad mātay qēs</u>	
<i>kî 'ôd lammô 'ēd</i>	<i>[kî neh^erâšâ ne 'ē'sâtâ]</i>		<i>lammô 'ēd mô 'ēdîm wahhēsî</i>
	<u>nīplā 'ôt</u>	<u>happ^elā 'ôt</u>	
	<i>'ad kâlâ [za'am]</i>	<i>ûk^ekâlôt [nappēs yad 'am qōdeš]</i>	<i>tīklênâ [kol-'ēlleh]</i>

Notice the systematic nature of the above parallels. In terms of which columns are being compared, the pattern is AC, AD; BC, BD – set forth as a mathematician might wish to do it. In this context, notice that vs. 35 is the last verse of the first half section of 11:29-39 (i.e., 29-35), and vs. 36 is the first verse of the last half section of 11:29-39 (i.e., 36-39). Thus, we are not just dealing with two verses here, but with two half sections, which together represent the entire section. The time period is the same in Dan 7:25 as it is in 12:7, and I suggest the timeframe of Dan 11:29-39 is the same as both of these. Dan 11:29-39 describes the king of the North's activity during the "time, times, and half a time" of Dan 7:25 and 12:7.

Discussion

The context for vs. 40a is not just the rest of vs. 40, but the preceding section as a whole. Verse 29 begins, and vs. 35 ends, with the word *lammô 'ēd* ("at the appointed time"), which supports the idea that this is a cohesive bloc of verses. I suggest the first appointed time, in vs. 29, marks the beginning of the three and a half medieval "times" and that the second appointed time, in vs. 35, marks their end.

But the period takes in more than just 11:29-35; it also includes 11:36-39. The cohesion of these subsections is demonstrated by the fact mentioned above that vss. 29-35/36-39 link back to 7:25 and also forward to 12:7. Thus, from two directions we have confirming evidence that 11:29-39 takes place during the three and a half "times" or "days." This fact speaks to two related issues: that vss. 29-39 all takes place within one period, and that the period in question is the "time, times, and half a time."

It is imperative that we understand this set of relationships involving *lammô 'ēd* (vs. 29) and *lammô 'ēd* (vs. 35) as a precondition for understanding the equally close relationship between *'ēt qēs* (vs. 35) and *'ēt qēs* (vs. 40). Verse 40 takes us forward into the time of the end from the moment to which vs. 35 has brought us. It represents, not a mid-point in the time of the end, but specifically the starting point for the time of the end. The great Southern attack occurs in 1798.

Part 4: Far Context

Revelation

Up to this point we have been dealing with the near context for Dan 11:40-45. We now consider the far context, which takes us to the book of Revelation. There are five sets of parallels to discuss: (a) Dan 11:40 / Rev 12-13, 17; (b) Dan 11:42-43 / Rev 11; (c) Dan 11:44 / Rev 13-14, 18; (d) Dan 11:45 and 12:1 / Rev 13-14, 17-19. My position is that we will not understand any of these passages fully until we understand them together. If the Holy Spirit speaks to us here, and speaks to us there, it is still the same Holy Spirit speaking and we must learn to hear all of what He says as though spoken with one voice.

Dan 11:40 / Dan 7; Rev 12-13, 17

The context for the Southern attack on the king of the North in vs. 40a includes more than vs. 40b-d. To see the connection we will have to take a step back.

In Dan 7 there are four separate beasts; in Rev 12, only one, a composite of the four. In Dan 7 the four world empires (Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome) represent five phases of power, with the fourth empire consistently represented twice. In Dan 2 iron is followed by iron mixed with clay; in Dan 7 there is a terrible fourth beast and a little horn; in Dan 8 the term "little horn" is used in two senses (secular, spiritual), and in Dan 11 the term "king of the North" is used in three senses (Greece, secular Rome, spiritual Rome). But my point is that in each chapter the fourth empire comes in two phases. The second of these represents a fifth phase of power.

In Rev 12 John mentions seeing a beast with seven heads and ten horns, "and on his heads seven diadems" (12:3). Whereas in Dan 7 the seven heads are counted as one for Babylon, one for Medo-Persia, four for Greece, and one for Rome, in Rev 12 and 13 the seven heads represent seven phases of power, as these unfold in history. It is no longer significant that the Greek empire divides "toward the four winds" (Dan 8:8) in respect to space; now the focus is on how the Roman empire divides in respect to time, with a secular phase and a spiritual phase, for a total of five. The question is how the five to the seven.

In Rev 13 there are "ten horns and seven heads" (vs. 1), and one of the heads is wounded (vs. 3). Saying that only one of the heads is wounded places the two statements in tension, because if the focus is on time and if the fifth phase of power in Daniel is not interrupted or subdivided in some way, we don't have seven phases of power. Only five. But if the fifth phase is powerful, then wounded, then powerful again, we do have seven phases. Does the wounding of spiritual Rome occupy three separate periods of time (vs. 1), or do the three periods pertain to only one historical power (vs. 3)? We could frame the matter either way, as John does.

The inherent tension between these characterizations is instructive and no part of the text can be set aside, so the tension must remain. Saying the wound heals implies there are three distinct periods of history (before, during, and after the wound); this is the focus of vs. 1. And yet the entire process of wounding and healing pertains to only one historical power (spiritual Rome); this is the focus of vs. 3. I suggest that the seven phases of power mentioned in Rev 12, 13, and 17 are Babylon (#1), Medo-Persia (#2), Greece (#3), secular Rome (#4), spiritual Rome before the wound (#5), spiritual Rome during the wound (#6), and spiritual Rome after the wound (#7).

In Rev 17 nothing is said about the power that receives the wound being the same as the one which recovers from it. If the sixth head represents the wounded state of the power in question, the fifth head precedes that, and the seventh head follows. The focus here is on the successive nature of developments in history. Rev 13 and 17 must be studied together, and these together with Rev 12, because, whereas in Rev 17 the strength, weakness, and renewed strength sequence involves three heads (here we have seven phases of power), in Rev 13 this entire sequence involves only one (here we have five phases, as in Daniel). Both facts are important, but only one can primary receive emphasis at any given time. See table 4.

Table 4
Phases of Power in Dan 2, 7, 8, 11;
Rev 12, 13, 17

	#4	#5	#6	#7
Dan 2	Iron	Iron and clay		
Dan 7	Beast	Little horn		
Dan 8	Little horn (secular)	Little horn (spiritual)		
Dan 11	King of the North (11:16-28)	King of the North (11:29-39)	King of the North (11:40-43)	King of the North (11:44-45)
Rev 12	Unidentified	Unidentified	Unidentified	Unidentified
Rev 13	Fourth	Fifth		
Rev 17	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh

The point of the above symbols is that spiritual Rome would be powerful for a long time ("1,260 days," Rev 12:6; "forty-two months," Rev 13:5; "a time, times, and half a time," Dan 7:25; 12:7; Rev 12:14). It would then be decisively attacked, the wound thus received would appear to be mortal (Dan 11:40, 41-43; Rev 13:3a; 17:8[x2], 11 ["is not"]), but it would heal (Dan 11:44-45; Rev 13:3b; 17:8["is about to rise," "is to come"]). In this model the wounded sea beast of Rev 13:3a corresponds with head #6 in Rev 17, and the restored sea beast of Rev 13:3b represents head #7. While the sea beast is wounded, the earth beast does everything in its power to help it recover. These powers are active (inactive) at the same time and this is what explains the difference between "is" and "is not" in Rev 17:10 and 8[x2], 11 respectively. While the sea beast "is not," the earth beast "is." Then the wound heals.

In Dan 11:40 we are talking about how the wound is inflicted, and in vss. 41-43 the process by which it heals. It heals as the king marches South and makes himself at

home there. In these verses we know that the wound is not fully healed, despite the military sounding language, because he has not yet resumed his earlier persecuting activity. Only when persecuting resumes is the wound fully healed. Healing means recovering the ability to persecute.

In the text of the passage this healing process is illustrated in the contrast between vs. 38 (where the king is giving "gold and silver") and vs. 43 (where he is getting "gold and silver"). In vs. 43 he is still recouping what he had lost previously. He is completing his recovery.

By the time we get to Dan 11:44-45 the king's powers are fully restored. The proof of this is that in these verses he again starts to persecute. What the time of the end is the end of, is persecution. Now it resumes. The king is back to the point where he was before. He is strong in 11:29-39, wounded in vs. 40, and gradually recovers in vss. 41-43. Then in vss. 44-45 he continues persecuting where he had left off previously in vss. 32-35, while exhibiting the attitudes of vss. 36-39. The interim between the persecution of 11:29-39 and the persecution of 11:44-45 is described in 11:40-43. There the king does not persecute. Only here do we not find persecution, and only here do we not find recapitulation. We see recapitulation previously in 11:16-22/23-28 and 29-35/36-39 and will see it again in 11:44-45/12:1. But that is another topic.

Dan 11:42-43 / Rev 11

There is a question whether it is legitimate to apply the term "Egypt" here in the same way as Rev 11:8. More is involved, but Rev 11:8 must be included. Dan 11:42-43 and Rev 11:8 are comparable.

In Dan 1 we see Babylon in conflict with Egypt, and in Dan 11 kings of the North are in conflict with kings of the South. In this equation king of the South = "Egypt" and king of the North = "Babylon." This is the opposition despite the fact that the term "Babylon" is not used in Dan 11:40-45, just as "Egypt" is not used in Dan 1:1. In the New Testament "Babylon" can refer to literal Babylon (Matt 1:11, 12, 17; Acts 7:43), or to secular Rome (1 Pet 5:13), or to spiritual Rome (Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2, 10, 21). Similarly, "Egypt" can mean either literal Egypt (twenty-two references),¹⁰ or spiritual "Egypt" (Rev 11:8). Spiritual "Babylon" is correspondingly opposite to spiritual "Egypt" in Revelation, just as king of the North is correspondingly opposite to king of the South in Dan 11:40-45. Making this connection does not violate any canon of exegetical rigor. On the contrary, missing it would.

Dan 11:44 / Rev 13-14, 18

Here the question is what "news from the east and the north" means. It does not mean the three angels' messages of Rev 14, because that would put the application in the wrong timeframe. The "news" is mentioned, not at the beginning of the time of the

¹⁰ Matt 2:13-15, 19; Acts 2:10; 7:9-12; 15, 17-18, 34, 36, 39, 40; 13:17; Heb 3:16; 8:9; 11:26-27; Jude 5.

end, but in the last moments of history before the end of the passage. Thus, the connection in vs. 44 is not with the first giving of the three angels' messages in Rev 14:6-11, but with the repetition of the second and third messages in Rev 18:2-3 and 4-8 respectively.

Before proceeding, notice that the catalogue of beasts mentioned in Rev 13:1 is drawn from Dan 7:2-8, as discussed above, and that the wording of Rev 13:5-7a is drawn from Dan 7:25. These passages are bound together by a set of one verbal and three thematic parallels. See table 4.

Table 4
Rev 13:5-7a Links Back to Dan 7:25

Dan 7:25	Rev 13:5-7a
He shall speak words against the Most High,	And the beast was given a mouth uttering haughty and blasphemous words , (13:5a)
and they shall be given into his hand for a time, times, and half a time .	and it was allowed to exercise authority for forty-two months . (13:5b)
and shall think to change the times and the law ;	It opened its mouth to utter blasphemies against God, blaspheming his name and his dwelling, that is, those who dwell in heaven. (13:6)
and shall wear out the saints of the Most High,	Also it was allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer them. (13:7a)

We have mentioned that Rev 13:5-7a looks back (to Dan 7:25). At the same time, Rev 13:7b looks forward (to Rev 14:6 and the first giving of the three angels' messages). See table 5.

Table 5
Rev 13:7b Links Forward to Rev 14:6

13:7b	And authority was given it over every tribe and people and language and nation ,	ABCD
14:6	Then I saw another angel flying directly overhead, with an eternal gospel to proclaim to those who dwell on earth, to every nation and tribe and language and people .	DACB

The term "authority" in Rev 13:7b is important. The sea beast has "authority" over "every tribe and people and language and nation" (Rev 13:7b), whereas the three angel's messages are given to "every nation and tribe and language and people" (Rev 14:6). The bolded key terms in table 5 are the same; only the sequence in which they occur is different (ABCD, DACB). The point to notice is that the scope of the beast's authority and the scope of the three angels' messages are the same. But Rev 14 is not the chapter we are dealing with here. In Rev 18 two of the messages are repeated with immense power and this repetition of the messages is what Dan 11:44a has in mind.

The king hears the repeated second and third messages as a direct challenge, and it is. The purpose of these messages is precisely to show the king's followers what

is involved in following him, and to urge them not to do so. The nature of the challenge is that the message pose a direct threat to his authority. This is what they are intended to do. As such, the king is at first alarmed and then filled with rage. He retraces his steps, marching out of the South Northward toward "the glorious holy mountain."

The first angel's message is tied to time ("the hour of his judgment has come") and, for this reason, is not repeated. But the second message is repeated. The first time we hear it the second angel's message says, "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great" (Rev 14:8). Four chapters later the same message is repeated, what it says is: "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great!" (Rev 18:2). The wording is identical. We note that Rev 18:2 is the first verse of 18:2-3.

The third angel's message is also repeated, but instead of repeating the angel's words, what we find is a repetition of his intent. The first time the third message is given it says: "If anyone worships the beast [13:4] and its image [13:14] and receives a mark on his forehead or on his hand [13:16], he also will drink the wine of God's wrath, poured full strength into the cup of his anger" (Rev 14:9-10). And so on. There is a question what this means, and whether its meaning is compatible with the "eternal gospel" (14:6). It sounds more like bad news than good news. But what the third angel's message means is, If you stay in Babylon things will go very badly for you. So don't stay! "Come out of her, my people" (Rev 18:4). Do it now, before it's too late! I love you and don't want bad things for you. Leave! While Rev 18:2 captures the wording of Rev 14:8, Rev 18:4 captures the sense of Rev 14:9-11.

Notice the chronological markers in Rev 18:4-8 and 9-24. In 18:4 and 8 the wording is: "lest you share [*hina mē sugkoinōnēsēte*] in her plagues" (vs. 4; i.e., you have not yet shared them); "her plagues will come [*hēksousin*] in a single day" (vs. 8; i.e., they have not yet come). By contrast, in Rev 18:9-24, the wording is: "for in a single hour your judgment has come [*ēlthen*]" (18:10); "for in a single hour all this wealth has been laid waste [*ērēmōthē*]" (18:17); "for in a single hour she has been laid waste [*ērēmōthē*]" (18:19). In this case the plagues have already fallen. Verses 4-8 describe a time different from that of vs. 9-24. The warning is given while it can still do some good, and only then does what it warns of follow. The above warning is what we have become accustomed to calling the loud cry of the third angel.¹¹

Dan 11:45 and 12:1 / Rev 13-14, 17-19

Here the question is what brings about the king's downfall. He commands all the combined forces of North and South, and yet comes to his end "with none to help him" (vs. 45). Why?

Immediately after Rev 18, a multitude of angels shout, in Rev 19, "Hallelujah! Salvation and glory and power belong to our God, for his judgments are true and just;

¹¹ The term "loud cry" does not occur in the Bible, but is familiar to Seventh-day Adventists. See, e.g., EW 277; 1SG 193; 2SG 223; 2b SG 32, 44, 112; 1T 6, 186, 203, 353, 486; 5T 4, 25; 6T 290, 401; 7T 17; 8T 63, 118; 9T 118, 154; 4SP 422, 424, 429.

for he has judged [*ekrinen*] the great prostitute [17:5] who corrupted the earth with her immorality, and has avenged [*eksedikēsen*] on her the blood of his servants" (Rev 19:1-2). These angels are celebrating the end of the judgment on the harlot (*to krima*, definite article, singular), as promised in 17:1. The earliest verbal parallels pointing forward to this ending point in Rev 19a are found in Rev 4-5. What I draw from this is that the judgment begins in the timeframe of Laodicea.¹²

Next, in Rev 19:5, we hear a voice "from the throne" which speaks of God as "our God." This can refer to no one other than the glorified Christ, which is an extraordinarily important fact to notice, because 19:5 is the first place in the book of Revelation where Christ is actually seated on a throne.¹³ And Rev 19:12 is the first place in the book of Revelation where He is actually wearing a crown ("many diadems"). I suggest the throne He speaks from in Rev 19:5 is not the one He has been sharing with His Father ever since the ascension, but His own. In announcing Jesus' birth, the angel says, "the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David" (Luke 1:32). The throne of His human father is not the same as the throne of His divine Father, and the two thrones are received at different times. He shares the throne of God at the ascension, but only receives the throne of His father David at the end of the judgment. Receiving it is a primary outcome of the judgment: "And to him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom" (Dan 7:14). Here is the broader context for Rev 19:5. And this in turn is the broader context for Dan 12:1.

The reason why we need to understand the timeframe of Rev 19a (including vs. 5) is because of what follows in Rev 19b. We know that Rev 19a is a judgment, because of the language already quoted ("you have judged"). And we know that what we are seeing is the end of this judgment, because the next thing Christ does is mount a white horse and leave, taking all His angel armies of heaven with Him to the earth (19:11, 14). This is a description of "Michael and his angels" (Rev 12:7).

¹² Throne, elders, creatures, multitude in Rev 4-5 corresponds in chiastically inverse order to multitude, elders, creatures, throne in Rev 19a. The sequence is ABCD:D'B'C'A'. It is a mixed chiasm.

¹³ "The most frequent objection to the enthronement ceremony interpretation of Rev 5 is that a number of details, which we might expect to find if it were an enthronement scene, are lacking in Rev 5: for instance, royal symbols such as a crown and the mentioning of the Lamb's enthronement and taking his place on the throne. or even some indication of a change in the Lamb's status.' Despite the clear kingship language that, together with the introductory image (3:21) and the technical terms with regard to the Messianic Davidic king, causes one to conclude that the scene of Rev 4-5 describes the coronation of Christ, I agree that the text is lacking a number of details that one might expect to be included, particularly the rite of anointing and the investment with the crown" (Ranko Stefanovic, "The Background and Meaning of the Sealed Book of Revelation 5" [PhD, Andrews University, 1995], 214). I applaud the author's candor in making this statement, but having done so, Rev 4-5 appears to offer a coronation without a crown and an enthronement without a throne. After a similar statement on p. 224, Stefanovic adds that "it is not until the establishment of the eschatological kingdom that the divine throne becomes the royal prerogative and the ruling seat of Christ (cf. Rev 22:1, 3; cf. 7:17)" (idem, 224; see 215, 225). This observation misses the supremely important fact that Christ is portrayed in Rev 19, not only as occupying a "throne" (19:5, *tou thronou*), but as wearing "many diadems" (19:12, *diadēmata polla*). These things come together, not at the of the millennium, but at the end of the judgment. Giving Christ this throne and these diadems is one reason why there is a judgment (Dan 7:14).

In the language of Rev 19b, for Christ to get from the throne, where He says the words of 19:5, to the place where He mounts the white horse of 19:11, He would have to stand up. This is what Dan 12:1 means when it says, "At that time shall arise Michael." Michael standing up shows one aspect of what is involved in the second coming.

At the same time the king of the North is also getting ready for action, preparing to annihilate the small group on earth who refuse to acknowledge His authority and insist on urging others to reject it. As the king prepares to exercise his immense, and now unchallenged, power over the above group who are now entirely at his mercy, Christ is silently moving toward the earth, with every holy angel there is. This is why there is silence in heaven under the seventh seal in Rev 8:1. No one is there. They are all coming with Michael to the earth to rescue His saints.

Human language being what it is, we have to frame our words in sentences and convey these sentences sequentially. But if the king's wrath and the time of trouble are the same (11:44b / 12:1b), and if the king's downfall and the saints' deliverance are the same (11:45a / 12:1c), it would be reasonable to suggest that Michael rising and the king falling are, if not the same, at least inseparably related (11:45b / 12:1a). This is earth's final battle. The first army is fully assembled. "And he shall pitch his palatial tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain" (11:45a). The king has so many troops they extend out away from the city all the way to the sea. And now the second army arrives, and when it does, the whole contest is over before it begins (Mal 4:1-3; 2 Thess 2:8). The king "shall come to his end, with none to help him" (Dan 11:45b).

Spirit of Prophecy

If Dan 11:40-45 takes place in the end time ("At the time of the end," vs. 40a), it would be reasonable to compare the final verses of Dan 11 with the final chapters of *The Great Controversy*. It is my hypothesis that if Daniel describes last events, and Revelation describes last events, and *Great Controversy* describes last events, they are all describing more or less the same things.

The following comparisons will be based on Dan 11:40b-45 and *Great Controversy* chaps. 35-40. From Dan 11 we omit vs. 40a (the Southern attack), because Ellen White discusses related events so extensively that we would have to include sixteen additional chapters in order to include it. And from *Great Controversy* we omit chaps. 41-42, which would take us beyond the scope of our passage – not beyond 12:1-3, but beyond 11:40b-45.

It will be useful to divide both the verses and the chapters into two groups. The first group of verses and chapters consists of Dan 11:40b-43 (the campaign against the South) and *Great Controversy* chaps. 35-37; the second group of verses and chapters consists of Dan 11:44-45 (the campaign against God's people) and *Great Controversy* chaps. 38-40.

Form of the argument

Our starting assumption will be that Dan 11:40b-43 is a cohesive unit of text, that 11:44-45 is a cohesive unit of text, and the two units correspond to each other. This is group 1. Similarly, we assume at the outset that *Great Controversy* chaps. 35-37 are a cohesive unit of text, that chaps. 38-40 are a cohesive unit of text, and that these two units correspond to each other as well. This is group 2. Building on this foundation, our first hypothesis will be that Dan 11:44-45 maps onto chaps. 38-40 in useful ways (group 2). And our second hypothesis will be that Dan 11:40b-43 maps onto chaps. 35-37 as well (group 1). The first hypothesis will be easier to demonstrate than the second.

In what follows I will call Dan 11 source A and *Great Controversy* source B. Thus, let Dan 11:40b-43 = A1 and Dan 11:44-45 = A2; and let GC 35-37 = B1 and GC 38-40 = B2. See table 5.

Table 5
Dan 11:40b-45 and GC Chaps. 35-40

	Source A	Source B
Group 1	A1 (11:40b-43)	B1 (ch. 35-37)
Group 2	A2 (11:44-45)	B2 (ch. 38-40)

The form of my argument in what follows is that, if A1 corresponds to A2, and if B1 corresponds to B2, and if A2 corresponds to B2, then A1 should correspond to B1. The thing that makes it difficult to compare group A1 verses and group B1 chapters is that Dan 11:40b-43 sounds military, while *Great Controversy* chaps. 35-37 do not. Both describe a conflict that is as real as the air we breathe, but they do this in different ways. At issue is the nature of the relationship between content and style. I suggest that any apparent discrepancies between A1 and B1 follow from the way the material is narrated and have nothing to do with their content. Here are the comparisons. See table 6.

Table 6
Parallels Between Dan 11:40b-45 and
Great Controversy chaps. 35-40

Source A		Source B	
Dan 11	ESV	GC	Chapter Title
Group 1			
40b-d	[B]ut the king of the north shall rush upon him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen, and with many ships. And he shall come into countries and shall overflow and pass through.	35	Liberty of Conscience Threatened
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.	36	The Impending Conflict
42-43	He shall stretch out his hand against the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. ⁴³ He shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt, and the Libyans and the Cushites shall follow in his train.	37	The Scriptures a Safeguard
Group 2			
44a	But news from the east and the north shall alarm him,	38	The Final Warning
44b	[A]nd he shall go out with great fury to destroy and devote many to destruction.	39	The Time of Trouble
45	And he shall pitch his palatial tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain. Yet he shall come to his end, with none to help him.	40	God's People Delivered

There is a clear and straightforward connection between the "news" in vs. 44a and the "warning" of chap. 38. This corresponds to what we have become accustomed to call the "loud cry" of the third angel. Similarly, there is a clear connection between the "fury" in vs. 44b and the "time of trouble" of chap. 39, where the fury corresponds to the king and the trouble corresponds to the saints. And finally, there is a clear connection between the end of the king in vs. 45 and the deliverance of God's people in chap. 40, where the end of the king pertains to the king and the deliverance of God's people pertains to God's people. In some cases (news/warning, fury/trouble, end/deliverance) we are seeing the same events from different perspectives, but the events are clearly the same. This much has to do with group 2 comparisons (A2 = B2).

It requires more insight and more effort to reason from the king passing through countries in vs. 40b to events that will threaten our liberty of conscience in chap. 35; or from thousands falling/being delivered in vs. 41 to the impending conflict of chap. 36; or from the king's ability to inundate both "Egypt" and "the Libyans and the Cushites" in vss. 42-43, to the Scriptures being a safeguard in chap. 37. But the connections are there to see if we will see them. These are group 1 comparisons (A1 = B1). We now discuss each comparison in turn.

Group 1 comparisons

Verse 40b-d / chap. 35. In vs. 40 the Southern attack and the Northern response do not happen at the same time, nor do they happen in the same place. The evidence for this is that in response to the attack the king marches South. He would not have to march anywhere if his attacker were still present. But time has passed, and the attacker is not still present. The attack occurs at one time and place (the North), while the response occurs at another time and another place (the South). The events unfold gradually.

In chap. 35 this time lag gives God's people a period of respite, but Ellen White points out that any respite it affords is temporary. The king will revive, bringing with it a resurgence of earlier abuses. What we see now is not what we will see later.

Verse 41 / chap. 36. In vs. 41, for the king to come into (or against) "the glorious land" implies exerting an influence there. Similarly, when "Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" are delivered, that the king's influence is something others are able to escape. If "the glorious land" is a code word for God's remnant people, what I have just described is not the expected result. The remnant should resist and "Edom and Moab" should succumb. The fact that these expectations are reversed illustrates what we mean by "the shaking," where some are shaken out and others are shaken in. Anciently, the Jews were related to Edom, Moab, and Ammon, so these were literally people with whom the Jews had an affinity. Currently there are no Edomites, or Moabites, or Ammonites, but there are many with whom God's remnant people have a close spiritual affinity.

Recall that the words translated "come into" in vs. 41 can mean "come against." The king exerts an influence among us and it is a hostile influence, which I suggest we should identify as theistic evolution. Ever since Dan 7:25 the king (the "little horn" in Dan 7) has wanted to change the law of God. Theistic evolution lets God create, but not in a short time. Thus, any connection between creation and a formula of words such as, "Let there be light" (Gen 1:3), is broken. This is a major difference, because when we remove the speaking of words from the process of creation, we also remove the Speaker. There is no need for a Speaker if speaking is not part of the process. And the all-important element of time, which gives us the seventh-day Sabbath marking the end of creation week, is also gone. There is no need for a Sabbath if there is no connection between creation and the weekly cycle of seven days. Those who subscribe to theistic evolution among us generally continue keeping the Sabbath, but the reason for keeping it is gone, and so is the connection between the Sabbath and Christ – the One who speaks the words that bring all things into existence (John 1:3; Col 1:15-16 [note the word "For"; Heb 1:2). Sadly, when hardship comes, theological weak spots like these will become evident in the shaking.

In chap. 36 of *Great Controversy* Ellen White points out that a conflict is coming and that the main issue in that conflict will be the law of God. The king will attempt to

limit our freedom to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, so persistence in keeping it will require strong conviction and strong theological reasons. At the same time, many in the world are unaware that keeping the Sabbath is even a desirable goal, much less something God requires. At issue is a choice between right worship and a substitute for right worship. Verse 41 and chap. 36 have considerable significance and immediacy for Seventh-day Adventists today.

Verses 42-43 / chap. 37. In vs. 42-43, the king invades "Egypt" with no detectable resistance. He simply appropriates its wealth and makes himself at home. Important issues are being contested, but this happens in such a way that few realize there is a contest. This is spiritual warfare, but those who are not spiritual have no realization that anything is happening at all. Ellen White, in chap. 37, shows that our only safety in this conflict lies in making ourselves carefully aware of what the issues are and are not through Bible study. Only in this way can we understand what the king is doing. And this is something we must understand in order to remain faithful.

Group 2 comparisons

In vs. 44a/chap. 38, as we become more strongly aware of what the issues are, we realize how much awareness others don't have and start warning them. In vs. 44b/chap. 39 this warning swells to a loud cry. The king hears the message being given to his subjects and becomes alarmed, then furiously angry. He tries to put a stop to what is being said and in vs. 45/chap. 40 this results in the intervention of Michael. The result is that God's people will be delivered and that the king "shall come to his end, with none to help him." The king's falling is directly related to Michael's rising.

We should say just a word about the close connection between Dan 11:44-45 and 12:1. Both passages refer to a time of fury, or of trouble. Fury pertains to the king; trouble pertains to those he tries to silence. In this context the king comes to his end and God's people are delivered. Again, we are seeing things from two points of view. The downfall of the king refers to the king, and the deliverance of the saints refers to the saints. See table 6.

Table 6
Dan 11:44-45 / 12:1

He shall go out with great fury to destroy and devote many to destruction. (11:44)	And there shall be a time of trouble , such as never has been since there was a nation till that time. (12:1b)
Yet he shall come to his end , with none to help him. (11:45)	But at that time your people shall be delivered , everyone whose name shall be found written in the book. (12:1c)

It is in the nature of human language that we form our sentences sequentially. Even if two actions are simultaneous, they must be narrated one after another. In the

present case, the angel first describes the second coming from a human perspective (trouble on earth) and then from a divine perspective (help from heaven). This is an entirely reasonable way to account for the close relationship between 11:44-45 and 12:1. Nor is such an explanation unique within the chapter. Dan 11:44-45 / 12:1 is the chapter's third recapitulation. There are two others (11:16-22 / 23-28; 29-35 / 36-39). Together these three recapitulations take in nearly everything said about Rome in the chapter. Only 11:40-43 is not included. The reason for this omission is that in these verses the king is recovering from his wound. This is where we are in the prophecy now.

The above verses from Dan 11 and chapters from *Great Controversy* are tracing the same closely connected set of last events. The accounts are not narrated in the same way, but they would not need to be. Style is not content. In Dan 11:40-45 only the words are military; the issues are not. The conflict being described involves spiritual, rather than military, warfare.

Part 5: Interpretation

In this paper I have endeavored to examine the text of Dan 11:40-45 in some detail, comparing this with other Scriptures, and comparing Scripture with the Spirit of Prophecy. Forcing the text to go through the full length of this exegetical gauntlet is not optional. At an irreducible minimum we must study the passage in isolation, then in its near context, then in its far context, and end by performing a reality check with the Spirit of Prophecy. In my view, no interpretation which is unable to pass all these hurdles should be considered adequate. We must hear Daniel speak consistently with Daniel, hear Daniel speak consistently with Revelation, and hear both Daniel and Revelation speak consistently with the Spirit of Prophecy. My position is, there is only one voice to hear, so if it appears that there is dissonance among the above sources, we are the ones generating it.

Taking all this together, I suggest that in Dan 11:40-45 the angel offers an extended geographical metaphor, built on themes already present in the rest of the chapter. There are three metaphors in vs. 40 (animal, windstorm, flood), a number of terms referring to people groups that no longer exist in the end time (Edom, Moab, Ammon), terms whose face value meaning is spiritual ("the glorious land," "the glorious holy mountain"), a web of similarities linking "king of the north" to "Babylon" on the one hand (Dan 1) and "king of the south" to "Egypt" on the other (Rev 11), and a likelihood that there is direction symbolism in the fact that the king marches from the South, rather than the North, in vs. 44. All these factors conspire to suggest that the angel's intended hermeneutic is not one of literalism – an impression which only grows deeper when we compare the final verses of Dan 11 with the final chapters of *Great Controversy*.

Below I criticize the idea of interpreting literally and argue in favor of interpreting spiritually. There is a distinction between what is spiritual and what is symbolic, although having said this, it is necessary to clarify that not every trace of symbolism is absent from the chapter. In Dan 11:40a the king of the South gores the king of the North. This

contest is similar to the one between Persia and Greece as described in Dan 8:4-8. If describing a king as a horned animal is symbolic in Dan 8, there is a question why we would have to use a different term when encountering the same type of description in Dan 11. Kings do not have horns. This fact raises the important and demonstrable point that Dan 11 is not monolithically literal.

Interpreting Literally

It is not just that vs. 40 contains three metaphors. The entire passage, with its North/South imagery, is an extended geographical metaphor. The terms "glorious land" and "glorious holy mountain" are terms of spiritual intent, which must be interpreted in the context of such other similar expressions as "Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites" (vs. 41), and, "the Libyans and the Cushites" (vs. 43), referencing people groups some of which no longer exist. "Egypt" occurs in vss. 42, 43; "Babylon" does not. But Babylon is the opposite counterpart of Egypt in chap. 1, just as king of the North is the opposite counterpart of king of the South in chap. 11. The opposite between Syria and Egypt is a false dichotomy. Historically, Syria is where the Seleucid capital went when it was moved away from Babylon.

In Dan 8:4-8 a goat attacks a ram, killing it with a prominent horn. In Dan 11:40a the king of the South gores the king of the North – with what? Literal kings do not have horns, but symbolic representations of kings do. In both cases personal conflict is represented by animal conflict. If this is symbolism in the one case, what shall we call it in the other? In Rev 11 we read about "the city that symbolically is called Sodom and Egypt" (vs. 8), and this end time power is symbolic. The text says so. In Dan 11:42-43 we read about the same end time power (the same term is used, and it applies in the same timeframe), but this time it cannot be symbolic. On what basis? The argument that "Egypt" must be literal because all of Dan 11:40-45 is literal has been weakened by what we just said about *yitnaggah`immô* in vs. 40a.

A number of years ago Hans LaRondelle argued that we should not only study Revelation in the context of Daniel, but Daniel in the context of Revelation.¹⁴ I suggest that LaRondelle was right and that verbal parallels should be given more exegetical weight than our presuppositions about how to interpret them. Parallels are data points. Presuppositions are presuppositions.

Human language is routinely used in extended senses. Only this can account for its ability to talk about things not yet seen or experienced. It's the way language works. Saying something must be interpreted literally because these words or those words were used to describe it, is not an argument. Any term in any language can be given an appropriate extended meaning as required by context. Parallels between Daniel and Revelation represent a contextual level of information.

¹⁴ LaRondelle ***

After some military sounding language in vs. 40b-d and 41, we read that "the land of Egypt shall not escape" (vs. 42). How shall we interpret this statement? We must interpret it in the context of comparable terms in the previous verse. Notice the earlier statement, "but these shall be delivered out of his hand: Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites " (vs. 41). The angel is setting up a contrast. The one group would be delivered, the other not. This fact places the terms of vs. 41 on the same level as those of vss. 42-43. One implication of this is that, if there are constraints on the way we interpret the one group of terms, those same constraints should apply as we interpret the other. Since no literal interpretation of "the Ammonites" is possible in the end time, this fact represents an argument that a literal interpretation of "Egypt" – although possible – is not what the angel intends.

There is another problem. If the king fights with literal "chariots and horsemen, and with many ships" (40b), someone in the South should know this and offer at least token resistance. But there is none, or at least if there is it is not mentioned in the text. What is mentioned is that the king "shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt, and the Libyans and the Cushites shall follow in his train" (vs. 43). It would be contextually reasonable to suggest that vs. 43 explains vs. 42. If so, the sense in which "Egypt" fails to escape is that the king appropriates its wealth. This is not what one would expect in a military invasion.

If, however, the invasion is not military – if the riches of "Egypt" are what an unspiritual world considers valuable – this would include the positions and attitudes which inform its thought. In this case, the king could appropriate the wealth of "Egypt" by adopting Southern points of view. This would be consistent with what was said earlier about theistic evolution and would not be seen as an invasion, but merely a change of attitude on the king's part. In this context, marching from the South in vss. 44-45 takes on new meaning and raises the question who exactly has taken over whom in vss. 41-43.

Making the passage describe a military attack on literal Jerusalem is problematic, for one reason, because at any given time only one army is present. The king marches South, then North. But it is the same king in both cases. There is no second army. The idea that Jerusalem is caught in the middle between opposing forces does not follow from a close reading of the passage.

Interpreting Spiritually

Three times in Dan 11:41-45 the angel depicts widely unequal contests. First, in vs. 40a the king has no defense whatever against a Southern attack. One reason for this is that in 1798, when Berthier abducts Pius VI, only Berthier has an army. Although pope, Pius VI is merely one individual against a powerful French army. Second, "Egypt" has no defense against the Northern response when it comes, because the South is unspiritual and has no ability to so much as identify that spiritual warfare is taking place. And third, the king has no defense whatever against Michael when He stands up and

comes to the earth with all the angels of heaven (Matt 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27; Rev 19:1). The first contest occurs in vs. 40, the second in vss. 41-43, the third in vss. 44-45. On each occasion the contest is hopelessly unequal.

Verses 41-43

When Pius VI leaves Rome and dies in exile some consider the papacy moribund. But one pope loving his personal freedom is not the same as the system coming to an end. Before his death, Pius leaves instructions for the next conclave and the papacy lives on – in reduced circumstances.¹⁵ But things get worse before they get better. In 1870 Garibaldi absorbs the Papal States into a united Italy and the popes are left with no temporal holdings beyond the walls of the Vatican.

From this low point the way back has been long and hard. The concordat with Mussolini in 1929, acknowledging the popes' secular rule over Vatican City was a promise of eventual recovery. In the years since then, a Roman Catholic has served as United States president (John F. Kennedy, 1960-63), and both John Paul II (1979) and Francis I (2015) have addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations.¹⁶ Currently seven out of nine justices on the supreme court are Catholic, and so is the president of the United States (Joe Biden, 2021-24).¹⁷ Things are not now as they were in 1798 or in 1870. But neither is it the case that they are now as they soon will be. The crowds paying handsome admission fees to visit the Vatican's magnificent architecture, sculpture, and art, have no awareness of the church's careful attention to grand strategy, strategy, and tactics, as it seeks to further its global power and influence. This conflict is not military in nature, but it does truly represent spiritual warfare. This much has to do with history.

In regard to the text, a number of factors indicate a period of gradual restoration after the wound. First, when he is attacked in the manner of one animal goring another (vs. 40a), the king responds at the level of a windstorm (vs. 40b) and then at the level of an enormous flood that sweeps everything away before it (vs. 40d). This series of metaphors are arranged in such a way as to depict a growing level of force. Second, while some are able to escape the king's influence in vs. 41, "Egypt" is not able to do so in vs. 42. Less force is exerted in 41, while more is exerted in vs. 42. Third, after invading the land of "Egypt" in vs. 42, the king goes beyond "Egypt" to secure the loyalties of its near neighbors in vs. 43. First "Egypt," then the lands beyond "Egypt."

A fourth factor is that, while the king is in a position to give wealth in vs. 38, in vs. 43 he must replenish his supply of such things. If this is part of the recovery, he is still recovering at the end of vs. 43.

¹⁵ J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford University Press, 1986), s.v. Pius VI.

¹⁶ Francis also gave a pre-recorded address to the General Assembly on September 25, 2020.

¹⁷ Religious identity and Supreme Court justices – a brief history (theconversation.com).

Verses 44-45

When persecution resumes in vs. 44, that shows that the time of healing is over. In vss. 44-45 the king is in full possession of all the power he ever had. In these final verses the king's aggression is not directed against "Egypt" (vss. 41-43), but against "the glorious holy mountain" (vs. 44-45). At this point "shall arise Michael" (12:1) and He comes to the earth with all the holy angels. This is the second coming.

Part 6: Conclusion

As we review our passage, certain familiar terms come to mind: (a) the mortal wound (vs. 40), the shaking (vs. 41), the loud cry (vs. 44a), the time of trouble (vs. 44b), the second coming (vs. 45). To us these are familiar terms, but many do not know them. Most of the king's subjects, in fact, do not know the prophecies and have no idea how to interpret the events taking place around them on every side. When we take our message to the world, this is the message we should take.

There is a message we should not take. God has not given us the task of speculating about another middle eastern war. That kind of message would make the king smile. He would find it amusing. But vs. 44a tells us that one day a very different message will be given. Verse 44a does not tell us what the message says; Rev 18 does that. But we do know, on internal evidence, what results follow from giving it. The result is that the king will become alarmed, and then furious. Alarming and infuriating the king is not our task. We should not go out of our way to be needlessly antagonistic. But what we absolutely must do is tell his subjects, and those under his influence, not to follow him. They need to understand why they should not follow him, and what this has to do with worshipping God as the Creator of heaven and earth.

As this message is given, it will shake some people out, but many will be shaken in. Opposition will be aroused, a time of trouble will follow, and Jesus will come. These are the issues to which we must draw people's attention as we interpret Dan 11:40-45.