

Historical Overview of Dan 11:16-22

Copyright (c) 2004 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

Introduction

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 is nothing innovative in saying that it is also central to Dan 11.¹

Here then is the central claim of the present research--and not of this one paper only. 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.² 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?

Verses 16-19: Jews and the Roman Republic

During the time covered by the middle third of the present prophecy secular Rome was first a republic, then an empire. In both cases Rome came directly into contact with God's people living in Judea.³ Our story concerning secular Rome begins in 168 B.C. One year previously Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-163) had invaded Egypt and at Memphis had himself proclaimed Pharaoh. He was now besieging Alexandria and to all appearances success was within his grasp. It was the end of an era. Soon a century and a half of intermittent warfare

between the Ptolemies and Seleucids would be over. The remaining parts of Alexander's vast empire would be brought under the control of a single authority. These things were all true of course, but for reasons Antiochus did not anticipate. There was another factor to consider.

Rome displaces Greece in the prophecy

"The invader [*habbā' ʿēlāyw*] will do as he pleases; no one will be able to stand against him." (Dan 11:16a)

The formulaic nature of vs. 16a. The opening clause of vs. 16 contains an introductory formula.⁴ The words "he will do as he pleases," with minor variations, occur four different times in the book of Daniel. One example is found in chap. 8 and the three remaining examples are found in chap. 11. See below.

1. He did as he pleased [*w^eʿāsā kiršōnō*] and became great. (Dan 8:4)
2. "Then a mighty king will appear, who will rule with great power and do as he pleases [*w^eʿāsā kiršōnō*]." (Dan 11:3)
3. "The invader will do as he pleases [*w^eyáʿās . . . kiršōnō*]; no one will be able to stand against him." (Dan 11:16a)
4. "The king will do as he pleases [*w^eʿāsā kiršōnō*]." (Dan 11:36)

In Dan 8:4 (example 1) the above formula describes Persia's rise to power over Babylon and certain other countries.⁵ In Dan 11:3 (example 2) it describes how Alexander the Great would earn his title by rapidly defeating Persia. In vs. 16 (example 3) the same formula describes a power comparable to but different from both Persia and Greece and at a time later in history than either of them. Then the discussion shifts from secular matters to religious ones and the "invader" seen first in vs. 16 reemerges in vs. 36 as a religious entity (example 4).

The formula under discussion is a reminder of the four world empire motif found in earlier chapters. It is not carelessly placed within the book. Some variant of the words "he will do as he pleases" describes first Persia (8:4), then Greece (11:3), then secular Rome (11:16), and finally religious Rome (11:36). The formula does not describe Babylon in chaps. 8 or 11; Babylon is not mentioned at all in chaps. 8 or 11. But repeating the formula reemphasizes the world empire motif nonetheless, with its well known and easily recognizable set of parallels.

In this context the assertion that someone "will do as he pleases" is not a random observation. On the contrary it serves to remind us that the world empires in Daniel do not appear randomly but form a clearly defined series. Coming as it does after Persia (vs. 2) and Greece (vss. 3-15) the only part of the series that remains is Rome. Here is the point that Antiochus missed with such unfortunate results. He took only himself into account and did not consider the interest Rome would take in his actions as he attempted to overpower Egypt. We should learn from his failure. There is more to think about here than Antiochus.

The form criticism of Bernhard Hasslberger. Bernhard Hasslberger, in an extensive form critical study of Dan 8 and 10-12, acknowledges that the formula "will do as he pleases" begins a section in vss. 3 and 36 but in vs. 16 it is all but ignored.⁶

In vss. 3 and 36 Hasslberger takes both words (*w^éáśâ* "and he will do", *kiršônô* "as he pleases")⁷ together as jointly making up the formula in question. He refers to a three-fold occurrence of the formula within the chapter and uses the term *Formel* (formula) to describe all three occurrences of it.⁸ In his comments on vs. 16, however, where the subject of the clause comes between *w^éáśâ* (equivalent to *w^éáśâ* elsewhere) and *kiršônô*, the second term is the only one discussed, the word *Umstandsbestimmung* ("adverbial modifier") is used (*kiršônô* "further clarifies and strengthens the verb"),⁹ and vss. 15 and 16 are taken together with no break stronger than a verse number between them. Within his proposed section of vss. 13-21, vs. 16 is the only verse fused in this manner to the one before it.

Although Hasslberger states that one formula occurs three times in Dan 11, in his treatment of vs. 16 the force it might be expected to have--based on the parallels he himself calls to our attention--is entirely lost. This fact is inexplicable and inconsistent. The formulaic expression *w^éáśâ . . . kiršônô* deserves the same emphasis in vs. 16 that *w^éáśâ kiršônô* gets in vss. 3 and 36. The words and syntax are equivalent. Their force is the same. In vs. 16, no less than in vss. 3 and 36, the formula in question must be allowed to indicate a major break in the narrative and start a new section.

First verbal parallel with Dan 9. So far we have discussed the words *w^éáśâ* "and he will do" and *kiršônô* "as he pleases." The subject of the clause, not yet specified, appears between the two words which describe his activity (*habbā^ʔ ʔēlāyw* "the one who comes toward him"). In NIV the corresponding English words ("The invader") are moved to the beginning of the sentence to accommodate the rules of English grammar. Thus, "The invader will do as he pleases; . . ." The word *habbā^ʔ* occurs also in chap. 9, in a passage closely parallel to the present one.

"After the sixty-two 'weeks,' the Anointed One will be cut off and will have nothing. The people of the ruler who will come [*nāgîd habbā^ʔ*] will destroy the city and the sanctuary." (Dan 9:26, margin)

The "Anointed One," or Messiah, can only be Christ.¹⁰ And if this is the case, "the ruler who will come" can only be Rome. In A.D. 31 Pontius Pilate crucified Christ (vs. 26a) and in A.D. 70 Titus destroyed the city where He had been crucified (vs. 26b). The word *habbā^ʔ* (lit., "the coming one, the comer, the one who comes") provides an important verbal link between Dan 11:16 and Dan 9:26. Daniel's series of four world empires begins with Babylon (Dan 2:38). It continues with "Media and Persia" together (Dan 8:20) and then with "Greece" (Dan 8:21). There is no direct identification of the last world empire in chap. 11 or in chap. 9, but this is what we would expect in light of the enigmatic nature of the terrible fourth beast in chap. 7. On the basis of similarities such as these among chapters I submit that the "invader" (*habbā^ʔ ʔēlāyw*) in 11:16 and the "ruler who will come" (*nāgîd habbā^ʔ*) in 9:26 are one and the same. The reference in both cases is to secular Rome.

One other point which needs to be clarified here is that I do not claim Dan 11:16a is proleptic. It does not specifically look forward to a future time but applies generally to the entire period of Roman dominance. In the context of vs. 16a we are dealing with events a century and

a half before Christ's birth. Dan 9:26, on the other hand, speaks of Christ's death and events that would occur after that. Thus, proposing that *habbāʾ* in Dan 9:26 and 11:16a are closely parallel requires explanation. If they are parallel, why are the settings different? But notice that the word linking the two verses in question is not a predicate, which would normally give some indication of tense, but a substantive. The word *habbāʾ* answers the question who. It does not answer the question when. Rome is the power that would come toward or against God's people next after Greece. It is generally the case that after the political collapse of Hellenism Rome would have the power to do as it pleased. Thus, Rome would order Antiochus out of Egypt, crucify the promised Messiah, and destroy Jerusalem. The above actions would be performed at different times, but the point is that the one performing them would be the same in each case.

Gaius Popilius Laenas removes Antiochus from Egypt. We now consider the circumstances which led to Antiochus' confrontation with Rome during what appeared otherwise to be a highly successful invasion of Egypt.

With Syria subdued twenty years earlier and Egypt virtually a Roman protectorate, the final defeat of Macedon in 168 B.C. established beyond question Roman domination of the eastern half of the Mediterranean, as the wars with Carthage had previously established it in the western half. Nothing illustrates this fact in sharper relief than the famous story of the circle of Popilius Laenas, given below. This event, which occurred a few weeks after the defeat of the Macedonians at Pydna, understandably enjoyed a great vogue among the Romans (cf. Livy XLV.xii).¹¹

The story of Antiochus and Laenas is now quoted from Polybius, using the Loeb edition, however, instead of quoting further from Lewis and Reinhold.

At the time when Antiochus approached Ptolemy and meant to occupy Pelusium, Caius Popilius Laenas, the Roman commander, on Antiochus greeting him from a distance and then holding out his hand, handed to the king, as he had it by him, the copy of the senatus-consultum, and told him to read it first, not thinking it proper, as it seems to me, to make the conventional sign of friendship before he knew if the intentions of him who was greeting him were friendly or hostile. But when the king, after reading it, said he would like to communicate with his friends about this intelligence, Popilius acted in a manner which was thought to be offensive and exceedingly arrogant. He was carrying a stick cut from a vine, and with this he drew a circle round Antiochus and told him he must remain inside this circle until he gave his decision about the contents of the letter. The king was astonished at this authoritative proceeding, but, after a few moments' hesitation, said he would do all that the Romans demanded. Upon this Popilius and his suite all grasped him by the hand and greeted him warmly. The letter ordered him to put an end at once to the war with Ptolemy. So, as a fixed number of days were allowed to him, he led his army back to Syria, deeply hurt and complaining indeed, but yielding to circumstances for the present.¹²

This is more than an entertaining story. After Alexander's death (331 B.C.) his empire went through a period of turbulence. An understanding of sorts was worked out among his generals at Triparadeisos in 323 B.C. by which Cassander (son of Antipater) would rule in Greece and Macedonia, Lysimachus in Thrace, and Ptolemy in Egypt, Judea, Phoenicia, and Syria. Antigonus would get all the rest--Anatolia and most of the east. Seleucus at this time was isolated in Babylon. After a breakdown of these terms there was more fighting and then another agreement in 311 B.C.

By its terms Cassander was confirmed in Macedon as regent of Alexander IV until the boy came of age in B.C. 305, Ptolemy in Egypt as before, Lysimachus in a greatly enlarged Thracian satrapy, and Antigonus in central Anatolia, Syria- Phoenicia and Mesopotamia. In theory the eastern satrapies were his as well, but he never occupied them, and Seleucus reigned guardedly but undispossessed in Babylon.¹³

Lysimachus and Seleucus finally joined forces to rid themselves of Antigonus (Ipsus, 301) and as a result there were four more or less clearly recognizable divisions of the empire, with "Cassander in Greece, Lysimachus in Anatolia, Ptolemy in Egypt, and Seleucus in Asia"¹⁴ This was the state of affairs prophesied in Dan 11:4. Later Seleucus removed Lysimachus from Anatolia (Corupedion, 281) and came very close to taking Thrace as well. After this one might say there were three parts to Alexander's former empire--Greece, Asia, and Egypt.

Let us now approach the same point from another direction. In 190 B.C. Rome evicted Antiochus III the Great from Thrace, which he was then attempting to claim, and from all of Anatolia as well (Magnesia, 190). Next Rome broke the power of the Macedonian homeland (Pydna, 168). Later that same year Rome ordered Antiochus IV out of Egypt, thus claiming the role of protector of Egypt. The list has a familiar ring: Thrace, Anatolia, Macedonia, Egypt. Syria would not be annexed for another century, but the pattern is clear. We should neither under interpret nor over interpret these events. Rome was beginning the long process of displacing Greece in the eastern Mediterranean. These events in turn are a sequel to what Rome had already done in the western Mediterranean by systematically destroying the power of Carthage.

The great Carthaginian wars of the previous century did not directly affect God's people. Neither did Antiochus III's defeat in Anatolia, or Rome's victory over Macedonia at Pydna. But when Antiochus IV was removed from Egypt he came back livid with rage, and he came back through Judea. This fact did directly affect God's people. The outrages he performed on his way provoked resistance, the resistance provoked reprisals, and Antiochus' reprisals were so extreme that they brought about a full scale holy war for the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem.

The mission of Laenas to Antiochus in Egypt must be understood in the above context. It is a significant event in Jewish history. When the angel says, "no one will be able to stand against him" (Dan 11:16a), that is a general statement about a very broadly based state of affairs but it is forcefully illustrated by the manner in which Laenas was able to remove Antiochus from Egypt with nothing more than a word.

Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus enters Judea
in 63 B.C.

"He will establish himself in the Beautiful Land and will have the power to destroy it." (Dan 11:16b)

A gradual process. The establishment of Rome in the Beautiful Land of Judea (or Palestine) had a beginning and an end. There was a time before which Rome had no part or interest in Judea. And there was a time after which Rome had reduced Jerusalem to piles of shapeless rubble and thus fulfilled Christ's sorrowful prediction: "I tell you the truth, not one

stone here will be left on another; every one will be thrown down" (Matt 24:2). The influence of this foreign state would be introduced in some way, grow, come to full maturity, and eventually crush out all hope of Jewish national existence. If this is so, we must ask where the process began.

There is an identifiable starting point in history where Jews first came into relationship with Romans. Judas Maccabeus made a formal request for a treaty of mutual friendship and it was duly ratified by the Roman senate in 161 B.C.¹⁵ It is important to remember that the initiators of this treaty were Jewish, not Roman. But of course ratifying a treaty with a country is not the same as establishing oneself there. So the above treaty cannot be said to fulfill Dan 11:16b.

Pompey in Judea. The stage in the development of Judeo-Roman relationships that vs. 16b has in view comes a century later when Pompey enters the country. There are two facts about Pompey's involvement with Judea that must be appreciated in order to understand what the prophecy is saying about these events. First, Pompey was invited by Jews to intervene in Jewish affairs. As Smallwood points out, "the civil war in progress provided 'a god-sent opportunity' for intervention in a country which the annexation of Syria inevitably brought into the orbit of Roman influence."¹⁶ It may have been inevitable that Pompey would march through Judea.¹⁷ But in actual fact he was invited to intervene and when he did so he was acting at the request of Jewish leaders, although with results they did not foresee. And second, Pompey did not annex Judea. It is true that he annexed Syria and that Judea was placed under Syrian protection at this time, but Judea itself was not annexed. This is an important point. Annexation would not come until later.

Just as Judea had requested that Rome enter a formal diplomatic relationship with it some one hundred years before, it was now specifically and urgently requested that Romans act to settle a dispute involving Jewish domestic politics. It is a recurring motif--part of a curious and tragic symbiosis between Jews and Romans in Dan 11--and one that we will see again.¹⁸

The cause of the problem initially was that the Hasmonean king Alexander Jannaeus died in 67 B.C. leaving two sons. Hyrcanus II had been high priest since 76 B.C. and on his father's death became king as well. That was as it should be because he was the heir. But his brother Aristobulus II was the more aggressive of the two and was better fitted to rule. There was a battle near Jericho, Aristobulus won, and he subsequently had himself proclaimed both king and high priest.

It was an arrangement that could have lasted except for the intervention of Antipater, Herod's father. Under Antipater's prompting Hyrcanus took his case to Aretas, king of the Nabatean Arabs, who defeated Aristobulus in battle and besieged him in the temple fortress at Jerusalem.

Marcus Aemilianus Scaurus preceded Pompey into Syria while the latter was still campaigning in Armenia, probably in 65 B.C. He then hurried on to Judea. While he was there both Hyrcanus and Aristobulus placed their cases for the succession before him. Scaurus, after the usual bribe, decided for Aristobulus and ordered Aretas to raise the siege. Aretas did so. Again Aristobulus appeared to be the winner, and again Antipater would not let matters rest.

Pompey himself reached Damascus in the spring of 63 B.C. As he in turn continued on toward Judea, Antipater met him and urged the claims of Hyrcanus on his attention. Aristobulus also sent representatives. But this time there would be no immediate decision. Pompey was

preoccupied with plans for his upcoming Nabatean campaign and had time to wait for events to develop in Jerusalem. When Aristobulus alarmed Pompey by his later actions he was ordered to turn over all his strongholds. He was unable to refuse and promised, among other things, to allow Pompey inside Jerusalem. Aulus Gabinius was sent with a few men to take over the city, but when he arrived Aristobulus' supporters barred the gates and refused to let him in.

Pompey therefore arrested Aristobulus and made preparations to besiege the Jewish capital. Hyrcanus's supporters let the Romans inside the city walls, but the forces of Aristobulus occupied the temple precincts and prepared to withstand a siege. The Romans, who had brought the necessary siege machines from Tyre, now began the siege, which was terminated three months later, in July 63 BC. It is said that 12,000 Jews were killed in the operation, in addition to those taken prisoner. Pompey and some officers went inside the sanctuary itself, but apparently no plundering of the temple treasures took place. Pompey is credited with encouraging the priesthood to resume the temple cultus as soon as possible.¹⁹

Judea not yet annexed. Upon leaving the region Pompey gave Syria the responsibility of overseeing affairs in Judea. It is important to realize that this was a patron/client relationship and not one of direct administration. Syria and Judea were both under Pompey's patronage. He could do what he chose with either. In the actual event he chose to annex Syria. But he did not annex Judea. This fact has not received equal emphasis from all writers on the subject. McCullough, for example, states that, "In 64 BC what was left of Seleucid Syria had become the Roman province of Syria, and Judea was now made part of this province, whose legate (governor) was Scaurus."²⁰ Peters makes a similar statement, which also requires qualification.

Judaea was now incorporated into the eastern defensive system. Hyrcanus was confirmed as High Priest; no more is heard of Antipater for the immediate present. Aristobulus was carried off to Rome with his family (a son, Alexander, escaped en route) to grace Pompey's triumph. The territories of Judaea were added to Syria so that what, in effect, remained was the temple state of Jerusalem, ruled by a High Priest and under the close supervision of the Proprætors, subsequently the Proconsuls, of Syria. The first of these was Scaurus himself (B.C. 62-59).²¹

Pompey removed some Judean possessions, it is true, but Jerusalem was still ruled by a high priest. And what remained would still be ruled by kings reigning in Jerusalem. Herod was a king and he reigned in Jerusalem. So if Roman occupation was already complete half a century before Christ, why do we read nothing of Herod answering to a Roman governor for his actions when he murdered all the male children "in Bethlehem and its vicinity who were two years old and younger" (Matt 2:16)? There is a reason why Herod did not answer to the Roman governor in Jerusalem. There was no governor. On the other hand, when Christ was brought before Pilate at a later time He was not extradited to Syria for that purpose. Sometime between 4 B.C. and A.D. 31 a Roman governor had been installed at Jerusalem. This represents a significant change.

Jewish efforts to shake off Seleucid control finally succeeded in 141, but after eighty years of independence, due mainly to the weakness of Syria, Palestine came under Roman control, partial from 63 B.C. and complete from A.D. 6.²²

Thus, Pompey's settlement occupies middle ground between the earlier noninvolvement and eventual total control. It is by Pompey's actions that Rome "will establish himself in the

Beautiful Land and will have [but not exercise] the power to destroy it" (Dan 11:16b). But not until the next clause do we read that, "He will determine to come with the might of his entire kingdom" (Dan 11:17a). This later determination does not concern us yet. But the point is that whatever degree of foreign involvement we find in vs. 16b, vs. 17a asserts that there would be more. Pompey's work was transitional in nature.

Second verbal parallel with Dan 9. The Hebrew phrase *w^ekālâ b^eyādô* "and destruction in his hand" uses a word that occurs earlier in chap. 9.

"He will confirm a covenant with many for one 'week,' but in the middle of that 'week' he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And one who causes desolation will come on the wings of abominations, until the end [*w^ead-kālâ*] that is decreed is poured out on him." (Dan 9:27, margin)

In Dan 9:27 *w^ead-kālâ* is translated "until the end." In Dan 11:16b *w^ekālâ b^eyādô* is translated "and will have the power to destroy it." The word in both cases is the same. Both passages share a similar context. Rome in Dan 11:16b has just reached a middle stage of involvement in Judean affairs and the prophet points out that concealed within that involvement is a potential for utter disaster. The end ("consummation," KJV) has to do with Jerusalem; the things decreed are poured out on the one that brings Jerusalem to an end. Neither would escape.

Prolepsis in vs. 17

"He will determine to come with the might of his entire kingdom and will make an alliance with the king of the South. And he will give him a daughter in marriage in order to overthrow the kingdom [*l^ehašhîṭāh*], but his plans will not succeed or help him." (Dan 11:17)

"He shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and he shall bring terms of peace and perform them. He shall give him the daughter of women to destroy the kingdom; but it shall not stand or be to his advantage." (Dan 11:17, RSV)

In an earlier paper I argued that there is one proleptic statement at the end of vs. 16 and another at the end of vs. 17.²³ I would now prefer to say that all of vs. 17 is proleptic. The angel arranges his material topically. This is an extremely important fact about the chapter. In the present case, while vs. 16b brings us to a point of intermediate Roman involvement and ends with the phrase *w^ekālâ b^eyādô* "and destruction in his hand," vs. 17 continues the same thought, breaking sequence with what must follow in order to do so.

Judea becomes part of the Roman Empire. When Herod died in 4 B.C. a delegation of Jews was sent to Augustus and urged him to abolish the monarchy altogether, allowing Judea to function as an "independent" state under direct Roman protection. No action was taken on this request at the time, but in A.D. 6 Augustus annexed Judea and the Jewish homeland became part of the Roman Empire.

At [Herod's] death the country exploded in revolt. His son Archelaus who succeeded him as king was maintained in power only with the greatest difficulty by Varus, the Augustan legate in Syria, while deputations of Jews went to Augustus and swore they would rather have a Roman governor than Archelaus. So it was to be. After propping up Archelaus for nearly ten years, Augustus

finally sent him off to exile in Gaul in A.D. 6, and Quirinius, the new legate in Syria, annexed Judaea to his own province. The Equestrian Coponius was sent out as its resident Procurator. Two of Herod's other sons continued to hold territory, though not royal titles, inherited from their father-Philip in Trachonitis (between Genesareth and Damascus) and Antipas in Galilee and Peraea east of the Jordan.²⁴

This was the third time that Jews had officially invited Romans to become more closely involved in their affairs. Once again the Jews got what they themselves had asked for and again the results were not what they intended. In my view this fact, which has received virtually no emphasis in the literature, is captured insightfully at the end of the first clause of vs. 17. The narrating angel considered it important.

The verse begins: *w^eyāsēm pānāyw lābō² b^tōqep kol-malkûtô* "And he will determine [lit., set his face] to come with the might of his entire kingdom" (vs. 17a). This much should be clear. The difficulty has to do with the next two words: *wīšārîm ʿimmô*. NIV suggests "and will make an alliance with the king of the South." The king of the South is nowhere to be seen in vs. 17, or anywhere else in vss. 16-22.²⁵ A literal gloss would be, "and upright ones (or things) with him."

The word here glossed "upright ones" could also be "upright things," i.e., the terms or conditions of an agreement, hence an alliance. NIV adopts the latter sense and assumes that the king of the South is a cosignator. In this case *ʿimmô* "with him" would refer to the party the alliance was imposed on (A entered an alliance "with" B) instead of the one imposing it (A brought "with" him the terms for an alliance imposed on B). But the text does not say "king of the South," nor does it say "alliance." All this is conjecture. What the text does say is *wīšārîm ʿimmô* "and upright ones (or things) with him." There are thirty-one other examples of *y^ešārîm* "upright ones (things)" in the Old Testament in the plural absolute. All but five of these refer to persons.²⁶ Thus, in the absence of clear contextual evidence to the contrary, "upright ones" must be preferred over "upright things" as a gloss for this word in Dan 11:17.

The clause ends with the word *w^eʿāsâ* "and he will do." Here and elsewhere in Dan 11 this expression means, "and he will do successfully," i.e., "he will succeed at doing."²⁷ It is important to bear in mind as we say this that Rome's goals were different from those the Jews had. Their interests did not correspond. We return to this point below.

In the present model if *wīšārîm* is glossed "and upright ones," the reference would be to those who were alarmed at the evil behavior of Archelaus and who appealed to Rome in hopes of gaining relief from it.²⁸ It is peculiar that the Jews most concerned for the well being of their country and most offended by the despicable conduct of Herod's successor would invite the very subjection to Rome that would eventually destroy them. Roman involvement in Judaea was something the Jews themselves had asked for—officially and on three separate occasions.²⁹ This is not an interpretation but a statement of fact. My interpretation is that Dan 11 captures the full irony of the situation.

Overview of Judeo-Roman relationships. The last part of vs. 17 is highly structured. There are four clauses. And again at two points it would be possible to give alternative glosses:

1. *ûbat hannāšîm yitten lô*
and he will give him the daughter of women
2. *l^ehašhîtāh*
to ruin her (or it [the kingdom])
3. *w^elō^ʔ ta^amōd*
and she (or it) will not stand
4. *w^elō^ʔ lô tihyeh*
and she (or it) will not be his (or be for him)

The question in vs. 17b is how to interpret the reference to a "daughter of women" and also the "ruin" that would befall her. The woman could be literal and the ruin figurative, or the woman could be figurative and the ruin literal. It is not possible to take both literally or necessary to take both figuratively. I suggest that the woman is a symbol for the Jewish people. Her ruin is the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the events that would follow that during the next century under Hadrian.

The four clauses of Dan 11:17b are arranged chiastically below. These clauses occur in the order A B B' A' but their significance is best understood when they are read back in the order A A' B B'. Thus, in addition to simply parsing the clauses ("and he will give him the daughter of women" [A], "to ruin her" [B], "and she will not stand" [B'], "and she will not be his" [A']), one should compare the first clause ("and he will give him the daughter of women" [A]) with the fourth ("she will not be his" [A']) and the second ("to ruin her" [B]) with the third ("and she will not stand" [B']). See table 1.

Table 1
Chiastic Arrangement of Clauses
in Vs. 17

First Part		Second Part	
B	<i>l^ehašhîtāh</i> to ruin her	<i>w^elō^ʔ ta^amōd</i> and she will not stand	B'
A	<i>ûbat hannāšîm yitten lô</i> and he will give him the daughter of women	<i>w^elō^ʔ lô tihyeh</i> and she will not be his	A'

There are some broader comparisons to make as well. The words *w^elō^ʔ ta^amōd* "and she will not stand" (vs. 17b) should be taken together with a similar clause in vs. 16b (*w^eya^amōd b^eéreš hašš^ebî* "and he will stand in the Beautiful Land") and *w^elō^ʔ lô tihyeh* "and she will not be his" (vs. 17b) should be compared with vs. 17a *w^eyāsēm pānāyw lābô^ʔ b^etōqep kol-malkûtô* "and he will set his face to come with the might of all his kingdom"). Thus, "and she will not stand" corresponds to "and he will stand in the Beautiful Land," while the words "and he will give him the daughter of women" correspond to "and she will not be his." He will stand (vs. 16b), but she will not stand (vs. 17b). He will take her (vs. 17a), but she will not be his (vs. 17b). Judea would not allow God to possess her (Matt 23:37-39; Luke 13:34-35; 19:41-44) and she would not allow Rome to do so either. Rather than belong to anyone she would cease to exist. And this is what happened, as the history of the period so tragically demonstrates.

Third verbal parallel with Dan 9. Clause B of table 1 says *l'hašhîṭāh*, lit. "to ruin her." The same root is used in a similar context elsewhere: "The people of the ruler who will come will destroy [*yašhîṭ*] the city and the sanctuary" (Dan 9:26). This is the third verbal parallel between Dan 11:16 or 17 on the one hand and Dan 9:26 or 27 on the other. This concentration of parallel words in passages of similar contextual meaning cannot be a coincidence. The destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is the topic in Dan 9:26 and I submit that it is reasonable to apply the same word in a similar context to the same set of historical facts when we come to Dan 11:17.

On the one hand the object destroyed is "the city and the sanctuary" (Dan 9:26). On the other hand the object destroyed is "the daughter of women" (*bat hannāšîm*). Montgomery calls the latter interpretation absurd, but that is because he is thinking of a literal woman (Cleopatra I).³⁰ Thus, the verse deals with the frustration of a king's plans, not the death of his daughter. If the verse really did have Cleopatra I in view--daughter of Antiochus III the Great (223-187), wife of Ptolemy V Epiphanes (204-180), and mother of both Ptolemy VI Philometor (170-145) and Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (Physcon) (170-116/5)--or some other historic individual, then of course Montgomery would be right. But why is it necessary to think that the verbal action must be metaphorical and the woman literal? It would make equally good sense to argue that the verbal action is literal and the woman metaphorical. Thus, at the outset Montgomery's solution is not the only one available. And I think it will be easier to find biblical parallels for the sort of interpretation I propose than for his. How many other passages in the Old Testament talk about Cleopatra I, if in fact this one does? By contrast, how many passages use a woman as the basis for a metaphor involving God's people? Without attempting to answer this larger question, consider one example.

The word of the Lord came to me: (16) "Son of man, with one blow I am about to take away from you the delight of your eyes. Yet do not lament or weep or shed any tears. (17) Groan quietly; do not mourn for the dead. Keep your turban fastened and your sandals on your feet; do not cover the lower part of your face or eat the customary food of mourners."

(18) So I spoke to the people in the morning, and in the evening my wife died. The next morning I did as I had been commanded.

(19) Then the people asked me, "Won't you tell us what these things have to do with us?"

(20) So I said to them, "The word of the Lord came to me: (21) Say to the house of Israel, 'This is what the Sovereign Lord says: I am about to desecrate my sanctuary--the stronghold in which you take pride, the delight of your eyes, the object of your affection. The sons and daughters you left behind will fall by the sword. (22) And you will do as I have done. You will not cover the lower part of your face or eat the customary food of mourners. (23) You will keep your turbans on your heads and your sandals on your feet. You will not mourn or weep but will waste away because of your sins and groan among yourselves. (24) Ezekiel will be a sign to you; you will do just as he has done. When this happens, you will know that I am the Sovereign Lord.'" (Ezek 24:15-24)

In Ezek 24 the city of Jerusalem and its temple are the counterpart to Ezekiel's wife in the illustration. The city of Jerusalem was the Jews' "stronghold, their joy and glory, the delight of their eyes, their heart's desire" (Ezek 24:25). Elsewhere the figure of a husband and wife is frequently used to illustrate the relationship between God's people and Himself (Jer 2:2; 3:1-2, 8, 14, 19-20; Ezek 16:8, 32; Hos 2:16, 19-20). In Dan 11:17 the relationship referred to is not that between God's people and their rightful Lord, or between God's people and their temple. It

is between God's people and a foreign power. But the same principles apply and the symbolic intent of the passage is clear enough.

The relationship between Rome and the Jews was always strained and yet circumstances repeatedly conspired to make it closer. In fact at one point the Jewish leadership would go so far as to say to Pilate, "We have no king but Caesar" (John 19:15). This was a truly frightful statement.

- (3) For the Lord is the great God,
the great King above all gods.
- (4) In his hand are the depths of the earth,
and the mountain peaks belong to him.
- (5) The sea is his, for he made it,
and his hands formed the dry land.
- (6) Come, let us bow down in worship,
let us kneel before the Lord our Maker;
- (7) for he is our God
and we are the people of his pasture,
the flock under his care. (Ps 95:3-7)

"I am the Lord, your Holy One,
Israel's Creator, your King." (Isa 43:15)

"We have no king but Caesar, . . ." I do not think this came out quite like the speakers intended, but I am not putting words in anyone's mouth. That is what they said. Nor have I taken their words out of context. For three years Christ had advanced the claims of a kingship and a kingdom not of this world. The above statement was made by way of rejecting His claims to spiritual authority. They would not have the spiritual authority of Christ; they would have Caesar. So if Caesar was to be their king, what kind of relationship would he have with the Jewish nation?

When the Jews were finally beaten down and driven from their homeland into the already well established diaspora--after fighting viciously against Vespasian, Titus, Trajan, and finally Hadrian--they were like other such groups in certain ways. "In one crucial sense, however, the Jews were different from those other national groups: they were not only unassimilated, they were unassimilable." Assimilation for a Jew was tantamount to apostasy. He would not be dominated and could not be assimilated. If the "daughter of women" (bat hannaš'ām) is another term for the Jewish nation and if vs. 17b refers to the problems Rome would have trying to possess her, then the actual situation is well described by the verse.³¹

Indeed, if the above situation is what the angel had in mind, I do not know how a better illustration of it could be found. The context is one in which the Jews had appealed for Roman friendship and relied on Roman power in a downward spiral that would eventually result in their destruction. They could have trusted God for help in their various situations. A contrast is being developed here and the figure of a woman who would not accept either her husband or her lover conveys this thought with a delicacy appropriate to the symbol and an immediacy appropriate to the historical facts.

More on the parallels with chap. 9. It has been pointed out that there are no fewer than three separate verbal parallels between Dan 9:26-27 and Dan 11:16-17. The first involves the word *habba'* (lit. "the one coming," "the one [who] comes") in vs. 16a. Coming represents a beginning or starting point. This action is in sequence with the verses both before and after it. But the second and third parallels are based on roots meaning to destroy (*w^ekālâ*, "and destruction" [11:16b], *l^ehašhîṭāh*, "to destroy her" [11:17b]) and destruction represents an ending point. The associated actions in this case are not in sequence with what follows, at least not in Dan 11. Instead they break sequence to look forward briefly and point out the end results that would follow from events then taking place. See table 2.

Table 2
Comparison of Dan 11:16-17 With
Dan 9:26-27

Dan 11		Dan 9	
Ref.	Term	Ref	Term
11:16a	<i>habbā'</i>	9:26	<i>habbā'</i>
11:16b	<i>w^ekālâ b^eyādô</i>	9:27	<i>w^ead-kālâ</i>
11:17b	<i>l^ehašhîṭāh</i>	9:26	<i>yašhîṭ</i>

When correctly understood, this narrative technique keeps the story line in perspective by letting us know in advance where the discussion is leading. In the present case, the parallels between the two chapters occur early within Dan 11:16-22 because the chapter's various proleptic statements generally come at the beginning of sections. At the end of a section it would be meaningless to speak of a preview summarizing the section's contents.

I have stated elsewhere that, "Prolepsis is a literary device that allows the writer to treat sequence and emphasis separately."³² There is a reason why the angel would want to avail himself of a literary technique such as this. It has been pointed out that the Jews' "stronghold, their joy and glory, the delight of their eyes, their heart's desire" (Ezek 24:25) would be attacked by the Romans. This is an extremely important fact about Jewish history during the period under review. But it is not the most important fact. The most important fact is that the Prince of the covenant would be "destroyed" (vs. 22) by Pilate, not that the city He wept over would be destroyed by Titus. If sequence were inseparable from emphasis, the crucifixion would appear as nothing more than one event in a long list of others, with each item simply following the one before it.

When authors' names are alphabetized in a list of academic credits the express purpose for doing so is to give each name in the list equal status with all the others. This is why temporal sequence alone can never be an entirely sufficient organizing principle for the prophecy of Dan 11. The cross does not have equal status with any other event in history, much less with all other events. It was not the angel's purpose merely to reveal that this and this would happen, but to show which of the many events predicted would have special significance. It is all too easy to underestimate the level of thought exhibited in this chapter. The cross stands out with the simplicity of an emphasis that comes from talking about it last in a section despite the fact that other important events would follow it.

Thus, the destruction of Jerusalem--with a whole series of important parallels in chap. 9--is discussed toward the beginning of the section not because considerations of time place it there, but because considerations of emphasis place it there. The two factors are not the same and prolepsis is the basis on which they are occasionally separated within the prophecy.

Having followed Roman involvement with Judea through to its natural results in vs. 17 we now return to the point where the prolepsis began, i.e., the time of Pompey. There is an element of repetition in doing this, but it is minimized by a shift in focus. We are no longer dealing with Pompey in relation to the Jews as such but with the broader context for his actions. If we do not understand these things correctly we will misunderstand them. To avoid this the angel continues his explanation.

Pompey and the east

"Then he will turn his attention to the coastlands and will take many of them, but a commander will put an end to his insolence and will turn his insolence back upon him." (Dan 11:18)

When Attalus III of Pergamum died in 133 B.C. he willed his entire country to Rome.³³ The establishment of a province in Asia could no longer be deferred. It was a turning point for both parties.³⁴ Attalus' will, more than any other previous factor, drew Rome into Asia.

In 88 B.C. Mithridates VI Eupator (c. 121-63 B.C.), king of Pontus, almost succeeded in getting Rome back out of Asia. He swept through from the north pushing out the combined armies of Rome and Bithynia and later that same year procured on a single day the massacre of between eighty and one hundred fifty thousand Roman provincial officials who remained.

Mithridates was not Rome's only problem in Asia. His base of operations was Pontus on the northern coast of Anatolia but there were also Cilician pirates on the southern coast, who raided commercial shipping as far west as Sicily.³⁵

The Gabinian Law. Others had been commissioned to solve the problem of piracy before but without success. Then in 67 B.C. the senate passed a law offered by Gabinius (the Gabinian Law) under which Pompey would be given authority to take whatever measures he deemed appropriate anywhere in the Mediterranean basin by sea and inland to within 400 furlongs of the coast so as to solve the problem of piracy once and for all. Pompey divided his territory into thirteen different parts, laid his plans carefully, drew fully on the resources of the state, and had the pirates off the seas within three months. It was an impressive performance.

The Manilian Law. With Pompey's success against the pirates still fresh in everyone's mind, the following year (66 B.C.) a tribune named Gaius Manilius proposed legislation that would give Pompey even greater freedom to campaign this time against Mithridates. Under the terms of the Manilian Law Pompey was given a virtually unlimited *imperium* or grant of authority. During the previous year he had been limited to actions that could be taken on the seas and anywhere along the coast. Now the inland territories of Phrygia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, the upper Colchis, and Armenia were placed under his control as well.³⁶

In the end the wily Mithridates was defeated by Pompey but never captured. He escaped to the Crimea, which had once been part of his kingdom, and died trying to raise a force of Danubians for an invasion of Rome.

When the news of [Mithridates'] death reached Rome there was a public festival for ten consecutive days. One understands. For forty years this resourceful old war lord had been provoking the Romans in Asia, defeating or eluding every general sent out against him, raising the cry of nationalism and freedom among the Asians, and yet showing himself the equal of the Romans in repression, almost invincible in the mountains of Pontus, and capable of enormous mischief everywhere from Greece to the Tigris. The Romans never faced another like him. And in their forty-year attempt to engulf him they swallowed all of Asia and, by an almost accidental gesture, toppled the Seleucids as well.³⁷

Of special interest here is the fact that Pompey's war against Mithridates took the conqueror to so many other places besides Pontus, one of which was Judea. The triumph he celebrated afterward in Rome was for victories over "Asia, Pontus, Armenia, Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Syria, the Scythians, Jews and Albanians, Iberia, the Island of Crete, the Bastarnians, and, in addition to these, over King Mithridates and Tigranes."³⁸

Asia, Pontus, Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and the island of Crete were all either within or immediately adjacent to Anatolia. Armenia is located between the Caucasus Mountains and the Tigris River. Tigranes was king of Armenia. Mithridates was king of Pontus, on the south shore of the Black Sea. The Bastarnians were a Germanic tribe on the western end of the Black Sea, whose territory extended between the rivers Danube and Dniestr. These were probably the Danubians Mithridates was trying to raise against Rome at the time of his death. The territory of the Albanians and Iberians was not in Europe, as one might suppose, but in the Caucasus.³⁹ The Scythians, of Iranian stock, occupied the northern shore of the Black Sea from the Don River westward to the Dniepr, including the Crimean peninsula where Mithridates fled after being defeated by Pompey. Lesser Armenia bordered on the Black Sea, west of the Euphrates and north of Cappadocia. Syria was west of the Euphrates and south of Cappadocia. The Jews were south of Syria. Still farther south, though not included in the above list, were the Nabatean Arabs, against whom Pompey also campaigned. His broader purpose was in fact to extend Roman authority from the Atlantic Ocean in the west, where he had campaigned on earlier occasions, to the Red Sea in the east.⁴⁰ The war against Mithridates turned into much more than a war against Mithridates.

While it is important to grasp the magnitude of Pompey's achievement at the time when these things took place, it is almost impossible for us to do so.

Pompey left the East not only as its patron, but to a considerable extent (and one hard to realise nowadays) literally as its owner. Having assigned it to cities and kings and to the Roman People as far as administration was concerned, he held the mortgage-bonds; and, unlike a modern investor in foreign states, he could be sure that financial control meant political control, as well as a safe income. One can only wonder how much he invested in the numerous cities that he actually founded and where he was worshipped as *ktistes* [founder].

This was business on a grand scale, dwarfing the doings of the *negotiatores* that tend to fill our textbooks. Indeed, as we have seen, these men might well be only the agents of senators. Pompey was the outstanding example; the greatest of the owners of the captive world.⁴¹

The territories that Pompey conquered were not all organized as provinces. Cappadocia was still a client kingdom when Augustus died in A.D. 14. So was Lesser Armenia.⁴² What he

did annex and bring under direct Roman control was Cilicia and Syria, while also consolidating Rome's position in Bithynia.⁴³ But Pompey's actions set a bold administrative precedent. His policy combined the advantages of minimal administrative responsibility and large revenues. Philosophically what this meant was that the twin concepts of *libertas* and *immunitas* ("liberty" and "immunity") were no longer related. In more practical terms it meant that Rome would tax its friends as well as its subjects.⁴⁴

Holding *imperium* without a break from 83 to his consulship in 70, [Pompey] acquired immense *clientelae* and probably immense wealth in all the western provinces; then, after his consulship, he refused to take up a paltry province and waited for his chance. It came in 67/6, and he eagerly seized it. With utter contempt—openly displayed—for his rivals and enemies, he used it to become the patron of the East, which, without consulting Senate or People, he organised like a monarch.⁴⁵

Pompey did not come to the east for the purpose of molesting Judea. From his point of view doing so was an almost trivial aside during the course of a much larger and more important program of military conquest. But if he had not entered Judea, there would be no reason for the prophecy to preserve any record of his exploits. Because he did enter Judea, the story is highly significant. We have discussed Pompey's settlement of the east twice now—once from the perspective of Judean politics (vs. 16b) and again from the perspective of Roman politics (vs. 18a). We are not through with Pompey yet, however. In a later section his impact on Jewish religion is pointed out as well, since while in Jerusalem he besieged the temple and forced his way into it.⁴⁶ But those events are discussed in a later section.⁴⁷

Pompey's confrontation with Julius Caesar. Pompey was the representative of Rome who "will turn his attention to the coastlands [islands, i.e., distant places] and will take many of them" (vs. 18a). Julius Caesar, on the other hand, was the representative of Rome who "will put an end to his [Pompey's] insolence and will turn his insolence back upon him" (vs. 18b).

His immense success under the Gabinian and Manilian Laws made Pompey the toast of Rome. He was certainly the most powerful man there. Marcus Licinius Crassus was reputed to be the wealthiest.⁴⁸ This brought the two into conflict. When young Gaius Julius Caesar, propraetor of Farther Spain, returned home from his province in 60 B.C. with hopes of running for the consulship, he knew that the support of at least one of these great men would be needed to secure his own position. But he could not approach either of them for fear of making the other his enemy. What Caesar finally did was to reconcile Pompey and Crassus, thus gaining the support of both men instead of just one. As a result he was

. . . at once triumphantly elected consul, and when he was consul they [Pompey and Crassus] voted him the command of armies and allotted him the province of Gaul, and so placed him as it were in a citadel, not doubting but they would divide the rest at their pleasure between themselves when they had confirmed him in his allotted command.⁴⁹

After Caesar's first five year term in Gaul he came to the town of Lucca and met with some two hundred senators and as many as sixty proconsuls and praetors. All left well rewarded, but with Crassus and Pompey he entered into a special arrangement by which these two men would run jointly for the consulship and then vote him a five year extension in his province. There was an outcry when this plan became known, but Crassus and Pompey were elected anyway and Caesar was confirmed in his province. In this way the first triumvirate was formed—a curious political anomaly produced by the facts of power rather than the laws of state.

Pompey at this time was married to Caesar's daughter Julia, who loved her husband devotedly. But Julia died in childbirth. Next Crassus lost an army of 44,000 men and his own life while off campaigning in Parthia. Together these two deaths were even more unfortunate than they would have been separately, because Julia and Crassus served as moderating influences on Caesar and Pompey. With these counterbalances gone there was no more check on the boundless ambitions of the two remaining triumvirs and the world was not large enough for both of them. The specter of civil war was beginning to loom large by now but, while some halfhearted measures were taken to avert it, for the most part Pompey did not take Caesar seriously. He simply ignored the threat.

Here is one example of the "insolence" (*herpâ*) referred to in vs. 18b. It is not that Pompey heaped abuse on Caesar. He did not bother doing even that. Instead he paid no attention to Caesar at all, considering his own position beyond challenge. Insolence is not an action so much as an attitude. It involves thinking lightly about or taking no account of a person.⁵⁰ But Caesar was not to be ignored. The prophecy has identified the cause of Pompey's downfall with clear insight.

When Caesar finally crossed the border of his province and marched on Rome, thus dislodging Pompey, he put an end to the latter's insolence. When he later followed Pompey into Macedonia, defeating him there and causing him to seek refuge in Egypt virtually alone, in the company of his wife and only a handful of personal friends, he turned Pompey's insolence back upon him. Pompey arrived off the coast of Egypt in a single ship asking pathetically for assylum and help. After some time a lone fishing vessel set out from shore. There were only a few men on board and they did not receive the great general courteously. Some urged him to turn around and leave while he was still able. But he made for shore and was assassinated as soon as he got there.

When Caesar came to Egypt in pursuit he was presented with Pompey's signet ring and his head. On seeing them he wept and ordered that Pompey's assassins be executed. But these are not the things emphasized in the prophecy. While Caesar was in Egypt the Jews gave him substantial and enthusiastic support, for Pompey had beseiged and desecrated the temple. Caesar did not forget this sincere expression of loyalty and gave the Jews an impressive list of concessions in return, having to do both with trade and with military obligations.⁵¹

Just as we will read more about Pompey in a later section, we read more also about Caesar. In particular there is more that needs to be said about his munificence toward the Jews.⁵² In the other half of the larger section spanning vss. 16-28 details are filled in that could not be included here.⁵³ And later still, the desecrating actions of vs 31 will be seen to have Pompey as their precedent, while Caesar establishes a similar precedent for the flattery of vs. 32. In this way, as in so many others, secular Rome prepares the way for religious Rome. The point here, however, is that while pursuing Pompey Caesar came to the east and that when he did so he established contact with the Jews on favorable terms.

Julius Caesar and Rome

"After this, he will turn back toward the fortresses of his own country but will stumble and fall, to be seen no more." (Dan 11:19)

There are two parts to this verse. First, a certain ruler "will turn back toward the fortresses of his own country." And second, he "will stumble and fall, to be seen no more." The one clause refers to this individual's life, the other to his death. The individual in question is Julius Caesar.

Caesar establishes sole rule in Rome. With Pompey finally gone Caesar could devote his considerable energies to establishing his power in the capital. His innovations in domestic policy were in some ways as bold as Pompey's were in foreign policy. Pompey had celebrated triumphs over three continents, taking in virtually the whole Roman world--Africa, Europe, and Asia.⁵⁴ He had campaigned from the Atlantic Ocean to within a short distance of the Caspian and Red Seas, annexing Cilicia and Syria and ensuring a reliable income to the state from taxes levied elsewhere. It was a precedent of the greatest importance and had its own more immediate and practical implications. Wars could now be waged in the provinces virtually without reference to their monetary cost. Caesar had a number of his own projects in mind at the time of his death,⁵⁵ but for us his most important contribution lay in his attempt to establish the sole and permanent rule of one man in a state traditionally governed by a senate, two consuls, and a number of other popularly elected officials. There had been dictators before, but each had laid down his powers after the crisis that created a need for them was passed. Caesar did not.

Nevertheless his countrymen, bowing to his good fortune and accepting the bit in the expectation that the government of a single person would give them some respite from the civil wars and calamities, appointed him dictator for life. This was indeed a tyranny avowed, since his power was now not only absolute, but permanent as well.⁵⁶

Pompey was that Roman who "will turn his attention [lit., turn his face] to the coastlands" (vs. 18); Caesar was the one who "will turn back [lit., turn his face] toward the fortresses of his own country" (vs. 19). While Pompey is best known for increasing the extent of Rome's influence abroad, Caesar is best known for his influence on the form of government by which Rome would rule such a vast expanse of territory in the future.⁵⁷

Caesar is murdered in the senate. The circumstances of Caesar's death on March 15, 44 B.C., are well known.

The following story, too, is told by many. A certain seer warned Caesar to be on his guard against a great peril on the day of the month of March which the Romans call the Ides; and when the day had come and Caesar was on his way to the senate-house, he greeted the seer with a jest and said: "Well, the Ides of March are come," and the seer said to him softly: "Aye, they are come, but they are not gone."⁵⁸

Indeed before the Ides of March were gone Caesar would be lying in a pool of blood at the base of Pompey's statue in the senate building with twenty-three stab wounds covering his body. Due to their number some of the assassins even wounded each other.⁵⁹ But Caesar was a popular leader and his death was deeply and truly mourned.

At the height of the public grief a throng of foreigners went about lamenting each after the fashion of his country, above all the jews, who even flocked to the place for several successive nights.⁶⁰

Summary

There are a number of obvious similarities among the clauses of Dan 11:16-19 and these are now summarized. Verse 16a is a general statement that pertains to the section as a whole. Using literal English glosses the opening clauses of vss. 16b, 17a, 18a, and 19a are as follows: "And he will stand in the Beautiful Land" (vs. 16b), "And he will set his face to come with the might of his whole kingdom" (vs. 17a), "And he will turn his face to [the] islands" (vs. 18a), "And he will turn his face to [the] fortresses of his [own] land" (vs. 19a). Each clause can be divided into two parts--an action and a goal or object of that action. There is a striking similarity of wording in these four clauses in the Hebrew. One does not have to know that language in order to tell when the same words are being used in more than one clause. See table 3.

Table 3
First Comparison of Opening Clauses
in Dan 11:16b-19

Ref.	Action	Object
11:16b	w ^e ya ^c mōd b ^e -	ʔéreṣ haṣṣ ^e bî
11:17a	w ^e yāšēm pānāyw lā-	bōʔ b ^e tōqep kol-malkûtô
11:18a	w ^e yāšēb pānāyw l ^e -	ʔiyyîm
11:19a	w ^e yāšēb pānāyw l ^e -	mā ^c uzzê ʔarṣô

There are two different sets of relationships here. On the one hand we have "And he will stand in," "And he will set his face to," "And he will turn his face to," "And he will turn his face to." These are the actions that are performed. On the other hand we have "[the] Beautiful Land," "come with the strength of his whole kingdom," "[the] islands," and "[the] fortresses of his own land." These are the goals or objects of the above actions.

In both cases only three of the four items are of immediate interest. The first of the four actions is not closely parallel to the other actions and the second of the four objects is not closely parallel to the other objects. These extraneous items are now replaced with an "X" to allow a clearer focus on those that remain. See table 4.

Table 4
Second Comparison Of Opening Clauses
In Dan 11:16b-19

Ref.	Action	Object
11:16b	X	ʔéreṣ haṣṣ ^e bî
11:17a	w ^e yāšēm pānāyw lā-	X
11:18a	w ^e yāšēb pānāyw l ^e -	ʔiyyîm
11:19a	w ^e yāšēb pānāyw l ^e -	mā ^c uzzê ʔarṣô

On the one hand we have three relevant actions: "And he will set his face to," "And he will turn his face to," "And he will turn his face to." And on the other hand we have three relevant objects: "[the] Beautiful Land," "[the] islands," and "[the] fortresses of his [own] land." The actions are all equivalent now and only their objects contrast. Representatives of Rome

would set or turn their faces toward the Beautiful Land where God's people lived, toward other places equally far away, and toward their own native land. See table 5.

Table 5
Third Comparison of Opening Clauses
in Dan 11:16b-19

Ref.	Action	Object
11:16b	ʔéreṣ haṣṣêbî	Beautiful Land
11:18a	ʔiyyîm	Other distant places
11:19a	māʕuzzê ʔarṣô	Rome itself

Pompey was the one who "will establish himself in the Beautiful Land" (vs. 16). He did this as part of a general settlement of the east under the provisions of the Manilian Law. The other places that he conquered at the same time are called *ʔiyyîm*, not because they were surrounded by water, but because they were foreign and remote. Pompey would bring Judea within the sphere of active Roman influence and he would take similar action against a number of other places as far away from Rome as Judea was.

The crowning pinnacle of this glorious record was (as he himself declared in assembly when discoursing on his achievements) to have found Asia the remotest of the provinces and then to have made her a central dominion of his country.⁶¹

Caesar, on the other hand, "will turn back toward the fortresses of his own country" (vs. 19). Even Sulla had laid down his absolute power after a short time, but Caesar had had himself proclaimed dictator for life. He was not killed by the soldiers of some distant barbarian nation but by Roman senators in his own capital.

Neither Pompey nor Caesar did anything that was entirely and wholly unique, but their actions were performed on a large scale and both had a dramatic impact on the course of future events. Pompey made his greatest contribution in the area of foreign policy, while Caesar made his greatest contribution in the area of domestic policy. And yet we cannot speak of a Roman Empire at this time. The processes we are dealing with were gradual ones.

Verses 20-21: The Roman Empire

Jesus was born during the reign of the first Roman emperor and crucified during the reign of his successor. The man who finally presided over the transition from Republic to Empire was Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus, or simply Octavian, better known as Caesar Augustus (31 B.C.-A.D.14). Augustus' adopted son and successor was Tiberius Claudius Nero, or Tiberius (A.D. 14-37). Augustus had the given name Julius and Tiberius had the family name Nero, but Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus is not the Julius Caesar we have been discussing and Tiberius Nero is not the Nero who would later behead Paul.

Augustus: the Caesar of Christ's birth

"His successor will send out a tax collector to maintain the royal splendor." (Dan 11:20a)

Verse 20 represents a minor break within the section corresponding to the transition from Republic to Empire at Rome. Our story begins not with Augustus' rise to power but with the events surrounding Christ's birth.

Events during Augustus' reign. The Roman Empire had a beginning point. Otherwise it did not have a beginning point. If we are unwilling to make the second claim, we must make the first one and identify what year we have in mind. I have pointed out already that we are dealing with gradual processes but this does not mean history is a formless void. The facts of power that placed Octavian on the throne were determined at the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), not in the pillered halls of the senate at some later time. The Roman Empire began in 31 B.C.

We do not know with certainty what year Christ was born, but we do know that, whatever year that was, Caesar Augustus issued a decree during it "that all the world should be taxed" (Luke 2:1, KJV). NIV translates:

In those days Caesar Augustus issued a decree that a census should be taken of the entire Roman world. (2) (This was the first census that took place while Quirinius was governor of Syria.) (3) And everyone went to his own town to register. (Luke 2:1-3)

The present section begins not with the first event during Augustus' reign but with the most important event. It was a census during the second half of that reign which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem and accounted for the place of Christ's birth.⁶²

So Joseph also went up from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to Judea, to Bethlehem the town of David, because he belonged to the house and line of David. (5) He went there to register with Mary, who was pledged to be married to him and was expecting a child. (6) While they were there, the time came for the baby to be born, (7) and she gave birth to her firstborn, a son. She wrapped him in strips of cloth and placed him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn. (Luke 2:4-7)

Only a woman who has had a child could say what it was like for Mary to ride for hours at a time on a donkey's back during the ninth month of her pregnancy. Joseph did not live in Bethlehem and we know from other passages that he was a considerate man (Matt 1:19). Without the impetus provided by Caesar's census, Joseph, even if he had been planning to visit Bethlehem for other reasons, would surely have waited until Mary's delivery and the Christ child would have been born elsewhere. But the prophecies did not state that He would be born elsewhere. They stated that He would be born in Bethlehem.

"But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah,
 though you are small among the clans of Judah,
 out of you will come for me
 one who will be ruler over Israel,
 whose origins are from of old,
 from ancient times." (Micah 5:2)

Thus, the present group of verses begins in a stable behind an inn on one of the narrow and dusty streets of Bethlehem in Judea. And haughty Caesar helped, in ways he did not understand, to ensure that the ancient prophecies concerning the Messiah's birth would be exactly fulfilled.

End of Augustus' reign. While Augustus' rise to power is passed over with a mere notice that it happened, the circumstances surrounding his death receive more attention.

"In a few years, however, he will be destroyed, yet not in anger or in battle." (Dan 11:20b)

Augustus died in bed from old age combined with a persistent malady, quietly and secure in power.⁶³ These circumstances are quite different from those of Julius Caesar's death some fifty-seven years previously.⁶⁴ In vss. 19b and 20b the two events are contrasted. See table 6.

Table 6
 Comparison of Dan 11:19b With 20b

Ref.	Clause	Contrast
11:19b	w ^e nikšal w ^e nāpal w ^e lō yimmāšē and he will stumble and he will fall and he will not be found	Violence
11:20b	w ^e lō b ^o appáyim w ^e lō b ^e milhāmâ and not in anger and not in war	Tranquility

Tiberius: the Caesar of Christ's death

"He will be succeeded by a contemptible person [nibzeh] who has not been given the honor of royalty. He will invade the kingdom when its people feel secure, and he will seize it through intrigue." (Dan 11:21)

The "contemptible person" of Dan 11:21 is not Augustus but his successor, Tiberius.⁶⁵ Both the manner of Tiberius' accession and the nature of his character are singled out for comment in the prophecy. The one was considered devious and the other contemptible.

Tiberius' accession. The personal bond between Augustus and Tiberius was never strong.⁶⁶ Tiberius was the son of Augustus' fourth wife, Livia Drusilla, by an earlier marriage on her part. His father was one Tiberius Claudius Nero. Both father and son had the same set of names. Tiberius was later forced, against his wishes, to marry Augustus' daughter Julia, by an

earlier marriage on his part, making the tie between Augustus and his eventual successor both conjugal and adoptive. Tiberius was not young when he took the throne. He was already fifty-six years old when Augustus died on August 19, A.D. 14. But in the absence of a natural son, Tiberius was the obvious and necessary choice for the succession. He would not have been Augustus' first pick, however, if anyone else had been available.

Another important factor in the succession, apart from the matter of necessity, was Livia. She was Augustus' wife, Tiberius' mother, a forceful person by all accounts, and a woman with a pathological desire for her son to follow her husband as head of state. This was duly provided for in Caesar's will. When the end came and the great Augustus, now old and infirm, lay dying with Livia at his side, Tiberius was en route to Illyricum, just across the Adriatic from Italy.

Tiberius had hardly set foot in Illyricum, when he was recalled by an urgent letter from his mother; and it is not certainly known whether on reaching the town of Nola, he found Augustus still breathing or lifeless. For house and street were jealously guarded by Livia's ring of pickets, while sanguine notices were issued at intervals, until the measures dictated by the crisis had been taken: then one report announced simultaneously that Augustus had passed away and that Nero [i.e., Tiberius] was master of the empire.⁶⁷

It was no secret that Tiberius had not been Augustus' favorite. It was also no secret that, at least partially, his present position could be traced to his mother's influence. To these facts must be added Tiberius' own rigid and austere sense of propriety. When Augustus finally died it was inevitable that Tiberius would rule. Indeed, the announcement was that he already ruled, and yet he wanted

. . . to be regarded as the called and chosen of the state, rather than as the interloper who had wormed his way to power with the help of connubial intrigues and a senile act of adoption.⁶⁸

All of this worked together to produce an unusually strained situation in the capital. Both Tiberius and the senate knew that his position would have to be ratified. But by giving an appearance of holding back he placed those responsible for implimenting the various legalities of the situation in the position of urging him forward while both he and they pretended that the issue was not already decided.⁶⁹

The senate, meanwhile, was descending to the most abject supplications, when Tiberius casually observed that, unequal as he felt himself to the whole weight of government, he would still undertake the charge of any one department that might be assigned to him. Asinius Gallus then said:—"I ask you, Caesar, what department you wish to be assigned you." This unforeseen inquiry threw him off his balance. He was silent for a few moments; then recovered himself, and answered that it would not at all become his diffidence to select or shun any part of a burden from which he would prefer to be wholly excused. . . . Quintus Haterius and Mamercus Scaurus also jarred that suspicious breast—Haterius, by the sentence, "How long, Caesar, will you permit the state to lack a head?" and Scaurus, by remarking that, as he had not used his tribunician power to veto the motion of the consuls, there was room for hope that the prayers of the senate would not be in vain. Haterius he favored with an immediate invective: against Scaurus his anger was less placable, and he passed him over in silence. Wearied at last by the universal outcry and by individual appeals, he gradually gave ground, up to the point, *not* of acknowledging that he assumed the sovereignty, but of ceasing to refuse and to be entreated.⁷⁰

Tiberius' false hesitancy has become proverbial. Thus, the historian R. M. Errington refers in passing to "Perdiccas [one of Alexander's generals], Tiberius-fashion, hesitating in order to make the invitation so pressing as to be irresistible."⁷¹ Daniel says the "contemptible person" of vs. 21 "has not been given the honor of royalty." This does not mean, however, that power eludes him, because in the same verse we read that he "will seize [the kingdom] through intrigue." The kingdom does become his, but the circumstances are unusual.

Tiberius' character. Tiberius had a personality that was impenetrable and he was generally austere. In the introduction to his translation of Tacitus' famous *Annals*, Donald R. Dudley suggests it was one of the author's principal objectives to expose the malignity of Tiberius' character.

Above the rest, developing slowly and portentously over several books, tower those gigantic psychopaths, the Emperors. Claudius-uxorious, pedantic, and grotesque, with the odd appeal of those wholly devoid of dignity. Nero, the roistering young bully-boy with a taste for lechery and the arts, passing to the matricide and *folie de grandeur* of his later years. Above all, Tiberius-Tacitus' masterpiece, on which he lavished all his powers—the inscrutable countenance and the cold heart, the unwearying malevolence and the recondite lusts. In him Tacitus saw the archetype of the tyrant-Emperor, to which the sequel was Domitian. In his reign the law of treason was to unfold to an instrument of terror: then began that fearful system of spying and denunciation which so harassed the men of Tacitus' generation, reducing them all to silence, and sending the best of them to their graves. Tacitus' portrait of Tiberius is surely one of the most damaging indictments ever brought against a historical figure.⁷²

The political climate in Rome during Tiberius' later years is not a small or incidental fact about the history of this period. It bears directly on the events of the following verse.

Summary

Just as vss. 16-19 were bound together by the repeated phrase "And he will set (or turn) his face to," so vss. 20 and 21 are bound together by the repeated phrase "And X will stand in his place." See table 7.

Table 7
Comparison of Dan 11:20a With 21a

Ref.	Clause	Contrast
11:20a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannō And in his place shall arise	ma ^{ca} bīr nōgēs one who sends an oppressor
11:21a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannō And in his place shall arise	nībzeh one who is despised

Augustus would stand in Julius Caesar's place and, later, Tiberius would stand in Augustus' place. Augustus is remembered in the prophecy for ordering the census that brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem at the time of Christ's birth. Tiberius is remembered for his cold and forbidding manner, which allowed and fostered the development of a reign of terror and its

attending series of judicial murders based on false or insubstantial charges of disloyalty to Caesar.⁷³

Verse 22: A Context for the Crucifixion

"Then an overwhelming army [*ûz' rō'ôt haššétep*] will be swept away before him; both it and a prince of the covenant will be destroyed." (Dan 11:22)

The terror under Tiberius was no small event. It occupied roughly the ten years from his mother's death (A.D. 27)--whose funeral he excused himself from attending⁷⁴--to his own (A.D. 37). Within this period A.D. 31 was a turning point. The event that brought this about had to do with a former friend.

Sejanus

Aelius Sejanus was one of the few people who ever enjoyed Tiberius' complete confidence. Some idea of his position and influence can be gained from the following deposition, made at the trial of one his friends:

"In my situation, it might do me less good to accept the indictment than to deny it. But come what may, I shall freely declare that I was a friend of Sejanus, that I sought to become so, and was delighted when I succeeded. I had seen him, with his father, as commander of the Guard. Later he had high office both in the army and in the city administration. His friends and relations were rewarded with dignities. Intimacy with Sejanus conferred influence with the Emperor: his frown was reason enough for fear and the suppliant's garb. . . ."⁷⁵

As "commander of the Guard" Sejanus could be thought of as a chief of police. The law of treason was an instrument that he developed with great care, using it both to protect Caesar's interests and advance his own. He was so successful that toward the end he came very close to being named colleague and successor to the emperor. But as always, Tiberius hesitated. Months went by. The suspense was agonizing. Finally Sejanus could wait no longer and decided to force the issue. He tested the loyalty of a few friends and then made an attempt on the government. It was an altogether futile effort. He was apprehended and strangled on October 18, A.D. 31. Then came retaliation against the family. His widow took her own life, but before doing so she wrote a letter that pierced Tiberius' heart and appeared to remove every remaining spark of humanity from his soul. Tiberius had lost a son, Drusus, some eight years previously. It now came out that Drusus had not died a natural death. He had been poisoned and the one responsible had been Sejanus.⁷⁶ Tiberius was driven almost mad with consternation and grief. If things had been bad before, they became worse now. He could trust no one at all now, and this meant that everyone was suspect.

The "overwhelming army" (lit., "arms of a flood") that were swept away in the first part of vs. 22, were not soldiers fallen in battle. They were Roman citizens--many of them illustrious men--who were brought to trial and executed by a process of judicial murder under any pretext of disloyalty to Caesar.

Pilate

With this much as background, we return to the matter of why such things should occupy our attention in the prophecy. Pontius Pilate came to Judea as procurator in A.D. 26 and remained there until A.D. 36--i.e. during approximately the last ten years of Tiberius' life, a period roughly coterminous with the terror. It is highly significant in this context that the argument which finally tipped the balance against Jesus at His trial was a threat by the Jewish leaders to expose Pilate to Caesar on a charge of disloyalty. At one point Pilate had been disposed to release Jesus, but when the Jews made this threat he could not take it lightly.

From then on, Pilate tried to set Jesus free, but the Jews kept shouting, "If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar. Anyone who claims to be a king opposes Caesar."

(13) When Pilate heard this, he brought Jesus out and sat down on the judge's seat at a place known as The Stone Pavement (which in Aramaic is Gabbatha). (14) It was the day of Preparation of Passover Week, about the sixth hour.

"Here is your king," Pilate said to the Jews.

(15) But they shouted, "Take him away! Take him away! Crucify him!"

"Shall I crucify your king?" Pilate asked.

"We have no king but Caesar," the chief priests answered.

(16) Finally Pilate handed him over to them to be crucified. (John 19:12-16)

Our Savior's death has no parallel in history. It is unique. But arguing that the event is unique is not the same as arguing that it has no context. The context for the crucifixion is sketched with penetrating insight in Dan 11:22. The death of the Prince of the covenant would occur under circumstances similar to those which took the lives of so many distinguished Romans over a ten year period divided about equally before and after the cross.

In this connection a passage of Eusebius, describing Pilate as the creature of the anti-Semitic Sejan is relevant; it is reasonable to suppose that the eclipse of the favourite and the curtailment of his power were related to the fall of his patron on the 18th of October in the year 31.

The suppression of the autonomous mint in Judaea in the first half of the year 32, when the internal political situation of the country became so critical, may be taken as an indication of the curtailment of Pilate's power and of a change in the policy hitherto pursued towards the Jews, which had proved inopportune.⁷⁷

The connection with Sejanus might help to explain Pilate's own hardly pro-Jewish attitudes. Eventually the loss of Caesar's favor that Pilate had feared so much at Christ's trial became a reality and, in A.D. 36, he was summoned to appear before Tiberius. By the time he could arrive, however, the tyrant himself had died.

Summary

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. See table 8.

Table 8
Comparison of Dan 11:20 With 21

Augustus: Vs. 20		Tiberius: Vs. 21	
B	End of reign	Beginning of reign	B'
A	Actions at time of Christ's birth	Actions at time of Christ's death	A'

The present section does not end with the last event to occur, but with the one that has the greatest importance. 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 *w^egam n^egîd b^erît* "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.

The purpose of the material which precedes and follows these three words is to place them in context and show their significance. Everything else in Dan 11 leads either up to or away from the crucifixion of Christ at the prophecy's center. This fact, however, cannot be fully appreciated until we study the other half of the section, and of the chapter, in later papers.

Conclusion

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.

As he spoke, the angel used repetition and its resulting parallels to good effect. A number of examples have been pointed out. The introductory clause "The invader will do as he pleases," for example, occurs not only in vs. 16a, but with minor changes on three other occasions as well. The formula occurs a total of four times in Daniel. Verses 18 and 19 begin with identical words and highly similar ones are used in vs. 16. Here the repetition is three-fold. Verses 20 and 21 also begin with identical words. How much more simply could the angel have stated himself than to say the same thing again four, three, and two times respectively? There is no attempt here to baffle the reader with obscure facts but to lay things out just as clearly as possible. See tables 9 and 10.

Table 9
Summary of Selected Clauses

Ref.	Hebrew	Gloss
Four Cases of an Introductory Formula		
8:4	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	and he will do as he pleases
11:3	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	and he will do as he pleases
11:16	w ^{eyá} ás . . . kirsônô	and he will do as he pleases
11:36	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	and he will do as he pleases
Three Objects of Attention		
11:17b	w ^{eyāsēm} pānāyw lā-	and he will set his face to
11:18a	w ^{eyāšēb} pānāyw l ^{e-}	and he will turn his face to
11:19a	w ^{eyāšēb} pānāyw l ^{e-}	and he will turn his face to
Two Successors		
11:20a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannô	and X Hill stand in his place
11:21a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannô	and X Hill stand in his place
One Prince		
11:22b	w ^{egam} n ^{egîd} b ^{erît}	and also [the] prince of [the] covenant

Table 10
Historicist Applications

Ref.	Hebrew	Gloss
Four Cases of an Introductory Formula		
8:4	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	Persia
11:3	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	Greece
11:16	w ^{eyá} ás . . . kirsônô	Secular Rome
11:36	w ^{ec} āsâ kirsônô	Religious Rome
Three Objects of Attention		
11:17b	w ^{eyāsēm} pānāyw lā-	Beautiful Land (Pompey)
11:18a	w ^{eyāšēb} pānāyw l ^{e-}	Other distant places (Pompey)
11:19a	w ^{eyāšēb} pānāyw l ^{e-}	Roman homeland (Julius Caesar)
Two Successors		
11:20a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannô	Augustus (at Christ's birth)
11:21a	w ^{ec} āmad ʿal kannô	Tiberius (at Christ's death)
One Prince		
11:22b	w ^{egam} n ^{egîd} b ^{erît}	Christ dying 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. In the next issue of *Historicism* we consider those verses that complete the larger section of vss. 16-28 and bring us through the middle third of this remarkable chapter.