

## Notes

Note: All Scripture quotations in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society. In this paper there are a number of literal glosses, not always explicitly identified as such. Let these take the form "gloss" and quotations from NIV the form "quotation."

<sup>1</sup>In its quiet but pervasive orientation toward Christ Dan 11 is a microcosm of Daniel, and Daniel in turn is a microcosm of Scripture. Note the claim carefully. Daniel is not unusual within the larger body of inspired writings when those writings are taken as a whole. On the contrary, it is representative of their central thrust. And the things that make Daniel apocalyptic are precisely the things that make it representative. The single most important of these is a timeless interest in and focus on the work and person of Christ. That work has a beginning and end. It takes place on earth as well as in heaven. Its purpose is to defeat Satan, the author of evil. Thus, whereas most of the canonical books are not apocalyptic individually, their cumulative effect is" (Hardy, "The Christocentric Orientation of Daniel and of Scripture Generally," *Historicism* No. 1/ Jan 85, pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup>James A. Montgomery once stated that, "Western scholarship has been delivered from the vagaries of apocalyptic exegesis through the mediation of Jerome" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927], p. 469). Here Montgomery appears to confuse the vagaries of apocalyptic exegesis with apocalyptic exegesis as such, but they are not the same. By allowing the prophecy to talk pervasively about Christ the apocalyptic element is kept intact, as it should be, and only the vagaries of aimless application are removed.

<sup>3</sup>The term Judaea was used in two senses in antiquity, narrowly to denote the district centered on Jerusalem and widely to denote the whole Jewish or semi-Jewish area which became the Roman province--Judaea, Samaritis . . . , and Idumaea from A.D. 6, together with Galilee and Peraea after A.D. 44. Palestine (strictly Syria Palaestina) was the name of the province after 135" (Mary E. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, no. 20 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976], p. 1, n. 1).

<sup>4</sup>See Hardy, "Notes on the Linear Structure of Dan 11," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, pp. 14-16.

<sup>5</sup>See C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, 2 vols. (Mountain View, CA/Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981/85), vol. 1: *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*, p. 150.

<sup>6</sup>Hasslberger's book entitled, *Hoffnung in der Bedrangnis: eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12*, Munchener Universitatsschriften (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1977), is a published version of his doctoral dissertation.

<sup>7</sup>The Hebrew noun *rāṣôn* means "pleasure, will, desire" and the prefix *kē-* means "as" or "according to," but to translate *kirṣônô* as "according to his pleasure" would sound archaic.

<sup>8</sup>On vs. 3 Hasslberger states, "Finally 3c, with its formula  $\text{כְּ\text{רָצוֹן} + \text{נִוְ} = \text{כְּ\text{רָצוֹן} + \text{נִוְ}}$  is noteworthy. Within the unit [one] encounters it further in 11:16, 36. Through the stereotyped change the character of vs. 3, as describing the subject in general rather than concrete terms, is strengthened. That [the term] *malk* ["king"] is not introduced in and of itself is evident from the following verse. For the subject changes suddenly. No longer is *malk gibbôr* [the "mighty king"] central, but rather *malkūt=ô* ["his kingdom"]" (ibid., p. 206). On vs. 36 he states, "The new section begins in 36a with the formula  $\text{כְּ\text{רָצוֹן} + \text{נִוְ} = \text{כְּ\text{רָצוֹן} + \text{נִוְ}}$ . Apart from 8:4 it occurs elsewhere within the unit in 3c, 16a. It should be noted that what is described here is a culmination of both these last [instances]. One can hardly consider its repetition just here then as an accident" (ibid., p. 273).

<sup>9</sup>*k*:=*raṣṣō+n=ō* am Schluss hingegen wird durch das Verb bestimmt, ist also eine Umstandsbestimmung, die das Verb näher erläutert und festlegt" (ibid., p. 235). Verses 13-19 are divided into the following verse groupings: vss. 13 ("connection of both episodes"), 14 ("view of Israel in the framework of 13c"), 15-16 ("description of the expedition mentioned in 13c"), 17 ("intention to final result"), 18 ("new action and failure"), 19 ("end of this *m. ha=ṣapōn* [king of the North]").

<sup>10</sup>See Hardy, "The Day-Year Principle in Dan 9:24-27," *Historicism* No. 3/Jul 85, pp. 48-50.

<sup>11</sup>Naphtali Lewis and Meyer Reinhold, eds., *Roman Civilization, Sourcebook*, vol. 1: *The Republic* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1951), p. 189.

<sup>12</sup>*Polybius: The Histories*, 6 vols., W. R. Paton, trans., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927) 29.27.1-8. Contrast the widely different response of Philip, king of Macedon during the decades immediately preceding, when Marcus Aemilius conveyed a similar demand to him: "'My principal request,' he said, 'to the Romans is not to violate our treaty or to make war on me; but if nevertheless they do so, we will defend ourselves bravely, supplicating the gods to help us'" (ibid., 5:74-75). Philip's bravery, however, did not help him and Antiochus would have been foolish to do anything other than what he did.

<sup>13</sup>See F. E. Peters, *The Harvest of Hellenism: A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the Triumph of Christianity*, Touchstone Books (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), p. 77.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>15</sup>Once established by Judas Maccabeus the treaty with Rome was renewed by his brothers Jonathan and Simon on separate occasions and by Simon's son John Hyrcanus. "It was presumably the desire to enhance the Jewish cause that prompted Judas in 161 BC to send two envoys to Rome to establish a friendly alliance with the Roman Republic (1 Mac 8:17-32). We do not know how much Judas knew about the Romans (1 Mac 8:1-16 is a highly idealized picture of them), but he must have been aware of them as a state in the Mediterranean world powerful enough to force Antiochus IV to evacuate Egypt in 168 BC. He may have known, too, of the civil strife in Egypt between Ptolemy VI (181-145 BC) and his brother, and of the Egyptian request that Rome should intervene in this struggle. He may therefore have thought that friendship with such a state would strengthen Judea. Judas's envoys gained what they desired, a formal treaty between the Romans and 'the nation of the Jews' (technically the treaty was probably a *foedus aequum*, which provided for military assistance in defensive wars). This treaty appears to have been renewed c 145-144 BC by Jonathan (1 Mac 12:1-4). Another treaty is said to have been made by Jonathan with Sparta (1 Mac 12:5-23)" (W. Stewart McCullough, *The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod: 550 BC to 4 BC* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975], pp. 124-25).

After both Judas and Jonathan had ruled and died, Simon, a third son of Mattathias, came to power. According to Smallwood, "in 139, or perhaps as early as 142, Simon renewed the alliance with Rome again" (*Jews under Roman Rule*, pp. 7-8). "If we accept the tradition that Judas, Jonathan, and Simon established friendly relations with Rome (1 Mac 8:17-32; 12:1-4; 14:16-24), then it is probable that John [Hyrcanus] followed the same policy. The decrees of the Roman Senate which Josephus records (*Ant* xiii, 259-66; xiv, 145-8) present a number of difficulties which cannot be discussed in detail here, but they appear to indicate that the friendly alliance between the Jewish people and Rome was renewed in John's time. Two other decrees associated with John are one from the Athenians (*Ant* xiv, 148-55), possibly dating c 106-105 BC, and one from Pergamum, in response to envoys sent by John (*Ant* xiv, 247-55)" (McCullough, *History and Literature*, pp. 132-33). Their alliance with Rome was something of which the Jews were "immensely proud" (Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, p. 7).

<sup>16</sup>Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, p. 21.

<sup>17</sup>"Moreover, a great and eager passion possessed him to recover Syria, and march through Arabia to the Red Sea, in order that he might bring his victorious career into touch with the Ocean which surrounds the world on all sides; for in Africa he had been the first to carry his conquests as far as the Outer Sea, and again in Spain he had made the Atlantic Ocean the boundary of the Roman dominion, and thirdly, in his recent pursuit of the Albani, he had narrowly missed reaching the Hyrcanian Sea. In order, therefore, that he might connect the circuit of his military expeditions with the Red Sea, he put his army in motion" (*Plutarch's Lives*, Bernadotte Perrin, trans., Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968], "Pompey" 38.2-3; subsequently Plutarch, *Pompey*).

<sup>18</sup>On the death of Herod in 4 B.C. a delegation of Jews asked the Roman senate to abolish the monarchy and allow them to function as an independent state under direct Roman protection. This did not take place until A.D. 6. At that point Judea was given a Roman governor and lost its independence entirely and irreversibly. A few years later it would lose its existence.

<sup>19</sup>McCullough, *History and Literature*, p. 141.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 323.

<sup>22</sup>Smallwood, *Jews under Roman Rule*, p. 1.

<sup>23</sup>Hardy, "Linear Structure," pp. 16-17.

<sup>24</sup>Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 394.

<sup>25</sup>Verse 17 is the nadir of NIV's efforts in chap. 11. Other passages notable for their freedom include vss. 6 ("together with her royal escort and her **father**"), 14 ("The violent men among your own people will rebel **in fulfillment of** the vision"), 16 ("The **invader** will do as he pleases"), 20 ("His successor will send out a tax collector **to maintain the royal splendor**"), 22 ("Then an overwhelming **army** will be swept away before him"), 24 ("When **the richest provinces** feel secure, he will invade them and will achieve what neither his fathers nor his forefathers did"), 26 ("Those who eat from the king's provisions will **try to** destroy him; his army will be swept away, and many will fall **in battle**"), 28 ("The **king of the North** will return to his own country with great wealth"), 29 ("but this time **the outcome** will be different from what it was before"), 30 ("Then he will turn back and vent his fury against the holy covenant [omits: w<sup>ec</sup>-ašâ]"), 31 ("His **armed forces** will rise up to desecrate the temple fortress"), and 41 ("Edom, Moab and the **leaders** of Ammon").

<sup>26</sup>According to Solomon Mandelkern (*Veteris Testamentii concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae* [Leipzig: Veit, 1896]), the examples of *y<sup>ec</sup>šārîm* in the Old Testament are as follows:

Hebrew	Literal Gloss	Frequency
<i>y<sup>ec</sup>šārîm</i>	upright ones/things	25
<i>wîšārîm</i>	and upright ones/things	3
<i>layšārîm</i>	to upright ones/things	3
<i>w<sup>ec</sup>lîšārîm</i>	and to upright ones/things	1

All but four examples are in such poetic books as Psalms (x9), Proverbs (x17), and Job (x2). The four examples that are not in poetic books are Num 23:20; Neh 9:13; Hos 14:10; and Dan 11:17. Out of these thirty-two passages, only five refer to something other than a person: Hos 14:9 (10) ("The ways of the Lord are right; . . ."); Ps 19:8 (9) ("The precepts of the Lord are right, . . ."); Prov 16:13 ("they value a man who speaks the truth [*y<sup>ec</sup>šārîm*]"); Neh 9:13 ("You gave them regulations and laws that are just and right, . . ."); and Prov 8:9 ("To the discerning all of them [i.e., my words] are right; . . ."). The others are: (with *y<sup>ec</sup>šārîm*) Num 23:10 (20) ("Let me

die the death of the righteous, . . ."); Ps 49:14 (15) ("The upright will rule over them in the morning; . . ."); Ps 107:42 ("The upright see and rejoice, . . ."); Ps 111:1 ("in the council of the upright . . ."); Ps 112:2 ("each generation of the upright will be blessed"); Ps 140:14 ("the upright will live before you"); Prov 2:21 ("For the upright will live in the land, . . ."); Prov 3:32 ("the Lord . . . takes the upright into his confidence"); Prov 11:3 ("The integrity of the upright guides them, . . ."); Prov 11:6 ("The righteousness of the upright delivers them, . . ."); Prov 11:11 ("Through the blessing of the upright a city is exalted, . . ."); Prov 12:6 ("the speech of the upright rescues them"); Prov 14:9 ("good will is found among the upright"); Prov 14:11 ("the tent of the upright will flourish"); Prov 15:8 ("the prayer of the upright pleases him"); Prov 15:19 ("the path of the upright is a highway"); Prov 16:17 ("The highway of the upright avoids evil; . . ."); Prov 21:18 ("The wicked become a ransom for the righteous, and the unfaithful for the upright"); Prov 28:10 ("He who leads the upright along an evil path will fall into his own trap, . . ."); Job 4:7 ("Where were the upright ever destroyed?"); Job 17:8 ("Upright men are appalled at this; . . ."); (with *wîšārîm*) Prov 29:10 ("Bloodthirsty men hate a man of integrity and seek to kill the upright"); (with *layšārîm* "to upright ones/things") Ps 33:1 ("it is fitting for the upright to praise him"); Ps 112:4 ("Even in darkness light dawns for the upright, . . ."); Prov 2:7 ("He holds victory in store for the upright, . . ."); (with *w<sup>e</sup>lîšārîm* "and to upright ones/things") Ps 125:4 ("to those who are upright in heart").

<sup>27</sup>Instead of *w<sup>e</sup>āšâ* the textual apparatus in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* suggests *ya<sup>a</sup>šeh* "he will do," "he will make," changing *waw* to *yodh* and revocalizing with a different tense. Under this suggestion the text would read: *wîšārîm ʿimmô ya<sup>a</sup>šeh* "and upright things (terms for an agreement) with him he will make," i.e., "he will make an alliance with him." It is a very reasonable sort of change, but one that obscures the sense of the passage rather than clarifying it. Our dangling and disjointed *w<sup>e</sup>āšâ* occurs not once in the chapter but three times (vss. 17, 28, 30; cf. vss. 7, 39). It also occurs in Dan 8:24. "And he will do" is used in each of these passages to mean, "and he will do successfully," i.e., "and he will succeed." This peculiar construction always takes the form of a converted perfect, usually in the singular. For the corresponding plural *w<sup>e</sup>āšû* "and they will do," which gives us a fourth clear example in chap. 11, see vs. 32. If we treat *w<sup>e</sup>āšâ* as an isolated syntactic aberration in vs. 17 and change it to *ya<sup>a</sup>šeh* so as to make it something other than the idiom it is, we come out with something that is certainly clear ("and he will make an alliance with him"), but it is a different clear thing than we started with. We lose the important similarity between what Daniel is saying in vs. 17 on the one hand and in vss. 28, 30, and 32 on the other hand. That is, we lose what Daniel is actually saying. The sort of change recommended for this verse in the textual apparatus gives us a paradigm example of what Ellen White had in mind when she wrote, "I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the Word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another" (*Early Writings of Ellen G. White* [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1945], pp. 220-21).

<sup>28</sup>Inviting Rome to take an even greater share in Judean politics does not seem like a very upright thing to do. But it might be that the word is used to contrast those who worship the true God (the Jews) with the other party to the arrangement who worshiped pagan gods (the Romans). In this comparison the Jews could be "upright ones" without declaring on the moral value of their unfortunate political strategy. If this is not a correct solution, I do not have one.

<sup>29</sup>Commenting on a possible connection between the Jewish treaty with Rome and Antiochus VII Sidetes' (139-129) lifting of a siege on Jerusalem in 135/34 B.C., one author makes the following remark in passing: "Rome, in other words, had been hedging her bets, and her by now traditional protection of the Jews did not impede her freedom of action in other

directions" (Tessa Rajak, "Roman Intervention in a Seleucid Siege of Jerusalem?" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 22 [1981]: 80). In another place the same author says, "The reassertion of the alliance was a form of response which had by now become traditional and which had a clear meaning for the parties concerned" (ibid., p. 81). It is possible to lose perspective when speaking of the hated Romans in Judea and the groups dedicated to driving them out. The Romans were not the only party to the relationship. This fact could be overemphasized but it must not be forgotten.

<sup>30</sup>The foll. clause of purpose with a fem. obj. has generally been translated 'to destroy her,' the woman, which is absurd" (James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927], p. 442). If Montgomery's assumptions were the only ones available, his position would have more force. But one could easily start from other assumptions and reason with equal clarity to different conclusions.

<sup>31</sup>Hardy, "Linear Structure," p. 17. The source cited in the above quotation is Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 297.

<sup>32</sup>Hardy, "Linear Structure," p. 21.

<sup>33</sup>Badian, *Roman Imperialism*, p. 21. Other kingdoms bestowed on Rome in a similar manner include Cyrene (in 96 B.C., ibid., p. 22), Egypt (by Ptolemy Alexander I in 88 B.C.) (ibid., p. 31), and Bithynia (by Nicomedes IV in 74 B.C.) (Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 318).

<sup>34</sup>"The annexation of Asia, in its day, must have made a positively shattering difference" (ibid., pp. 47). With the wealth now flowing in from Asia foreign wars could be conducted almost without regard to financial pressures. This fact was not lost on those responsible for raising the necessary funds and thus materially shaped Roman attitudes toward the annexation and administration of new territories in general.

<sup>35</sup>Plutarch states that, "more annoying than the fear which they inspired was the odious extravagance of their equipment, with their gilded sails, and purple awnings, and silvered oars, as it they rioted in their iniquity and plumed themselves upon it. Their flutes and stringed instruments and drinking bouts along every coast, their seizures of persons in high command, and their ransoming of captured cities, were a disgrace to the Roman supremacy" (*Pompey* 24.3-4).

<sup>36</sup>Some of Pompey's contemporaries were afraid that, even in the war against a common enemy, this much power was too much for a single individual: "But this meant the placing of the Roman supremacy entirely in the hands of one man; for the only provinces which were held to be excluded from his sway by the former law, namely, Phrygia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Upper Colchis, and Armenia, these were now added to it, together with the military forces which Lucullus had used in his conquest of Mithridates and Tigranes" (Plutarch, *Pompey* 30.2).

<sup>37</sup>Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, pp. 320-21.

<sup>38</sup>Pliny, quoted in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* 1:286.

<sup>39</sup>"The greatest of these peoples are the Albanians and the Iberians, of whom the Iberians extend to the Moschian mountains and the Euxine Sea, while the Albanians lie to the eastward as far as the Caspian Sea" (Plutarch, *Pompey*, 34.1).

<sup>40</sup>This ambition was based in part on the false idea that a single ocean surrounds the Mediterranean world (see Plutarch, *Pompey* 38.2-3, n. 17 above). While Romans were slow at first to accept responsibility for administering conquered territories--such tasks were usually turned over to loyal surrogates--under Augustus, "the Roman empire was not only the whole world controlled by Rome: it was equivalent to the world itself. Nor was this view peculiar to Augustus or a recent development. . . . Polybius wrote the relevant passages between 167 ad 146, before the annexation of Macedonia and Africa as provinces. Yet for Polybius the Roman empire included not only these countries but the Ptolemaic kingdom in Egypt and the Seleucid kingdom in Syria, not to mention smaller kingdoms like Numidia and the theoretically free cities of Greece" (Andrew Lintott, "What was the 'Imperium Romanum'?" *Greece & Rome*, 2nd series,

28 (1981): 53. These were all places where, in Rome's view, loyal obedience was appropriate and where any breach of such obedience was punishable.

<sup>41</sup>E. Badian, *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1968), pp. 83-84. As the same author remarks earlier, "Pompey knew both business and politics" (*ibid.*, p. 83).

<sup>42</sup>Michael Grant, *Atlas of Ancient History*, rev. ed. (Dorset Press, 1985), "The Roman Empire at the Death of Augustus A.D. 14," pp. 57-58.

<sup>43</sup>Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 341. Badian states: "Pompey had added two provinces (plus a strip of Cilicia)" (*Roman Imperialism*, pp. 78). Here Badian includes Bithynia as a province organized by Pompey, although it had been bequeathed to the Roman people some ten years previously in B.C. 74 (*ibid.*).

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

<sup>45</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>46</sup>McCullough, "History and Literature," p. 141. See also Josephus, *Antiquities* 14.71-72.

<sup>47</sup>See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:23-28," in the next issue of *Historicism*. Pompey's impiety is mentioned in vs. 24a.

<sup>48</sup>Aulus Gellius, in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization*, 1:399. "Pompey did not advertise his wealth: he had no need to. Yet he could have bought Crassus out without feeling the pinch" (Badian, *Roman Imperialism*, p. 82).

<sup>49</sup>Lewis and Reinhold, pp. 277-78.

<sup>50</sup>For a similar use of the word "insolence" (*herpâ*, here *herpâtô* "his insolence") in the Old Testament consider the following: "Hear us, O our God, for we are despised. Turn their insults [*herpâtâm*] back on their own heads. Give them over as plunder in a land of captivity. Do not cover up their guilt or blot out their sins from your sight, for they have thrown insults in the face of the builders" (Neh 4:4-5 [3:36]). The "insults" referred to in Neh 4:4 are specified with more detail in vss. 1-3: When Sanballat heard that we were rebuilding the wall, he became angry and was greatly incensed. He ridiculed the Jews, and in the presence of his associates and the army of Samaria, he said, "What are those feeble Jews doing? Will they restore their wall? Will they offer sacrifices? Will they finish in a day? Can they bring the stones back to life from those heaps of rubble--burned as they are?" Tobiah the Ammonite, who was at his side, said, "What they are building--if even a fox climbed up on it, he would break down their wall of stones!" (Neh 4:1-3). This is the sort of attitude that the Hebrew word *herpâtô* (Dan 11:18) describes. It can be appropriately used whenever one thinks little of something or despises the inadequacy of someone. If this is the meaning of the word, it fits well in the present context. See also Hos 12:15.

<sup>51</sup>See Josephus, *Antiquities* 14.10 for a list of Caesar's many concessions to the Jews. It was typical of Caesar to do things on a grand scale, but this does nothing to diminish the scope or significance of his actions on this particular occasion.

<sup>52</sup>See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:23-28," in the next issue of *Historicism*. Caesar is mentioned in Dan 11:24b.

<sup>53</sup>Here is the genius of Uriah Smith's discontinuity at vs. 23, discussed at length in the next issue of *Historicism*. The chapter divides into three approximately equal parts (vss. 3-15, 16-28, and 29-45). These correspond to brass, iron, and iron mixed with clay in Dan 2. The historical entities referred to in the three sections are respectively Greece (vss. 3-15, with Persia in vs. 2), secular Rome (vss. 16-28), and religious Rome (vss. 29-45). Verses 16-22 represent only half a section--the first half of the middle third of the chapter. Verses 23-28 must be included also. But with the crucifixion coming in the middle at vs. 22, there is a natural dividing point and so I discuss the halves separately. At vs. 23 Smith correctly follows the angel's train of thought back to Rome's first contact with the Jews, as Judas Maccabeus initiates a treaty of friendship between his own nation and theirs. Not all of Smith's comments on Dan 11 have

stood the test of time, but those on vss. 16-28 have. They are substantially correct just as they stand, but for reasons that I am convinced Smith not understand.

<sup>54</sup>"But that which most enhanced his glory and had never been the lot of any Roman before, was that he celebrated his third triumph over the third continent. For others before him had celebrated three triumphs; but he celebrated his first over Libya, his second over Europe, and this his last over Asia, so that he seemed in a way to have included the whole world in his three triumphs" (Plutarch, *Pompey* 65.5).

<sup>55</sup>Plutarch (*Caesar* 58-59) mentions six such projects, only one of which was actually brought to completion before Caesar's death. He wanted to campaign against the Parthians (Persians) in the east, the Scythians to the north of the Black Sea, and finally the Germans, coming this time from the east, all the way through to Gaul and so back home to Italy. He wanted to put a channel through the isthmus of Corinth as part of his preparations for the Parthian campaign. He wanted to divert the Tiber in a way that would reduce the inconvenience of trade with Rome by sea. He wanted to build earthworks on the coast nearest Rome and to make a new harbor at Ostia, removing the hidden rocks and shoals that made it hazardous. None of these things were done. But he also wanted to reform the calendar and this he did brilliantly. In consultation with the Alexandrian astronomer Sosigenes he introduced the concept of a leap year, in which a single day is intercalated every four years instead of waiting a number of years to intercalate an entire month. The problem is that a lunar year is considerably shorter than a solar year. In the Roman system of his day there was a discrepancy of fully three months between the astronomical and calendrical versions of the equinox. And so Caesar intercalated 67 days between November and December of 46 B.C., making that year 445 days long. The Julian calendar can be compared to Newtonian mechanics in that it is not perfect but has enduring value for practical purposes. The nature of the imperfection in the present case is that the Julian calendar over corrects. The year was getting too long and events were now advancing very slowly forward instead of rapidly backward as in Caesar's day. In 1582 it was necessary for pope Gregory XIII to remove ten days. Thus, October 5 was reckoned as October 15. Note that the day did not change as a result of this adjustment, only the date. Suetonius gives a list of Caesar's unfinished plans similar to that found in Plutarch (see Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* 1:286-89).

<sup>56</sup>Plutarch, *Caesar* (57.1), quoted in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization*, 1:290.

<sup>57</sup>After Caesar's death Cicero had this to say: "Our tyrant deserved his death for having made an exception of the one thing that was the blackest crime of all. Why do we gather instances of petty crime--legacies criminally obtained and fraudulent buying and selling? Behold, here you have a man who was ambitious to be king of the Roman people and master of the whole world; and he achieved it! The man who maintains that such an ambition is morally right is a madman, for he justifies the destruction of law and liberty and thinks their hideous and detestable suppression glorious" (quoted in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* 1:294).

<sup>58</sup>*Plutarch's Lives*, Bernadotte Perrin, trans., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), "Caesar" 63.5-6 (subsequently Plutarch, *Caesar*).

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 291.

<sup>60</sup>Suetonius, quoted in Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* 1:293.

<sup>61</sup>Pliny, *ibid.*, p. 286.

<sup>62</sup>What Luke says about the above census would seem to pit him against other historical sources. But this does mean that what he says should be doubted. "Luke's accuracy betokens not only contemporary knowledge but a natural accuracy of mind, and if his trustworthiness is vindicated in points where he can be checked, we should not assume that he is less trustworthy where we cannot test his accuracy" (F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952], p. 17). Now is the time to apply the above principle. "Among the first acts, for instance, of Augustus' Syrian legate Quirinius, who presided over the incorporation of Judaea as a province in A.D. 6, was to

institute a census" (Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 391). The conclusion is obvious. The census of Luke 2:1 occurred in A.D. 6. But Herod died in 4 B.C. and both events are connected with the birth of Christ. The *New Bible Dictionary* (2nd ed., Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1982), s.v. Quirinius, has an excellent discussion of this problem. It is pointed out there that the *Lapis Tiburtinus* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 14.3613) describes the career of a distinguished Roman official, possibly Quirinius although the name is missing, and states that when this person "became imperial legate of Syria he entered upon that office 'for the second time' (Lat. *iterum*). The question is: did he become imperial legate of Syria for the second time, or did he simply receive an imperial legateship for the second time, having governed another province in that capacity of the earlier occasion?" (ibid.). There is evidence to take the former view, i.e., assuming the above document is dealing with Quirinius, that he was legate of Syria on two occasions. The census taken when Judea became a province was well remembered. Thus Gamaliel could say to his rabbinic colleagues, "After him, Judas the Galilean appeared in the days of the census and led a band of people in revolt. He too was killed, and all his followers were scattered" (Acts 5:37). Gamaliel, as quoted by Luke, says simply "the census," but in his account of Christ's birth there appears to be a question which census. "(This was the first census that took place while Quirinius was governor of Syria)" (Luke 2:2). Here we have, not "the census," but "the first census." How many were there? If there was more than one, there were at least two. The second one occurred when Quirinius assumed his term of office in A.D. 6. The first one must therefore have occurred during a prior term of office. I am not picking at a single word here. Why did Luke include vs. 2 at all? There was a potential for misunderstanding in regard to the identity of this particular census that led Luke to insert a qualifying sentence. When all the evidence is taken together, there is ample reason to trust Luke when he says that a census took place under Quirinius at the time of Christ's birth some ten years prior to Judea's annexation as a Roman province.

<sup>63</sup>Tacitus states "that some suspected foul play on the part of his wife [Livia]" (*Annals*, J. Jackson, trans., Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979], 1.5). But he stops short of confirming that the rumor was true, stating only that it was circulated. We should be cautious in assuming the veracity of a rumor that Tacitus was unable to confirm so short a time after the event. Some said there might have been foul play. The prophecy says there was not. I accept the latter version of the story. But this is not a simple exercise of faith. A. H. M. Jones states in regard to Augustus' marriages: "We know nothing of his relations with his first three wives, all married for political reasons, except that he divorced Scribonia because he was 'tired of the perversity of her character' (Suetonius, *Augustus* 62, 2). His love match with Livia was a conspicuous success, despite her failure to produce a much desired heir, and they lived together happily for over fifty years: . . ." (*Augustus*, Ancient Culture and Society Series [New York: W. W. Norton, 1970], p. 164). Livia might come across poorly in Tacitus, but she and Augustus loved each other.

<sup>64</sup>Julius Caesar died on March 15, 44 B.C. and Augustus on August 19, A.D. 14. It is misleading to add 14 to 44 to get a total elapsed time of 58 years from the one event to the other. Instead we must add 43 full years plus nine months to 13 full years plus eight months for a total of 57 full years plus five months, or approximately 57 years.

<sup>65</sup>Tiberius had the family name Nero, but was not the one who would later execute Paul. The relationship between them was as follows: Tiberius' second wife was Augustus' daughter Julia. During her first marriage Julia had had a daughter, Agrippina, who later married Augustus' great nephew Germanicus. Nero was a grandson of this latter union.

<sup>66</sup>Jones takes the opposite view. "Tiberius was a difficult character, proud and reserved, and Augustus was not altogether successful in handling him. He led him to believe that he was the destined heir, granting him special privileges as early as 24 B.C., constantly employing him as his legate on important wars and missions, giving him the proconsular *imperium*, and finally the tribunician power in 6 B.C. Tiberius was not unnaturally bitterly aggrieved when he saw the

exaggerated honours bestowed on Gaius and Lucius, and retired in dudgeon to Rhodes. The quarrel was not healed until both Gaius and Lucius were dead, and it was Augustus who kept it up when Tiberius was willing to be reconciled with him. This period, however, is not typical of their relations. Suetonius has preserved some scraps of letters from Augustus to Tiberius which reveal a very relaxed and intimate relationship between them" (*Augustus*, pp. 164-65). If Augustus wrote letters to Tiberius that appear "relaxed and intimate," this is a fact about Augustus. By all accounts Tiberius was neither relaxed nor intimate with anyone.

<sup>67</sup>Tacitus, *Annals* 1.5.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, 1.7.

<sup>69</sup>"For in every action of Tiberius the first step had to be taken by the consuls, as though the old republic were in being, and himself undecided whether to reign or no. Even his edict, convening the Fathers to the senate-house was issued simply beneath the tribunician title which he had received under Augustus. It was a laconic document of very modest purport:--'He intended to provide for the last honours to his father, whose body he could not leave--it was the one function of the state which he made bold to exercise.' Yet, on the passing of Augustus he had given the watchword to the praetorian cohorts as Imperator; he had the sentries, the men-at-arms, and the other appurtenances of a court; soldiers conducted him to the forum, soldiers to the curia; he dispatched letters to the armies as if the principate was already in his grasp; and nowhere manifested the least hesitation, except when speaking in the senate" (*ibid.*).

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*, 1.12-13.

<sup>71</sup>"From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323-320 B.C.," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 90 (1970): 51. Errington is citing an ancient author when he makes the above remark. The person who said it first was Curtius Atticus, who knew Tiberius well. Curtius was one of a small number of scholars and literary figures who had accompanied the emperor to his island retreat on Capreae. "The friends he took with him, apart from Sejanus, evince a genuine love of scholarship and science as practised in those days; Thrasyllus with his philosophy and starlore, Cocceius Nerva, a distinguished jurist and man of culture, Curtius Atticus, renowned for eloquence, and grammarians and men of letters" (S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 11 vols. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963], vol. 10: *The Augustan Empire 44 B.C.-A.D. 70*, p. 632).

<sup>72</sup>*The Annals of Tacitus: A New Translation by D. R. Dudley* (New York: Mentor Books, 1966), p. xiii.

<sup>73</sup>Tiberius has not found so much hostility among modern historians as in Tacitus. "It would thus be unreasonable to expect from Tacitus an unbiased view, and the only way to win this is by careful examination. Space does not admit of a full analysis, which has already been exactly and triumphantly carried out by scholars, and in any account of the Empire it would be an error in proportion to assume that the law of *maiestas* is the most significant features of Tiberius' rule" (*Cambridge Ancient History* 10:628). In the prophecy before us that is precisely the most significant feature of Tiberius' rule. This is due, not to a lack of perspective, but to the angel's focused approach. Ultimately he is not telling us about Tiberius; he is telling us about Christ. The law of treason was what affected Christ most directly during Tiberius' reign and so that is what the angel talks about as he presents the essential features of that reign to Daniel.

<sup>74</sup>Tacitus, *Annals* 5.2.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.*, 6.8 (quoted here from Dudley's translation instead of the Loeb edition).

<sup>76</sup>See *Cambridge Ancient History* 10:363-38.

<sup>77</sup>E. Bammel, "Syrian Coinage and Pilate," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1951): 110. When Bammel says, "In this connection," what he is talking about is an increase in Judea's use of bronze coins minted in Syria during and after the year A.D. 32.