

Appendix

Uriah Smith and the King of the North in Dan 11:36-39 and 40-45

In the Daniel file at the Biblical Research Institute (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists) in Washington, DC is a paper by Raymond F. Cottrell entitled, "The Pioneers on Daniel Eleven and Armageddon." In that paper Cottrell discusses the development of Uriah Smith's views on Dan 11 against the backdrop of positions then current both within his own denomination (James White) and outside it (the popular Protestant commentators of his day).

Smith in relation to exegetes
outside his denomination

It was Smith's purpose to show that the Seventh-day Adventist system of prophetic interpretation was largely based on positions shared by other religious bodies. Thus, it was not our positions but our synthesis of them, our perspective, that made the Seventh-day Adventist system of prophetic interpretation unique. His initial books on the subject, *Thoughts on Revelation* (first published 1865) and *Thoughts on Daniel* (first published 1873), were drawn from articles he had published as editor of the *Review and Herald*, which at this time was largely written for a non-Adventist readership.

At first Smith held that the king of the North in Dan 11:40-45 was Rome. But then he espoused the popular view of his day that it was Turkey--the "sick man of the east." The religious press during the 1870s was filled with speculations about the demise of Turkey as a viable power in Europe and Smith was caught up in this line of thinking.

Smith in relation to exegetes
within his denomination

Uriah Smith and James White were in agreement so long as Smith held that the king of the North was Rome. But when Smith's views changed White's did not and, although their personal relationship remained cordial, they supported differing positions. In an editorial for the November 29, 1877 issue of the *Review and Herald* James White summarized his argument, which I find entirely persuasive, as follows:

Let us take a brief view of the line of prophecy four times spanned in the book of Daniel. It will be admitted that the same ground is passed over in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven, with this exception, that Babylon is left out of chapters eight and eleven. We first pass down the great image of chapter 2, where Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome are represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron. All agree that these feet are not Turkish but Roman. And as we pass down the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the beast with ten horns, representing the same as the great image, again all will agree that it is not Turkey that is cast into the burning flame, but the Roman beast. So of chapter 8, all agree that the little horn that stood up against the Prince of princes is not Turkey but Rome. In all these three lines thus far Rome is the last form of government mentioned.

Now comes the point in the argument upon which very much depends. Does the eleventh chapter of the prophecy of Daniel cover the ground measured by chapters two, seven, and eight? If so, then the last power mentioned in that chapter is Rome (quoted by Cottrell, *ibid.*, p. 7; the last paragraph was originally printed in italics).

Of course here we are not discussing vss. 40-45 but 36-39. Having taken the position that the king of the North was Turkey at the end of Dan 11, Smith interpreted vss. 36-39 in a corresponding manner. All this makes a fascinating story, and I wish that I could cite Cottrell at greater length, but the point is that my own interpretation of Dan 11:36-39 does not ignore what our pioneers have written. There was more than one pioneer. In vss. 2-35 I take Smith as a point of reference; in vss. 36-45 I take White.