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.

[1]See Hardy, "'North' and 'South' in Dan 11: A Prolegomenon to the Final Verses," *Historicism* No. 21/Jan 90, pp. 41-42.

[2]See idem, "Ezekiel's Prophecy Against Gog," *Historicism* No. 20/Oct 89, pp. 30-35.

[3]*Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White*, 3 vols. (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1962), 1:83.

[4]I do not claim that Ellen White had the self-realization that she was writing a commentary on Dan 11:40-45 in chaps. 35-40 of *Great Controversy*. But the Holy Spirit knew exactly what He was leading her to do. In the same way Daniel himself did not know what he had heard even while the angel was standing there telling it to him (see Dan 12:8). But the angel knew and in any event the instruction is there for our benefit. A model such as this can only be problematic so long as we fail to appreciate Peter's words: "For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet 1:21).

[5]There are 320 chapters in the Conflict Series (73 in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 60 in *Prophets and Kings*, 87 in *Desire of Ages*, 58 in *Acts of the Apostles*, and 42 in *Great Controversy*). Six chapters from this number represents almost two percent of the whole. Ellen White devotes the entire middle book of the Conflict Series to the gospels. But what bloc of six verses from the gospels are discussed in multiple chapters of *Desire of Ages*? One might argue that she devotes more space to the parables of Christ (*Christ's Object Lessons*) or the Sermon on the Mount (*Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing*). But one chapter per parable is less than one chapter (on average) per verse. The whole Sermon on the Mount, which occupies three chapters of Matthew (chaps. 5-7), is discussed in six chapters in *Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing* and the beatitudes, which occupy eight verses of Matt 5 (vss. 3-10), are treated in one chapter. So I do not intend my claim with regard to Ellen White's treatment of Dan 11:40-45 as a rhetorical flourish. It is literally true--if we accept the idea that *Great Controversy* chaps. 35-40 deals with the passage in question--that she gives this passage more attention than any other.

[6]Actually the text says that the king attacks "him" (vs. 40b, KJV) or "'his opponent'" (NIV). My reasons for arguing that "'his opponent'" in this case is the king of the South are as follows. When the king of the South attacks and therefore provokes someone, the king of the North is the one who responds. And he responds more specifically by attacking Egypt. So if the first "him" (vs. 40a, KJV) is not the king of the North, why does the king of the North and not some other king answer that provocation in the next clause? And if the second "him" (vs. 40b, KJV; "'him,'" NIV) is not the king of the South, why does the response consist of an attack on Egypt and not on some other country? The most economical explanation of these facts is that vss. 40a and the rest of what follows up through the end of vs. 43 relate to each other as cause and effect. The king of the South dominates the king of the North, then in response the king of the North dominates the king of the South.

[7]From this it does not follow that vss. 36-39 occur during the "time of the end." Instead they clarify material introduced in the preceding section (vss. 29-35). See Hardy, "Some Comments on Dan 11:36-39," *Historicism* No. 19/Jul 89, pp. 2-7.

[8]In Dan 8:17 the words *lᵉʿet qēṣ* ("'the time of the end'") refer at least in part to the end of the 2300 days. Combining this fact with what we have learned about the timeframe of Dan 11:40-45 (shortly before the second coming), it is clear that the 2300 days extend to a point shortly before the second coming. Other similar expressions used in Dan 8 are *bᵉʾaḥᵃrît hazzáʿam* ("'later in the time of wrath,'" vs. 19), *lᵉmôʿēd qēṣ* ("'the appointed time of the end,'" vs. 19), and

lᵉyāmîm rabbîm ("'the distant future,'" vs. 26). In vs. 19 the angel is not saying "'the appointed / time of the end'" but "'the appointed time [*lᵉmôʿēd*] / of the end [*qēṣ*].'"

⁹See Ps 44:5 (=6) ("Through you we push back [*nᵉnaggēᵃḥ*] our enemies"); and Ezek 34:21 ("'"Because you shove with flank and shoulder, butting [*tᵉnahhᵉḥû*] all the weak sheep with your horns until you have driven them away, . . ."'"). The word used here are "push" and "shove" rather than "gore," but notice the reference to horns in the second passage.

¹⁰The surface components of this word are *sug* (<*sun*) "with" (in the sense of mutual action, "together with"), *keratis* (<*keras*) "horn," *thēsetai* "will" [m3s, deponent]).

¹¹See James A. Montgomery, *Daniel*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), p. 466.

¹²The Latin says, *quasi tempestas veniet contra illum* "he comes against him like a tempest." See also, in the English or Hebrew, Ps 50:3 ("Our God comes and will not be silent; a fire devours before him, and around him a tempest rages [*niśᵃrâ*]") and Job 27:21 ("'The east wind carries him off, and he is gone; it sweeps him [*wîśāᵃrēhû*] out of his place'"). In Daniel this root is used only here (11:40). In Isa 28:2 we have the corresponding noun form *śáʿar* "wind" ("Like a hailstorm and a destructive wind [*śáʿar qāṭeb*], like a driving rain and a flooding downpour, he will throw it forcefully to the ground").

¹³The form *wᵉšāṭap* is used (with a different sense) in Lev 15:11 ("'"Anyone the man with a discharge touches without rinsing [Áśāṭap] his hands with water must wash his clothes and bathe with water, and he will be unclean till evening"'"). The sense of Dan 11:40c is preserved in, for example, Jer 8:6 ("'"Each pursues his own course like a horse charging [*šôṭēp*] into battle"'") and 47:2 ("'See how the waters are rising in the north; they will become an overflowing torrent [*máyim šôṭēp*]. They will overflow [*wᵉyiśṭᵉpû*] the land and everything in it, the towns and those who live in them'"). The root from which we get *wᵉʿābar* is used in Dan 9:11 ("'All Israel has transgressed [*ʿābᵉrû*] your law'") and 11:20 ("'His successor will send out a tax collector [*maʿbîr nôgēś*]'"). Used together, both roots convey the idea of going beyond a limit of whatever kind.

¹⁴The parallel with Isa 8:7-8 is appropriate because the words used in the two passages are the same and also because there is a close relationship between the books of Isaiah and Daniel generally. See George G. Nicol, "Isaiah's Vision and the Visions of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 501-4.

¹⁵C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, 2 vols. (Mountain View, CA/Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981/85), vol. 2: *The Message of Revelation for You and Your Family*, pp. 324-25.

¹⁶Obadiah gives evidence that Edom was still a viable nation at the time of Judea's exile to Babylon.

¹⁷The location of Ammon shifts over time. At the time of the conquest it lies opposite about the upper half of the Dead Sea. By the seventh century it has been pushed northward to a location above the Dead Sea and east of the Jordan River.

¹⁸Sennacherib came to Jerusalem on two separate occasions. Compare Isa 36:1 with 2 Kgs 18:13-16 and Isa 36:2-37:38 with 2 Kgs 18:17-19:37. See Hardy, "The Context for Ezra's Use of a Fall-to-Fall Calendar," *Historicism* No. 8/Oct 86, pp. 14-15, 59-60, n. 40.

¹⁹The same word spelled *rbwt* is correctly vocalized *rabbôt* "many" in vss. 40 ("'many ships'") and 44 ("'to destroy and annihilate many'").

²⁰No masculine forms are attested. Consider *ʾābôt* "fathers." When *ʾābôt* is used in a sentence as the subject of a verb, the verb is always masculine despite the fact that *ʾābôt* is grammatically feminine. In the same way, the adjective *rabbôt* "many (feminine)," unlike *ribbôt*, occurs is attested in both genders (*rabbôt* "many" [feminine] and *rabbîm* "many" [masculine]) and

so for that word a lack of gender agreement between the adjective and its corresponding verb would be significant, whereas for *ribbôt* it is not.

[21]The word translated "'main part'" (RSV) in vs. 41 is Hebrew *rēšît*. The Syriac has *wešarkā dabnē ʿammôn* ("and the remnant of the children of Ammon"), which implies that the Hebrew text from which it was taken read *šʾryt* (*šᵉʾērît*) "remnant" rather than *rʾšyt* (*rēšît*) "main part." At issue is whether most of Ammon would fall (reading *šᵉʾērît*) or not fall (reading *rēšît*) as a result of the king's attack. The textual evidence favors the latter reading, with no change in the text as it now reads.

[22]See Hardy, "Ezekiel's Prophecy," pp. 6-9, 26-29.

[23]The root *mlṭ* "save" (Dan 11:41; 12:1), derives historically from the root *plṭ* "save," (Dan 11:42): "'Egypt will not escape [*miṣráyim lōʾ tihyeh liplēṭâ*].'" See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), s.v. *mlṭ*.

[24]The language of vs. 42 is no different from that of vs. 40 ("'He will invade many countries [*ûbāʾ baᵃrāṣôt*] and sweep through them like a flood'"). There also the word "'many'" is supplied.

[25]Nebuchadnezzar's major campaign against Egypt was fought in 601 B.C. "It was during this campaign (in late 601) that Babylon and Egypt fought to a standstill, and Nebuchadnezzar withdrew to Babylon with no tribute" (Mark K. Mercer, "Daniel 1:1 and Jehoiakim's Three years of Servitude," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 27 [1989], p. 188).

[26]The word *bᵉmikmannê* (<*mikmān*) is built on a root *kmn*, which is used only here in the Old Testament. In Syriac the word *kᵉmen* means "to lay wait, lie in wait, lie in ambush, to be full of wiles and deceits." So the idea of "treasure" appears to derive from that of hiding something away. Notice that the order of the words is reversed in vs. 8. There we have "'silver and gold,'" here "'gold and silver.'"

[27]The word translated "'in submission'" (*bᵉmiṣʿādāyw*, lit. "in his steps") could be taken to mean "in his line of march." If Lybia and Nubia are in the king's line of march, the implication is that he goes there. This is the sense I have given the passage above. Elsewhere the same word *miṣʿād* is used only in Ps 37:23 ("The Lord delights in the way of the man whose steps [*misᶜᵃdê-geber*] he has made firm") and Prov 20:24 ("A man's steps [*miṣᵃdê-géber*] are directed by the Lord"). Keil suggests that, " *bᵉmiṣʿādāyw* (*at his steps*) = *bᵉraglāyw*, Judg. iv.10, denote the camp-followers, but not as mercenary soldiers (v. Leng., Hitz.). The *Lybians* and *Cushites* represent all the allies of the Egyptians (cf. Ezek. xxx.5, Nah. ii.9), the most southern nations of the earth" (C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.), Vol. 9: *Ezekiel, Daniel*, p. 472. Thus, the king does not march to Lybia or Nubia but draws auxiliaries from those countries for his army.

[28]See Hardy, "Ezekiel's Prophecy," p. 17.

[29]Ezekiel seems to be making a similar point when he brings "Cush" and "Put" together in Ezek 38:5. In antiquity "Put" was "the easternmost part of Libya, or the westernmost part of Egypt, or, if it is separate from both (which is more likely), the territory between them" (ibid.)

[30]In this context the idea of a Russian king of the North at the end of Dan 11 becomes unintelligible. Russia vs. Egypt is not Armageddon and, with a heavy belt of muslims along and within its southern border, attacking another Arab nation in the same category as Afghanistan would be highest folly. On the other hand a Russian attack on Israel would play well to the Arab world--discounting now any actions the United States might take to prevent it--but the text describes no such scenario. The king's campaign in Dan 11:40-43 is first and foremost a campaign against Egypt. A Russian Armageddon might seem plausible at first but it does not bear careful scrutiny.

[31]The same sense occurs in 2 Chr 32:18 ("Then they called out in Hebrew to the people of Jerusalem who were on the wall, to terrify them and make them afraid [*lᵉyārʾām ûlᵉbahhᵃlām*] in

order to capture the city"); and Ezra 4:4 ("Then the peoples around them set out to discourage the people of Judah and make them afraid [reading *ûmᵉbahhᵃlîm* (Qere) for *ûmᵉballᵉhîm* (Kethib)] to go on building").

[32]For the sense of "hasten" see 2 Chr 35:21 ("'God has told me to hurry [*lᵉbahhᵃlḗnî*]'"); Esth 2:9 ("Immediately he provided her with her beauty treatments [*wayyᵉbahhēl ʾet-tamrûqêhâ*] and special food," lit. "he hastened her beauty treatments," beginning them as soon as possible); Eccl 5:2 (1) ("Do not be quick [*tᵉbahhēl*] with your mouth"); 7:9 ("Do not be quickly provoked in your spirit" [*ʾal tᵉbahhēl bᵉruḥᵃkā likʿ̂ôs*]).

[33]The similar expression "'Beautiful Land'" is used in Dan 8:9; 11:16, and 41. See also Ezek 20:6.

[34]The directional symbolism of this final attack is provided in part by such other passages as Isa 14:13.

> (13) You said in your heart,
>   "I will ascend to heaven;
> I will raise my throne
>   above the stars of God;
> I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly,
>   on the utmost heights of the sacred mountain
>   [*bᵉyarkᵉtê ṣāpôn*].
> (14) "I will ascend above the tops of the clouds;
>   I will make myself like the Most High."
> (15) But you are brought down to the grave,
>   to the depths of the pit. (Isa 14:13-15)

The words translated "on the utmost heights of the sacred mountain" are *bᵉyarkᵉtê ṣāpôn* (lit., "on the sides of the North"). This is directly parallel to the phrase "the utmost heights of Zaphon" in Ps 48:2, where the same term is rendered by its sound ("Zaphon") rather than by its sense ("North"): "Great is the Lord, and most worthy of praise, in the city of our God, his holy mountain. It is beautiful in its loftiness, the joy of the whole earth. Like the utmost heights of Zaphon is Mount Zion, the city of the Great King" (Ps 48:1-2). For related discussion see J. J. M. Roberts, "*ṢĀPÔN* in Job 26,7," *Biblica* 56 (1975): 554-57.

[35]Ellen White, refers to the atheism of the French Revolution as "a new manifestation of satanic power" (*The Great Controversy* [Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1940], p. 269). What was new at that time has by now become a commonplace of socialism (vs. 40a). The healing of the fatal wound does not constitute a new manifestation but the revival of an old one (vss. 40b-43). The next time Ellen White's phrase would apply with dramatic force is to the impersonation of Christ by Satan (vss. 44-45). I would like to thank Dr. David Duffie for calling the above passage from *Great Controversy* to my attention (personal communication, April 12, 1990), although he should not be held responsible for my application of it.

[36]Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem, God's People Delivered: The Relationship Between Daniel 11:45 and 12:1*, reprint ed. (Berrien Springs: First Impressions, n.d.), p. 61. At this point Were takes his argument too far, because Paul clearly states that, "God did not reject his people, whom he foreknew" (Rom 11:2). It is an issue that deserves comment. The seventy weeks (490 years) of Dan 9:24 were "'decreed'" (nehtak, "cut off") or especially set apart for the Jewish people. Something then happened to distinguish their status during that time from their status afterward, i.e., during the rest the 2300 days (2300 literal years). The above distinction is brought about not by taking anything from the Jews but by giving what the Jews once enjoyed exclusively to all the Gentiles as well. In this way God made both groups equal, removing the last of the Jews' special privileges. The key word here is "special," not "privileges." No privilege is removed but now it is no longer a unique possession of any one group. Anyone at all who accepts Christ's Sonship can share its benefits by faith. This is why it is consistent for Paul to say what he does in Rom 11:2 and also that, "There is neither Jew nor

Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. If you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal 3:28-29). Only if a Jew rejects Christ is his own claim to sonship rejected. This is an easy point to miss and I believe Were has missed it.

[37]According to Montgomery (*Daniel*, p.) the word translated "'royal tents'" (ʾappadnô > *ʾappéden) comes from Persian (*apadana*). "Cf. the description of the tent of Alexander the Great, which was erected after the oriental type, in *Polyaen[us] Strateg[ica]* iv.3.24, and of the tent of Nadir-Schah in Rosenmuller, *A. u. N. Morgl.* iv. p. 364 f. These tents were surrounded by a multitude of smaller tents for the guards and servants, a circumstance which explains the use of the plur." (Keil, *Daniel*, p. 473). Sharon Pace Jeansonne suggests that, "The original Hebrew had ʾhlw 'his tent,' =o', _'. The present M reading, ʾhly, 'my tent' is a later corruption due to the confusion of *waw* and *yôd*" (*The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 19 [Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988], p. 77). But why does ʾhly have to mean "my tent"? What happened to masculine plural construct as a possible explanation? We need not assume that the original text was ʾhlw "his tent" (with *waw*) because the Septuagint and Theodotian do. The confusion between waw and yodh works both ways with equal facility. An original ʾhly > ʾohᵉlê "tents (of)" ʾappadnô "his palace," i.e., "his palatial tents" (with *yodh*), could just as easily be mistaken for *waw*, thus accounting for the attested Greek forms. I grant that the Greek translators read the text as *waw*. The question is whether they were right.

[38]*Daniel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1978), p. 203. Deut 33:19 says, "'They will summon peoples to the mountain and there offer sacrifices of righteousness; they will feast on the abundance of the seas [*yammîm*], on the treasures hidden in the sand.'" Judg 5:17 says, "'Asher remained on the seacoast [*lᵉḥôp yammîm*] and stayed in his coves.'"

[39]In Dan 8:4 we read, concerning the Persian ram, that "none could rescue from his power" (*wᵉʾên maṣṣîl miyyādô*) and in 8:7, concerning the Greek goat, that "none could rescue the ram from his power" (*wᵉlōʾ-hāyâ maṣṣîl lāʾáyil miyyādô*). There is no corresponding statement for the transition between secular and religious Rome. But in Dan 11:45, when the last phase of Roman power collapses at the second coming of Christ, the same formula is used once more: "'Yet he will come to his end, and no one will help him'" (*ûbāʾ ʿad-qiṣṣô wᵉʾên ʿôzēr lô*).

[40]Two such prophetic parallels are found in Ezek 38-39 and Rev 19. See Hardy, "Ezekiel's Prophecy," pp. 38-34.

[41]See *Historicism* No. 16/Oct 88, pp. 2-18. Duffie's argument is that the idea of conditionality has been overworked in our efforts to account for the differences between what could have happened to Israel and what actually did happen. In the present case we are not dealing with a misuse of conditionality but merely with the need to understand. So the focus is different but the principles are all the same. Duffie's paper should be read together with this one.

[42]This last approach was the one used in Hardy, "On What Basis Shall We Interpret Zech 12-14?" *Historicism* No. 12/Oct 87, pp. 22-56.

[43]Carpenter Books, Foreword by Bruce K. Waltke (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1984).

[44]See Hardy, "World Empire Motif," pp. 15-41; idem, "'North' and 'South'," pp. 41-59.

[45]See Hardy, ibid., p. 43, table 1.

[46]See ibid., p. 57.

[47]2 Chr 36:20, 22, 23; Ezra 1:1, 2, 8; 3:7; 4:3, 5, 7, 24; 6:14; 7:1; 9:9; Neh 12:22; Esth 1:3, 14, 18, 19; 10:2; Ezek 27:10; 38:5; Dan 5:28; 6:8, 12, 15, 28; 8:20; 10:1, 13, 20; 11:2.

[48]Dan 8:21; 10:20; 11:2; Joel 3:6; Zech 9:13.

[49]Consider the lists of directions given in Dan 8:4 and 9. The Persian ram "charged toward the west and the north and the south" (vs. 4). The Greek goat "grew in power to the south and to the east and toward the Beautiful Land" (vs. 9). The only direction that occurs in both lists is south.

[50]What brought Nebuchadnezzar to Judea in 605 B.C. was his pursuit of Egyptian stragglers after the battle of Carchemish. It is entirely possible that he originally had in mind taking more extensive action against Egypt--the Egyptian forces once deployed in Syria were in abject flight--but was prevented from doing so by his father's death.

"In the spring or early summer of the same year, the Egyptians laid siege to Kimuhu for four months and eventually recaptured it. When Nabopolassar heard of this, he returned to Syria and there made the city of Quramatu his base of operations against the cities of Shunadiru, Elammu, and Dahammu before returning home in the early part of 605 (15 Jan.-12 Feb.). The Egyptians, however, besieged the Babylonian garrison left at Quramatu shortly thereafter and forced the Babylonians to withdraw from the city. In response, Nabopolassar dispatched Nebuchadnezzar to Carchemish shortly after the beginning of his own twenty-first year of reign, which began on 12 April.

"In contrast to the previous Babylonian encounters with the Egyptians, Nebuchadnezzar defeated them soundly at Carchemish and subsequently routed the remnant which had fled southward to the province of Hamath. At this time the Babylonian forces conquered Hamath, but they apparently also continued moving southward within Hattu (i.e., Syria-Palestine), as evidenced by the fact that later (when he returned from Babylon after the death of his father) Nebuchadnezzar returned no to Hamath, but to Hattu (even though the Chronicles mention only the conquest of Hamath and not the conquest of Hattu). Upon learning of Nabopolassar's death (15 August 605), Nebuchadnezzar hastened back to Babylon and ascended the throne on 7 September" (Mercer, "Jehoiakim's Three Years," pp. 182-83.

[51]"At an unspecified time in his fourth year (30 Mar. 601-18 Mar. 600), Nebuchadnezzar returned to Palestine. It was during this campaign (in late 601) that Babylon and Egypt fought to a standstill, and Nebuchadnezzar withdrew to Babylon with no tribute. It was also during this campaign that Jehoiakim of Judah, who had paid tribute for the past three years, rebelled against the Babylonians. . . . Jehoiakim was a part of the pro-Egypt faction in Jerusalem and probably hoped that Necho would help him against the Babylonians. This renewed alliance would explain Nebuchadnezzar's march to Egypt in 601.

"Aware of the alliance between Jehoiakim and Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar marched for Egypt in the tenth month of 601 (21 Nov.-19 Dec.). When Necho heard of Nebuchadnezzar's action, he mustered his army and marched out to meet him. Both armies suffered heavy losses, and Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon with no tribute. The subsequent effect on both armies was significant: Nebuchadnezzar did not campaign the following year, and the Egyptians never regained any semblance of the control that they once exercised over Syria-Palestine" (ibid., pp. 188, 191).

[52]"Because of lack of positive historical confirmation, many scholars have doubted that the predicted invasion of Egypt by the Babylonians described here [Jer 46:13-26] and in Jer. 43:8-13; 44:30; Eze. 29:1-20 actually took place. . . . There is, however, a fragmentary Babylonian tablet dated in the 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar (568 B.C.) that speaks of a conflict between Nebuchadnezzar and Amasis of Egypt. Although it is impossible to determine the details of this invasion, the fact that it came the year after Amasis overthrew his predecessor, Apries, would seem to indicate that Nebuchadnezzar saw in the civil war then raging in Egypt an opportunity to conquer that weakened country and add it to his empire. This event may also be the correct setting of Josephus' narrative . . . . Ezekiel's prophecy (ch. 29:17-20) of a Babylonian conquest, given in the "seven and twentieth year" (571/570 B.C.), adds further probability to an invasion about this time. Secular history is silent as to the extent of the success of this Babylonian invasion. There may have been more than one campaign, but it is thought by some

that this campaign is the one described here by Jeremiah" (*The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7 vols. [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-57], 4:507).

[53]See Richard N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (New York: Mentor, 1963), pp. 112-13.

[54]See Richard A. Parker, "Darius and His Egyptian Campaign," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 58 (1941): 377. This revolt took place sometime between September 29, 522 (the death of Bardiya) and December 18, 522 (the last battle between Nebuchadnezzar III and Darius).

[55]See idem, "Persian and Egyptian Chronology," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 58 (1941): 285, 293.

[56]The first Persian satrap under Cambyses was a Persian named Aryandes (see idem, "Egyptian Campaign," p. 373). But one that we encounter toward the end of the Darius' reign was named Atiyawahy, an Egyptian (see idem, "Egyptian Chronology," p. 387). The tendency over time would be to use native satraps.

[57]*New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. Egypt.

[58]At Alexander's death (June 10, 323) there was no concensus on who would rule what. Discussion centered on whether Alexander would be succeeded by his brother or his son. The problem was that his brother was mentally defective and his son--if the child turned out to be a son and not a daughter--was not yet born. But the first interim agreement among the generals, worked out in a meeting which took place at Babylon, was along the following lines: "Those who were most important at Babylon received the most desirable satrapies: Ptolemy won Egypt; Leonnatus Hellespontine Phrygia. . . . Others were less important. Those who were present required reward for their support, and Perdiccas had no alternative to using the men he had. Lysimachus was given Thrace, Pithon Media; Menander, Alexander's satrap of Lydia, who was also present at Babylon, was confirmed; in Cilicia Philotas, probably also present at Babylon, was confirmed. Laomedon of Mitylene, one of Alexander's favoured Greeks, was given Syria; Eumenes, another Greek who had supported Perdiccas, was given the as yet unconquered Cappadocia and Paphlagonia: Leonnatus and Antigonus were to conquer it on his behalf. Of the rest, the less important, inoffensive, or immovable were confirmed in their posts which they held under Alexander: the former categories will account for the eastern satrapies, the latter for the likes of Antigonus in Phrygia Major, Lycia and Pamphylia" (R. M. Errington, "From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323-320 B.C.," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 90 [1970]: 57-58).

[59]"Trouble awaited Ptolemy at home and, in a sense, Egypt never recovered from the victory at Raphia. Sosibius' policies of taxation and recruitment, necessary in the face of the dangers of B.C. 219-218, bore painful fruits in the following years" (F. E. Peters, *The Harvest of Hellenism: A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the Triumph of Christianity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), p. 164-65).

[60]Ibid., p. 183-84.

[61]Ibid., p. 154.

[62]Octavian and Antony were the remaining members of the Second Triumvirate. "Lepidus was deposed from power by Octavian in 36 B.C. and kept under guard until his death in 12 B.C." (Naphtali Lewis and Meyer Reinhold, *Roman Civilization*, 2 vols., Harper Torchbooks [New York: Harper & Row, 1951], vol. 1: *Sourcebook I: The Republic*, p. 486, n. 96).

[63]Bernadotte Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives*, 11 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1968), vol. 9: *Demetrius and Antony, Pyrrhus and Caius Marius* (*Antony*, 36.2.). "However, since he was an adept at putting a good face upon shameful deeds, he used to say that the greatness of the Roman empire was made manifest, not by what the Romans received, but by what they bestowed" (ibid, 36.3).

[64]Rome had been the acknowledged protector of Egypt since 168 B.C. when Caius Popillius Laenas dramatically sent Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-163 B.C.) home from Alexandria and certain victory over Ptolemy VI Philometor (170-145 B.C.) (see C. Bradford Welles, *Alexander and the Hellenistic World* [Toronto: Hakkert, 1970], p. 123). But for a number

of years Rome appeared uninterested in annexing Egypt. "As early as 88, we find someone --and it is surely Roman financiers--lending a large sum of money to an Egyptian king (Ptolemy Alexander I) to enable him to collect a fleet and regain his throne. The circumstances of the time were exceptional, since Mithridates had made investment in Asia temporarily impossible, and some people no doubt had money to spare. As a security, they got a will bequething Egypt to the Roman People. When Alexander failed to regain his throne and was killed in the attempt, the Senate (by then under the *Cinnani*) made sure they got the money back; but no action was taken to annex the kingdom; this, as we had occasion to notice earlier, still seemed to be too contrary to traditional policy. It was only twenty years later, in very changed conditions, that the action of reclaiming the money could be interpreted by those in favour of annexation as *pro herede gestio*--even then unsuccessfully, as it turned out" (E. Badian, *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968), p. 73).

[65]Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 388.

[66]See Hardy, "'North' and 'South'," pp.45-47.

[67]The temple of Herod was larger than that of Solomon and must have rivaled it in beauty. "It used to be said: He who has not seen the Temple of Herod has never seen a beautiful building" (Isadore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud* [London: Soncino, 1935], Baba Bathra 4a, p. 12). For Ellen White's description see *The Desire of Ages* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1940), p. 575.

[68]"It is difficult to know how many Jews lived in these scattered communities. A reasonable guess estimates that there were about eight million Jews in the world just before the conflict with rome. Probably about one million lived in Babylonia, outside the Roman empire. About two and a half million lived in Palestine and four million of the rest of the Roman world. Jews formed two fifths of the population of Alexandria, and perhaps fifty thousand lived in Rome. Thus it has been calculated that in the first century C. E. the Jews were ten per cent of the total population of the Roman empire. In the eastern provinces, where they lived in greatest numbers, the proportion was higher, so that they were much more conspicuous" (Solomon Grayzel, *A History of the Jews From the Babylonian Exile to the Present*, rev. ed. [New York: Mentor, 1968], pp. 138-39). The above estimate might be generous, but there were also thriving Jewish communities in the Parthian Empire as well, most notably in Babylon (see ibid., pp. 216-62 passim).

[69]Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, pp. 531-32.

[70]See ibid., pp. 216-24.

[71]*The Earth Is the Lord's: The Inner World of the Jew in East Europe* and *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*, expanded ed., Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, 1950, 1952).

[72]The seventy years of Jer 25:11 and 29:10 must be measured not from 605 B.C. when Nebuchadnezzar first attacked Jerusalem but from 609 B.C. when Babylon finally defeated Assyria and began its career as the first of Daniel's world empires. See Ross E. Winkle, "Jeremiah's Seventy Years for Babylon: A Re-Assessment. Part I: The Scriptural Data," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 201-14; "Jeremiah's Seventy Years for Babylon: A Re-Assessment. Part II: The Historical Data," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 25 (1987): 289-299.

[73]Antiochus also figures (though indirectly) in vss. 14-16. There he is a historical figure. Here (in vss. 40-45) he is a type of some other historical figure. See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:2-15," *Historicism* No. 11/Jul 87, pp. 13-17.

[74]Daniel's knowledge of Nebuchadnezzar did not give him a complete understanding of the prophecy (see Dan 12:8). Nor does our knowledge of Antiochus give us a complete understanding of it. We will not understand this prophecy fully until the events it warns of occur.

But we must study these things now because by the time they do occur it will be too late to benefit from learning about them.

[75]"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)" (Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization*, 1:189). The story itself is now quoted from the Loeb edition: "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" (Polybius, *Histories*, 29.27.1-8).

[76]"Popilius and his aides then restored order in Alexandria; and after exhorting the two kings [Ptolemy VI Philometor and Ptolemy VII Physcon] to live in harmony and ordering them at the same time to send Polyaratus to Rome, they sailed to Cyprus, wishing to lose no time in expelling the Syrian troops that were in the island. When they arrived they found that Ptolemy's generals had already sustained a defeat and that things generally in Cyprus were in a turmoil. They quickly made the invading army evacuate the country, remaining there on watch until the forces had sailed off for Syria" (Lewis and Reinhold, *Roman Civilization* 1:190).

[77]Bruce M. Metzger, ed., *The Apocrypha*, The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977). "Antiochus's second attack on Egypt in 168 BC ended abruptly in the confrontation with the roman envoy, Popillius Laenas. While the king was thus engaged, an uprising occurred in Judea. The former high priest, Jason, attempted to regain control of Jerusalem, and Menelaus was forced to take refuge in the citadel (2 Mac 5:5-6). It was, however, an unsuccessful coup, and it cost Jason his life (2 Mac 5:7-10). Antiochus was not amused by such insurrectionary activities, and on his return journey from Egypt, doubtless deeply chagrined by his failure there and interpreting events in Judea as a revolt against himself, he went to Jerusalem to discipline its people in an extremely ruthless was (2 Mac 5:11-14; cf Dan 11:29-30 [according to the popular preterist view - FWH]). The figures in 2 Mac 5:14 of those killed or sold into slavery seem greatly inflated, but there can be little doubt that Judea was given to understand that anything like insurrection would not be tolerated. It is possible that Antiochus suspected that Jews with Ptolemaic sympathies were behind this trouble" (W. Steward McCullough, *The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod* [Toronto: University of Toronto, 1975], p. 114).

[78]"Antiochus, seeing that at Alexandria preparations were being made for the war concerning Coele-Syria, sent Meleager as his envoy to Rome with orders to inform the Senate and protest that Ptolemy was entirely unjust in attacking him" (Polybius, *Histories*, 27.19).

[79]See Hardy, "Dan 12:1-3 in Relation to Dan 11:44-45," to appear in *Historicism* No. 23/Jul 90.

[80]See Hardy, "World Empire Motif," pp. 15-41.

[81]The treatment of this topic in Maxwell, *God Cares*, 2:471-79 is especially good.

[82]Tables 2 and 3 are reproduced from the paper referenced in the previous note. In that paper they appeared as tables 5 (p. 23) and 7 (p. 35).

[83]See pp. 21-89 (Old Testament, 69 pages) and 89-176 (New Testament, 88 pages). For publisher see n. 2 above.

[84]See Martha Montgomery Odom, ed., *A Scripture Index to the Review and Herald Articles by Ellen G. White* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1978). This volume is 351 pages long (listings begin on p. 5), but more white space is left on each page than in *Index* 1:21-176. I do not have access to the *Signs* index volume.

[85]For Dan 11 see *Comprehensive Index* 1:83. Another significant omission is Rev 8-9 (the trumpets, ibid., 1:171). A paper which develops a definition of what a significant omission is and documents which ones occur would be a welcome addition to the literature already available on Ellen White.

[86]Originally published in 1888, the full title of this book is *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan: The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1950) (see earlier note). This is a 1950 copyright renewal of the 1911 edition.

[87]There is something very Roman about this. "From the very start of Roman history, powerful men had had free 'clients' attached to their persons and families. These men, though legally free, were by custom--and by the facts of power--obliged to obey and serve their patron in return for his protection. In a wider sense of the word, every *beneficium* created a relation of clientship, obliging the recipient to be prepared to render *officia*" (Badian, *Roman Imperialism*, p. 14).

[88]The quotation is from Josiah Strong, *Our Country*, chap. 5, pars. 2-4.

[89]See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:29-35," *Historicism* No. 18/Apr 89, pp. 23-27.   [90]See LaMar J. Sprout, "The French Waldenses of Provence," *Historicism* Supplement/Jul 89, pp. 36-41.

[91]"Although the Roman Church engaged in the persecution and burning of heretics before the 13th century, a clear distinction should be made between what went on before this date and the beginning of the operation of the courts. Since the decline of the Western Roman Empire, any heretic had been subject only to church law and church penalties, the severest of which was excommunication. But between the 11th and early 13th centuries, heresy was viewed increasingly as a capital crime" (Miroslav Hroch and Anna Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans: The Inquisition* [Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1988], p. 11). At the other end of its long career, Napoleon was instrumental in bringing the Inquisition to an end. He suppressed it in Madrid when he went there in December, 1808. It was subsequently declared unconstitutional--over the strenuous objections of Pius VII (1800-23)--February 12, 1813, reinstituted by Ferdinand VII July 21, 1814, abolished by the liberal revolution in 1820, restored again in 1823, and finally laid permanently to rest on July 15, 1834 when Queen Christina allied herself with the liberals in her government. See *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1964 ed., s.v. Inquisition. See also Hardy, "Dan 11:29-35," pp. 27-29.

[92]If all priests were male and half the population in any given parish were female, the privacy of the confessional--where all the guilty secrets of one's life had to be laid bare before the listening priest--provided ample opportunity for any unscrupulous cleric to judge who might be willing to repeat some of her indiscretions for his benefit. The suggestion that she do so was called a "proposition" by the inquisitorial courts. During much of the sixteenth century the category of offense prosecuted most often by the Inquisition, taking the Spanish city of Toledo as one example, was "propositions and blasphemy," reaching a peak of 256 cases in the five-year period 1551-55 (see Gustav Henningsen, "The Archives and the Historiography of the Spanish Inquisition," in Gustav Henningsen and John Tedeschi, eds., *The Inquisition in Early*

Modern Europe: Studies on Sources and Methods [Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986], p. 181). The church treated the problem of sexual overtures in the confessional as a problem linked to individual priests, but in fact the system of auricular confession itself extends an open invitation to such abuse.

[93]But it would not be entirely accurate to do so. "Vestiges of the non-Christian population who had not left the country were, in fact, the reason for the introduction of courts of Inquisition. Another reason was that many who elected to stay had contacts with the leading families of the land and were wealthy. This aroused the interest of the Crown who saw advantages to be gained from confiscating their property. These and other reasons explain the request of the Spanish kings to the Curia to renew the courts of Inquisition" (Hroch and Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans*, p. 46).

[94]J. C. H. Aveling, *The Jesuits* (New York: Dorset, 1981), p. 204. On the other hand consider Paul IV (1555-59), who as Cardinal Giampietro Carafa had been the church's chief inquisitor before becoming pope and he remained an ardent supporter of it throughout his pontificate. "On his death popular hatred for him and his family exploded, the rioting crowds destroyed the headquarters of the inquisition and released it wretched prisoners, and his statue on the Capitol was toppled over and mutilated" (*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Paul IV). Here we have a possible exception to the type of enlightened attitude Aveling mentions. Jesuits, incidentally, did not normally serve as inquisitors.

[95]This principle had been invoked since the days of Innocent III (1198-1216): "Against heresy itself he [Innocent] took energetic measures, declaring it (25 Mar. 1199) high treason against God; . . ." (J. N. D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986], s.v. Innocent III).

[96]Handbooks were published with the self-contradictory purpose of helping examiners keep their work on a high professional level. Tomaṡ Torquemada, under whose authority a hundred thousand persons were sentenced and two thousand burned, wrote one such manual in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century (see Hroch and Skýbová, *Ecclesia Militans*, pp. 46-47). There were many. I do not have the manual of Torquemada but an earlier one, dating from the middle of the fourteenth century and written by Nicolau Eymeric, chief inquisitor of Aragon, has been republished. One passage in chap. 5 is notable for its delicacy: "The inquisitors commonly use five kinds of torture when they give torment, which being known in all the world I will not specify here, since one can see them in [the manuals of] Grillando, Locato, etc." (Nicolau Eymeric, *Manual de inquisidores para uso de las inquisiciones de Espana y Portugal* [Inquisitors' Manual for Use by the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal] [Barcelona: Editorial Fontamara, 1974]). In saying this, despite any hyperbole ("in all the world"), Eymeric shows how extensively the church used torture during the fourteenth century. Such practices were not confined to the domain of an isolated sadistic bishop here or there but were generally known and widely implemented.

[97]*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Pius VI.

[98]Ward, "Napoleon and the Pope--What Really Happened in 1798?" *Ministry*, June 1979, p. 6.

[99]See C. Mervyn Maxwell, "An Exegetical and Historical Examination of the Beginning and Ending of the 1260 Days of Prophecy" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1951). The positions developed in the above thesis are incorporated in the author's later book, *God Cares*, vol. 2: *The Message of Revelation for You and Your Family* (see earlier note).

[100]*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. Pius VI.

[101]Ibid., s.v. Pius VII.

[102]Ibid., s.v. Pius IX.

[103]Ibid, s.v. Leo XIII.

[104]David Butler et al., "Special Report: The Pope of Promise," *Newsweek*, October 8, 1979, p. 39.

[105]"The Pope in America: It Was 'Woo-hoo-woo'," *Time*, October 15, 1979, p. 14.

[106]The above quotation is from chap. 38.

[107]An easily documented way to trace this growth is through the appearance of new Bible translations during this period. See Hardy, "Dan 11:29-35," pp. 31-32.

[108]A prominent spokesman for the above position is Howard Lindsell, former editor of the Evangelical magazine *Christianity Today*. I do not have space here to review his book, *The New Paganism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), but the baleful effects of the Enlightenment figure prominently in it: "Thus we live in a Post-Christian Age in the West and the displacement of the church from its leadership role in Western history was brought about by the Enlightenment, known in German as *die Aufklarung*. This eighteenth-century movement was responsible for the severest defeat the Christian church has suffered in its history" (ibid., p. xii). I could agree with this statement if it were modified to read, "the severest defeat the Catholic church has suffered in its history." But for Protestants I simply disagree with Lindsell. The period of the Enlightenment was one of great progress and growth. For all the attempted comprehensiveness of his book, Lindsell needs to clarify what he means by the church's "leadership role" and indeed what he means by "Christian church." Lindsell himself is every bit a Protestant but in some ways his work exhibits what could be mistaken for a broadly Catholic point of view in regard to the church's role in secular society.

[109]"Catholic scholars laud Luther as a great Catholic and loyal child of the church. Catholic scholar Dr. Otto Pesch, comparing Luther with St. Thomas Aquinas, called him 'one of the greatest witnesses for the Catholic faith.' . . . Perhaps the greatest example of the revised view of Luther was a televised musical celebrating the anniversary of his birth. Besides the music, which was composed of his hymns, there were dramatic portrayals of scenes from his life, including the Diet at Worms--all held at the Catholic National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.!" (Clifford Goldstein, *Hands Across the Gulf: Catholics and Protestants Break Reformation Barriers*, Discovery Books [Boise: Pacific Press, 1987], pp. 15, 16). This small book deserves a careful reading. It is richly documented and is well written in the bargain.

[110]Lance Morrow, "Time Essay: The Rise and Fall of Anti-Catholicism," *Time*, October 15, 1979, p. 36.

[111]"Agnes Gonxha Bojaxhiu, the daughter of an Albanian grocer and his wife, was born on Aug. 27, 1910, in Skopje, then in the Ottoman Empire and now in Yugoslavia" (Judith Cummings, "Stubborn Fighter for the Poorest of the Poor," *New York Times*, October 18, 1979, p. A14). In 1979, when she received the Nobel Peace Prize, the Order of the Missionaries of Charity which she founded in 1950 had 158 branches with 1,800 nuns and 120,000 co-workers. "Her order operates schools, hospitals, youth centers and orphanages, and 53,000 lepers are among the patients treated at medical centers in Africa and Asia" (Frank J. Prial, "Mother Teresa of Calcutta Wins Peace Prize," ibid., p. A1). She had been a candidate for the Peace Prize "ever since her work gained worldwide recognition more than two decades ago" (ibid.). Characteristically, Mother Teresa lives not in a cloister but among the poor she serves.

[112]Adrian Florensz Dedal, who reigned as Hadrian VI (January 9, 1522-September 14, 1923), had been a native of Utrecht in the Netherlands. Karol Wojtyla, who reigns now as John Paul II, was born on "18 May 1920 at Wadowice, an industrial town 50 km. south-west of Krakόw, Poland" (*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. John Paul II. By all accounts John Paul II is a remarkable man. "There is no question of his piety. At the chemical factory in Krakow, he dropped to his knees at noon for the Angelus, despite the taunts of co-workers, who pelted him with rags. Six books, two doctoral dissertations and a play attest to his genuine intellectual range" (Butler et al., "Special Report," p. 39).

[113]"The papal visit is now close to an art form as John Paul II--a former professor and actor--addresses presidents and peasants, intellectuals and entertainers, and scientists and students on a typical trip" (J. Bryan Hehir, "Papal Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy* 78 [1990]: 36).

[114]Butler et al., "Special Report", p. 39.

[115]This much should be said, but more should be added. David Warsh points out that the political right turn which expressed itself so dramatically in Eastern European during 1989 should be seen in the context of economic changes that started developing in Western Europe and the United States some twenty-five years earlier. After World War II "the economies of the social democratic welfare states of the industrial West grew more rapidly than ever before in history, as so did the size of their governments. . . . [Professional economists] endorsed, in fact, made a law of nineteenth-century German economist Alfred Wagner's prediction that the proportion of national income devoted to government spending would continually increase. Most of them took for granted the gradual convergence of Western mixed economies with socialist economies. Meanwhile, inflation in the industrial world gradually accelerated. By the mid-1960s, the first faint glimmerings of backlash were visible; by the mid-1970s, they were unmistakable. Newspaper editorials complained about the effects of high taxation; tax revolts took place at the ballot box in Sweden, Denmark, England, New York, Massachusetts, and California; legislators began preparing and passing tax-cut bills. . . . Everybody knows what happened next. Margaret Thatcher was elected in England, Ronald Reagan in the United States. Deng Xiaoping put China on a 'capitalist road.' In France, Francois Mitterrand executed an abrupt U-turn, privatizing industries he had nationalized only a few years before. Third-World leaders studied the 'Four Tigers'--Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Korea--for lessons in economic development. Led by Poland, Eastern Europe and finally even the Soviet Union seemed to turn dramatically in the direction of democracy and a larger role for market systems. In the meantime, however, inflation settled down again, and real government receipts stabilized at what were apparently permanently lower levels" (idem, "Who Supplied the Supply Side?" *Harvard Business Review*, May-June 1990, p. 38). "The Age of Keynes was for a time but not for all time" (John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Age of Uncertainty* [Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977], p. 226). Thus, from an economic point of view John Paul II was not creating a trend but following one in an impressive manner.

[116]Fred Barnes, "Communism's Incredible Collapse: How It Happened," *Reader's Digest*, March 1990, p. 108.

[117]Morrow, "Special Report," p. 38. This statement requires careful interpretation. There can be no papacy without the claim to universal obedience. I do not think it was the purpose of Vatican II to relinquish that claim. But like all diplomatic language, the object of this pronouncement is to provide common ground for people with different points of view. It should be read as a conciliatory gesture to non-Catholics.

[118]"John Paul II in His Own Words," *Newsweek*, October 15, 1979, p. 53. This statement was made during the pope's first visit to the United States.

[119]Butler et al., "Special Report," p. 36.

[120]In origin the word "Protestant" had to do with religious liberty rather than doctrine. At the Diet of Speyer in 1526 it was declared that, "In Lutheran lands the principle of religious liberty for Catholics must be observed, whereas in Catholic lands the same liberty would not be extended to the Lutherans. Against this invidious arrangement the Evangelicals protested, whence the origin of the name Protestant" (Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* [New York: Mentor, 1950], p. 248).

[121]Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. ed., *Luther's Works*, vols. 35-55 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), Theodore G. Tappert, ed., vol. 54: *Table Talk*, p. 444.

[122]Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958), 1:229.

[123]Recent events emphasize this point. "In Feb. 1984 John Paul concluded with the Italian government a revision of the Lateran Treaty (1929); this revision formalized the separation of church and state in Italy and, among other concessions, provided that Rome

should no longer be recognized as a 'sacred city'" (*Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, s.v. John Paul II).

[124]Protestants are not the king of the South. They are not the ones who challenged and overwhelmed the papacy in vs. 40a. And when the king of the North rides forth in response to the Southern challenge, his attack is not directed against them. He merely passes through their territory on the way to his real objective, which is to reassert his influence in the secular world.

[125]"To revert to the symbols given in chapter 17, it was *not the woman* that received the wound, but the *beast*. Obviously the wound means the taking away of the beastly power to dominate the world and deal with 'heretics.' This deadly wound will not be healed until the old power of persecution is restored. . . . In chapter 18, meaning a later period, the woman congratulates herself that she is no longer a widow; but it is plain that no part of the prophecy ever represents the Catholic Church as having been wounded or even hurt at all. Her paramour is the one who suffers the wound, and he is completely out of action" (George McCready Price, *The Time of the End* [Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1967], pp. 74, 76). Price's book is now out of print. This is a tragedy. It is filled with insight.

[126]Christians learned to give a variety of reasons for their gradual rejection of the Sabbath but in the final analysis they wanted to distinguish themselves from the Jews. Hatred was not the only emotion. Pride played a part as well. Jews were supposedly benighted and legalistic and yet Christians for many years felt obliged to imitate their Sabbath observance. Christian scholars must also have chafed at relying on the Jewish scholars they despised to establish the correct date for Easter (=Passover) each year. And so Christians found another way, with Rome occupying a leading role in the process. There were other reasons as well and all of these things took time to mature into a fully developed theology of Sunday sacredness. See Samuele Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), pp. 132-269.

[127]This is an interesting question. "The Christians of Asia Minor, following the Jewish chronology, and appealing to the authority of the apostles John and Philip, celebrated the Christian Passover uniformly on the fourteenth of Nisan (which might fall on any of the seven days of the week) by a solemn fast; . . ." (Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 8 vols. [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984], vol. 2: *Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100-325*, p. 210). Apart from the obvious problem of how the church could celebrate the same festival as the Jews without appearing to be dependent on them for it, the issue could be seen as whether Christ rose from the dead on a certain day of the week or a certain day of the year. In the West Christians came to think of the resurrection as occurring on the first day of the week (and of course it is true that He did rise on the first day of the week), but in the East Christians retained the earlier notion that He rose the day after Passover, which was a yearly rather than weekly celebration. "The Christian Passover naturally grew out of the Jewish Passover, as the Lord's Day grew out of the Sabbath; . . ." (ibid., 2:207). In the passage which says, "'He will speak against the Most High and oppress his saints and try to change the set times and the laws'" (Dan 7:25), "'set times'" refers to the innovation of a yearly Sunday and "'laws'" refers to the innovation of a weekly Sunday.

[128]The idea is one of cessation. A different root is used, however, in Exod 20:11 ("'but he rested [*wayyā́naḥ*] on the seventh day'"). So one could argue that the word *šabbāt* has special reference to the completed work of creation, which ceased on the seventh day, rather than to God's act of resting then, although in fact the two thoughts are so intimately related that no purpose would be served by trying to maintain a rigorous distinction between them.

[129]If the state, in consultation with the churches, enacts Sunday legislation as a means of getting God's blessing--the reason why this becomes an issue is that His blessing has been withdrawn--the act of doing so would provide a classic textbook example of righteousness by

works. First we write and enforce the needed laws, then God, on that basis, gives us His blessing.

[130]Illustrating the former, "As the storm approaches, a large class who have professed faith in the third angel's message, but have not been sanctified through obedience to the truth, abandon their position and join the ranks of the opposition. By uniting with the world and partaking of its spirit, they have come to view matters in nearly the same light; and when the test is brought, they are prepared to choose the easy, popular side" (GC 608). This quotation is from chap. 38.

[131]"In its quiet but pervasive orientation toward Christ Dan 11 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). If we start by first denying Christ's place in Daniel, no simple unifying principle remains and the term becomes fragmented and unmanageable. See Robert L. Webb, "'Apocalyptic': Observations on a Slippery Term," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (1990): 115-26.

[132]That part of the first angel's message which relates to time ("'Fear God and give him glory, because the hour of his judgment has come'" [Rev 14:7]) is not repeated. By the time of Rev 18 the judgment is virtually over. But the call to worship God as Creator ("'Worship him who made the heavens, the earth, the sea and the springs of water'" [Rev 14:8]) is indeed given again. God made all these things during creation week. The Sabbath began as the last day of that week. Thus, the first angel's message is a call for all mankind to acknowledge and understand the implications of the seventh-day Sabbath.

[133]The third angel's message says in part, "'If anyone worships the beast and his image and receives his mark on the forehead or on the hand, he, too, will drink of the wine of God's fury'" (Rev 14:9-10), i.e., he, along with the beast, will drink of the wine of God's fury. This same message is repeated by saying, "'Come out of her, my people, so that you will not share in her sins, so that you will not receive any of her plagues; . . .'" (Rev 18:4). The plagues pertain to the beast (or Babylon) but will be shared by anyone who accepts that power's authority in preference to the authority of God.

[134]There is a parallel in the history of Jericho: "By faith the prostitute Rahab, because she welcomed the spies, was not killed with those who were disobedient" (Heb 11:31). A difference is that in Rev 18 the harlot is the city instead of the woman escaping from the city.

[135]See Hardy, "Esther and the Death Decree," to appear in *Historicism* No. 24/Oct 90.

[136]Let me quote just one more paragraph: "That voice which penetrates the ear of the dead, they know. How often have its plaintive, tender tones called them to repentance. How often has it been heard in the touching entreaties of a friend, a brother, a Redeemer. To the rejecters of His grace no other could be so full of condemnation, so burdened with denunciation, as that voice which has so long pleaded: 'Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?' Ezekiel 33:11. Oh, that it were to them the voice of a stranger! Says Jesus: 'I have called, and ye refused: I have stretched out My hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all My counsel, and would none of My reproof.' Proverbs 1:24, 25. That voice awakens memories which they would fain blot out--warnings despised, invitations refused, privileges slighted" (GC 642).

[137]See n. 79 above.