

The Historicist Model for Interpreting Daniel

Copyright (c) 2006 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

Introduction

It will not be possible here¹ to consider all of the varied uses to which different authors have put the term "historicism."² Attention is primarily focused on historicism as it applies to the interpretation of apocalyptic prophecy, on Daniel within apocalyptic, and on chap. 11 within Daniel.

A major presupposition of the historicist views presented below is that God's dealings with mankind are characterized by ongoing involvement and take place within an extended historical matrix of ordinary human experience. The need to take seriously God's activity amid such commonplace affairs is pointed out by Gordon D. Kaufman, who regrets that

... the relationship between the *Heilsgeschichte* with which Christian faith is especially concerned and the ordinary, workaday, secular history in which all of us live every moment of our lives remains almost entirely unspecified. So despite its interest in "history" the Christian faith appears to many moderns to be in fact completely irrelevant to the only history which they know.³

The belief that God manifests His influence through events commonly known or available to any student of history has broad implications. It would be a fundamental error to think that only events which cannot otherwise be accounted for are significant prophetically. To the extent that Christians adopt such a view they erect an unnecessary philosophical barrier between "salvation history" and "ordinary, workaday, secular history" and have themselves to thank for the lack of relevance caused by it. This is not to say that God limits Himself to working in ways that are easily explained. When He chooses, God can act supernaturally, but the events of everyday human history are also available to Him as a means of working out His will.

During the early nineteenth century, Christians living in the United States generally interpreted Daniel from a historicist viewpoint similar to the one just described.⁴ Today, however, most Christian liberals have become preterists and most Christian conservatives are futurists.⁵ The main representatives of historicism in twentieth century America are Seventh-day Adventists. It is assumed below, unless stated otherwise, that a historicist writer is a Seventh-day Adventist writer, and vice versa.⁶

Inspiration of Scripture

The attitude of Seventh-day Adventists toward Scripture is indicated by Ellen G. White as follows:

In His word, God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the revealer of doctrines, and the test of experience.⁷

C. M. Sorenson expresses the same measure of confidence.

We have two mighty pillars of strong conviction in an infallible Bible and the principle of predictive prophecy, and holding these two great anchors of the soul, the Lord will lead us on step by step, and what further we need to know about the situation, will be revealed to us in His own good time by his own good providence.⁸

Although both writers cited use the word "infallible" in the passages cited, neither was unaware of the human element present in both the origin and subsequent transmission of the sacred text.⁹ Ellen White continues:

Written in different ages, by men who differed widely in rank and occupation, and in mental and spiritual endowments, the books of the Bible present a wide contrast in style, as well as a diversity in the nature of the subject unfolded. Different forms of expression are employed by different writers; often the same truth is more strikingly presented by one than by another. And as several writers present a subject under varied aspects and relations, there may appear, to the superficial, careless, or prejudiced reader, to be discrepancy or contradiction, where the thoughtful, reverent student, with clearer insight, discerns the underlying harmony.¹⁰

On the basis of the statements just quoted one could say that the way God makes His will known in Scripture is similar to the way He brings that will to completion in history. In both cases there is a balance to be maintained between two sets of influences. The decisions we make genuinely affect the course of events, on however large or small a scale, but God has a larger purpose in view which He ultimately causes to be accomplished. Both poles of influence are constantly and fully present in history. In Scripture also, the mind and experience of the prophet show through in his work, and yet the Spirit of God has moved upon him. Not all events have deep meaning and not all writing of a religious nature is inspired. But when such conditions do apply the result illustrates an interplay between God's activity and man's.

The attitude of Seventh-day Adventists toward the book of Daniel is a natural extension of their attitude toward the Bible in general. This particular book of prophecy is accepted--intelligently, but at face value and with reference to all its claims --as the inspired Word of God. Historicists are in full agreement with futurists on this point, while differing from them in the matter of verbal inspiration.¹¹

The Dating of Daniel

As regards the time when Daniel's prophecies were written, historicist and futurist views are once more in agreement. The following statement, with which Gerhard F. Hasel concludes a recent two-part survey of research bearing on this question, is representative:

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the classical problems of the syntax and spelling of the Aramaic of Daniel used in the past by certain scholars as support for an alleged

late date and a Western provenance appear now in an entirely new light. The new evidence and reassessment point to a pre-second-century-B.C. date and to an Eastern (Babylonian) origin. On the basis of presently available evidence, the Aramaic of Daniel belongs to Official Aramaic and can have been written as early as the latter part of the sixth century B.C.; linguistic evidence is clearly against a date in the second century B.C. Even if the exact date of Daniel cannot be decided on linguistic grounds alone, there is abundant and compelling linguistic evidence against a second-century Palestinian origin.¹²

Prediction and Application to History

LeRoy E. Froom, in vol. 1 of his massive history entitled *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, has suggested that the prophecies of Daniel not only describe actual historical events, which have found their individual fulfillments over the course of more than two thousand years, but that as each bloc of predictions was fulfilled it was correctly understood by many who were studying them at the time. This position is referred to below as the Froom Hypothesis. Froom states the background for his views on the fulfillment of prophecy as follows:

Extensive research such as this, with its voluminous findings, which have been carefully analyzed and organized, inevitably develops certain definite conclusions or convictions by the time the author rounds out his work, and comes to the task of recording his findings in systematic form.

For example, your investigator has been brought slowly but irresistibly to the conclusion that prophecy has been progressively understood just as fast as history has fulfilled it, step by step, down through the passing centuries. And, further, that always at the time of fulfillment of each major epoch and event of prophecy there have been numerous men of eminence and godliness, widely scattered geographically, who have recognized that a fulfillment was taking place before their very eyes. They have sensed where they were on the timetable of prophecy, and have left the record of that recognition. Such is the evidence.¹³

Notice Froom does not suggest that the various prophecies could be correctly understood by each succeeding generation in a different way.¹⁴ Instead the claim is that Daniel and other biblical writers were shown one overall system of prophetic history, the various parts of which were to be fulfilled serially. Each time a part of the larger whole came due for fulfillment--in its primary significance--the fact was recognized by careful students of that passage.

The circumstances surrounding Christ's birth, possibly alluded to in Dan 9:24,¹⁵ illustrate Froom's point. When the long predicted event finally took place there were some who recognized its significance--a few shepherds,¹⁶ an old man and woman in the temple,¹⁷ some oriental scholars.¹⁸ They surely did not realize all its significance; if the disciples after Christ's death did not yet understand the full breadth of His mission¹⁹ these earlier witnesses could not be expected to have done so. But they did realize that God was acting in a marked way to accomplish His purposes. Thus, God was not left without witnesses to this extraordinarily significant turning point in history.

It is important to notice that the implications of the Froom Hypothesis do not conflict with the biblical datum that the prophecies of Daniel were to be sealed.²⁰ In Froom's view, a given prediction was sealed until it was fulfilled. Not all of Daniel's predictions were to be fulfilled at the same time, and so not all were to be unsealed at the same time. The fact that some things he

wrote about were to remain sealed until the time of the end merely provides evidence that those particular predictions were not to be fulfilled until the time of the end. Thus, Daniel was shown a series of real historical events which began in his own day and have extended all the way to ours.

Not every age has had a prophet of its own, but through the writings of such earlier prophets as Daniel and John the Revelator people of every subsequent generation have been able to understand, if they wished to learn, something of the context for their experience in terms of events taking place during their own lifetime. There is no inconsistency here between Fromm and the implications of his hypothesis or between Fromm and the claims of the book of Daniel.

When Christ says, in Matt 28:20, "And surely I will be with you always, to the very end of the age," the assurances implicit within Daniel are stated openly. In the facts of personal experience as well as international affairs, and also in the prophetic record, God is always with us.

Chapter Outline and Commentaries

Modern historicist writers whose work is commonly available include Roy Allan Anderson,²¹ Robert D. Brinsmead,²² Desmond Ford,²³ C. Mervyn Maxwell,²⁴ George McCready Price,²⁵ Uriah Smith,²⁶ and Edwin R. Thiele,²⁷ These writers can be divided into two main groups, according to whether they place section breaks within Dan 11 at vss. 16 and 23,²⁸ or at vss. 14 and 21.²⁹ Of these possibilities the latter (vs. 21 or 23) has the greater importance, since it bears directly on one's interpretation of the prince figure in vs. 22.³⁰

A further diagnostic point has to do with vs. 29, placed by one group in the fourth century A.D.,³¹ and by the other group either considerably earlier³² or considerably later.³³ The above facts are summarized in table 1.

Table 1
Summary of Recent Historicist Commentaries

Author/Date	Vs. 14/16	Vs. 21/23	Vs. 29	Prince
Group 1				
Anderson (1975)	16 (p. 135)	23 (p. 142)	IV A.D.	Christ
Brinsmead (1970)	16 (p. 39)	23 (p. 45)	IV A.D.	Christ
Price (1955)	16 (p. 286)	23 (p. 293)	IV A.D.	Christ
Smith (1944, 1873)	16 (p. 246)	23 (p. 258)	IV A.D.	Christ
Group 2				
Ford (1978)	14 (p. 263)	21 (p. 266)	II B.C.	Onias III, Christ
Maxwell (1981)	14 (p. 281)	21 (p. 283)	XII A.D.	Christ
Thiele (n.d.)	14 (p. 133)	21 (p. 138)	XII A.D.	Christ

The reference to a prince in vs. 22 is preceded by a reference to a villain in vs. 21. These verses are now quoted for the reader's convenience.

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

intrigue. (22) Then an overwhelming army will be swept away before him; both it and a prince of the covenant will be destroyed."

As shown above, Christ is a possible referent of the prince figure in vs. 22 for all historicists listed; for most futurists the prince is Onias III.³⁴ See table 2.

The villain in vs. 21, according to Anderson, Brinsmead, Price, and Smith, is Tiberius Caesar,³⁵ for Maxwell and Thiele it is the medieval papacy, and for Ford it is Antiochus IV Epi-phanes. For most futurists³⁶ and all preterists³⁷ applying the villain figure of vs. 21 to Antiochus is an established datum. See table 3.

Table 2
The Prince

Interpreters	Prince (Vs. 22)
Historicists	Christ
Futurists	Onias III

Table 3
The Villain

Interpreters	Villain (Vs. 21)
Historicists	
Group 1	Tiberius
Group 2	Medieval Papacy
Ford	Antiochus IV
Futurists	
(All)	Antiochus IV

For Anderson, Brinsmead, Price, and Smith, Tiberius' role as villain follows from Christ's role as Prince, whereas for a majority of futurists Onias III as prince follows from Antiochus IV as villain. Thus, the essential element of contrast between these two major historicist and futurist positions on vss. 21-22 is that between Christ (the historicist Prince) in vs. 22 and Antiochus (the futurist villain) in vs. 21. This fact is represented in table 4 by bringing together the material from tables 2 and 3, with lesser characters in each model (Tiberius, Onias III) indicated by an "X" rather than being named.

Table 4
The Essential Contrast Between
Villain and Prince

Interpreters	Villain (Vs. 21)	Prince (Vs. 22)
Historicists	X	Christ
Futurists	Antiochus	X

As shown above, historicists and futurists propose two different characters as the center of focus in vss. 21-22. There is general agreement within camps on who this central figure is, but differences of opinion on how his opposite counterpart should be identified.³⁸ Historicists are

therefore united in identifying Christ as the Prince of the covenant. It should be understood, however, that the way this application is made varies and so does the identity of the corresponding villain, as well as the amount of internal cohesion between vss. 21 and 22.

For Thiele the villain of vs. 21 is the papacy.³⁹ Such an interpretation creates a number of contextual difficulties, most of which have to do with vs. 22. The latter verse says that the "prince of the covenant" would be "destroyed."⁴⁰ If the Prince is Christ, as Thiele holds, the first and most obvious way to apply the prediction would be to His crucifixion under Pontius Pilate. But in order to maintain that the pope is the villain of vs. 21 and that Christ is the One "destroyed" in vs. 22, Thiele brings the second passage into the timeframe of the first by generalizing its meaning. The word "destroyed" is taken to include spiritual disregard such as the church's later lack of emphasis on Christ's role as sole Agent of forgiveness, full and complete Sacrifice, intercessory High Priest, and so on.⁴¹ In this way the chronological problem is at least acknowledged. The pope starts being a villain in the prophecy during the sixth century A.D. and so the metaphorical destruction of the Prince also begins in the sixth century A.D. An additional feature of Thiele's exegesis of Dan 11 is that the land of Palestine remains a focus of attention throughout.⁴²

For Maxwell the issue of what happens to the Prince and when it happens remains moot; it is never really discussed. Christ is identified as the "prince of the covenant,"⁴³ but, following Thiele, the villain of the preceding verse is the medieval papacy.⁴⁴ Since every model has difficulties somewhere, those mentioned above in regard to the Prince of the covenant at vs. 22 are allowed to remain, without undo emphasis, pending further clarification. The essential differences between historicists of group 1 and group 2 are that, while all historicists apply vs. 22 to Christ in some way, for group 1 this application takes precedence over other matters. For group 2 maintaining strict continuity in the chapter's timeline is more important. Thus, in the case of Thiele and Maxwell vs. 22 is approached from the sixth century A.D. and is applied during the sixth century in an extended sense; in the case of Ford vs. 22 is approached from the second century B.C. and is applied both then (to Onias III, primarily) and in the first century A.D. (to Christ, secondarily). Despite their obvious differences Ford, Maxwell, and Thiele all have in common (1) that Christ is recognized, in one way or another, as the Prince of vs. 22, and (2) that His place there remains secondary to other exegetical considerations.

For the preterist the whole chapter is already applied before he gets as far as the first century A.D.; for the futurist it is skipped over as part of the gap. What brings the historicist to this era initially is a commitment to the idea of applying Daniel's prophecies in an essentially continuous manner across a wide expanse of history. But once inside the first century the historicist comes to the crucifixion of Christ and is faced with a decision as to how much emphasis this one event deserves relative to others in the chapter. For historicists of group 1, as stated above, it is more important to single out the reference to Christ at vs. 22 than to apply the rest of the prophecy in a strictly continuous manner. For historicists of group 2 this emphasis is reversed, or perhaps we should say that the original emphasis is retained. Either way, historical continuity is taken to be the single most important consideration.

In my own view one cannot have it both ways. The structure of this intriguing chapter is such that, if one requires its flow of narrative to be identical with its flow of history, Christ cannot be placed squarely in vs. 22. If He is, then the narrative must be seen as having some rather significant discontinuities. There is no historicist gap here, corresponding to the well known futurist gap; nothing is omitted. Instead two pivotal segments of history are dealt with in more than one connection.⁴⁵ Those structural characteristics of Dan 11 which contribute to this apparent problem will be discussed in a later paper.

Summary

As regards the identity of the Prince of the covenant in vs. 22, Christ is the term's only reference⁴⁶ for historicists of group 1 and group 2 apart from Ford. The destruction of the Prince is applied in a primary sense by group 1 historicists and by Ford, but in a secondary sense by the rest of group 2.⁴⁷ These facts, in comparison with the view taken by most futurists, are summarized in table 5 (below).

As regards the "contemptible person" of vs. 21, Tiberius is the term's only reference for most group 2 historicists. Ford accepts Rome only as a secondary reference for the villain, and takes the primary reference to be Antiochus. No historicist expositor applies the villain figure in a secondary sense (as opposed to reference). These facts are summarized in table 6.

Table 5
The Prince: Primary And Secondary
Reference And Sense

Interpreters	Reference	Sense	Prince
Historicists			
Group 1	1	1	Christ
Group 2	1	2	Christ
Ford	2	1	Christ
Futurists			
Most futurists	1	1	Onias III
Ford	1	1	Onias III

Note: Let "1" be read "primary," and let "2" be read "secondary."

Table 6
The Villain: Primary And Secondary
Reference And Sense

Interpreters	Reference	Sense	Villain
Historicists			
Group 1	1	1	Tiberius
Group 2	1	2	Papacy
Ford	2	1	Rome
Futurists			
Most futurists	1	1	Antiochus
Ford	1	1	Antiochus

Note: Let "1" be read "primary," and let "2" be read "secondary."

Conclusion

Three contrasting models for interpreting Dan 11 have now been discussed. Of these, futurist exegesis of Dan 11 could be approached as having a historicist starting point but with history confined to the second century B.C. in the first two thirds of the chapter, or it could be approached as having a preterist starting point with future reference added in the last section.

This matter is instructive and germane. If one were to think only of the presuppositions made by futurist exegetes on such matters as God's ability to predict future events, the best comparison would be between historicists and futurists in contrast with preterists. I submit, however, that the most significant fact about one's interpretation of Dan 11 is not when the chapter's historical events are said to occur, but the one on whom they focus attention. Viewed from this perspective, the comparison would be between preterist and futurist exegesis on the one hand and historicist exegesis on the other. This fact merely demonstrates that the presuppositions of an exegetical model and the presuppositions of those who espouse it are not necessarily the same and can find themselves in disagreement.

Futurists, like preterists, confine vss. 2-35 to the second century B.C. and omit Christ from vs. 22. Some futurists make a decided break at vs. 36 (or elsewhere) and concentrate entirely on future events from that point onward, some allow a dual interpretation in vss. 36-45 to events both future and past, and some concentrate more on past events than on future ones. There is a natural progression here, which preterists merely carry to completion by concentrating all, instead of some, of their attention on past events in the chapter's final verses. Thus, a significant continuum links the futurist and preterist positions in Dan 11, while on opposite ends of that continuum there are clear differences centering on God's role in originating prophecy.

When historicist and preterist views on Dan 11 are compared, the futurist position serves as a link between the two, combining some features of both. When historicism and futurism are compared, Ford's work is transitional between them. The greatest contrast is seen between historicism and preterism, and the central point of difference is now what it has always been--the nature of Christ's role as One predicted in prophecy. Porphyry's application of the villain figure to Antiochus was not an incidental fact about his model. It was the central rallying cry of an attack on the messiahship of Christ.⁴⁸

Within the historicist camp the most consistent fact about Dan 11 is not that it maintains an unbroken flow of historical narrative from Daniel's time to our own and beyond, but that it focuses attention on the Savior. This is the only thing that all historicists hold in common. They do not agree on how each event should be interpreted, or even assume that each verse of the chapter must follow the preceding one in time. But they do agree that in vs. 22 the Prince of the covenant is Christ.

¹The present paper is based on Frank W. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (Andrews University, M.A. thesis, 1983), pp. 65-85.

²Gordon D. Kaufman writes, in the introduction to his book, *Systematic Theology: A Historicist Perspective* (New York: Scribners, 1968) (p. xii, n. 3): "I am aware, of course, that the term 'historicism' has been used in a variety of ways to indicate this or that interpretation of history, including positivism, historical determinism, historical relativism, etc. In using this term I am not seeking to identify my views with any that may previously have been intended. I use the

word simply because it suggests a viewpoint that understands the world in historical terms, and many in terms of the radical implications of his historicity; and it is precisely this kind of viewpoint that the present analysis attempts to express." Historicism in this neutral sense in an emphasis on history as much as it is a set of principles for understanding history.

³Ibid., p. xii.

⁴See P. Gerhard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 19, 57-77 for discussion. See also Froom, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. 3: *Part I, Colonial and Early National American Exposition/Part II, Old World Nineteenth Century Advent Awakening*, pp. 382-410; vol. 4: *New World Recovery and Consummation of Prophetic Interpretation*, pp. 738-51.

⁵The preterist and futurist schools of interpretation may be said to represent two different concepts of how God manifests Himself in history. In the one case God works only through the common events of everyday life and in the other God works to a large extent through very uncommon events of a supernatural character. Both sides have gone too far in their respective directions.

⁶Taking historicism apart from prophecy, there are exceptions to this rule. Kaufman, whose work has been cited above, and with whom I find myself in close agreement, is an example of a non-Adventist historicist. But Kaufman says nothing about prophecy; it is unclear how he would choose to apply historicist principles in this specialized area of exegesis. As regards prophecy, and specifically Daniel, I know of no twentieth-century interpreter who is a historicist without also being a Seventh-day Adventist.

⁷*The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan: The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation*, rev. ed. (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1911; originally published 1888), p. vii. The entire introduction to White's book deals with the nature of inspiration.

⁸July 6, 1919 Bible Conference, Archives, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C., p. 79.

⁹Most Adventists no longer use the word "infallible" in a context such as this one, for the same reason that many evangelicals, including Billy Graham, no longer use the word "inerrant": "I believe the Bible is the inspired, authoritative word of God," Graham says, "but I don't use the word "inerrant" because it's become a brittle, divisive word" (Kenneth L. Woodward, *Newsweek*, 26 April 1982, p. 91). Such a possibility for misunderstanding did not exist sixty years ago. The intent of both White and Sorenson was to express confidence that God's written Word had shown itself perfectly trustworthy, and they were right in doing so.

¹⁰*Great Controversy*, p. vi.

¹¹The Ten Commandments were written on stone by God Himself (Exod 32:15-16). Occasionally words spoken by "the angel of the Lord" or some other heavenly visitant are recorded as a quotation (Gen 22:10-12 and many other passages). But in general it is not the case that Scripture presents thoughts which are God's in words that are also God's. Instead we find thoughts which are God's in words that are man's. Seventh-day Adventists do not teach verbal inspiration.

¹²Hasel, "The Book of Daniel and Matters of Language: Evidences Relating to Names, Words, and the Aramaic Language," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19 (1981):224-25. Also see idem, "The Book of Daniel: Evidences Relating to Persons and Chronology," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19 (1981):37-49. Not cited in either of these papers, but consistent with their conclusions, is H. W. F. Saggs, review of *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*, by W. G. Lambert, in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26 (1981):312-13. An additional paper by Hasel on the dating of Daniel is, "Daniel Survives the Critics' Den," *Ministry*, January 1979, pp. 8-11.

¹³Froom, *Prophetic Faith*, 1:15.

¹⁴See Ford, *Daniel*, p. 49: "The Possibility of Dual or Multiple Fulfillment. This should not be thought of as implying a double sense or prophecy but rather the same sense in recurring situations. This is sometimes called 'the apotelesmatic principle.'" Froom would not have

invoked the apotelesmatic principle in Dan 11. He would not have needed to, since every specification of the prophecy is accounted for by other means. There are cases, however, where its use is legitimate. A paradigm example would be Christ's miniature apocalypse in Matt 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21. For further discussion see Ford, *Abomination of Desolation*, pp. 62-74; "Ford responds to Shea," and "Shea Replies to Ford," *Spectrum* 11, 4 (1981):56-57, 59. A hermeneutical device as powerful as this one will require rigorous controls for its legitimate benefit to be realized.

¹⁵The clause of Dan 9:24 which, in my view, refers to Christ's birth is that which speaks of bringing in "everlasting righteousness." A text with which this one could be compared is Micah 5:2. The righteousness introduced by Christ's coming into the world extends not only to the future but also to the past. Dan 9:24 will be the subject of a later paper.

¹⁶Luke 2:8-20.

¹⁷Luke 2:25-38.

¹⁸Matt 2:1-12.

¹⁹Luke 24:13-49.

²⁰Dan 12:4, 9.

²¹Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies* (Mountain View: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1975).

²²Brinsmead, *The Vision by the Hiddekel: A Verse by Verse Commentary on Daniel Eleven* (Denver: International Health Institute, 1970).

²³Ford, *Daniel*, with a Foreword by F. F. Bruce (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1978). Here Ford's views are considered from the standpoint of historicism; they were considered from the standpoint of futurism in an earlier paper. See Frank W. Hardy, "The Futurist Model for Interpreting Daniel," *Historicism* No. 2/Apr 85, p. 41, and associated footnote.

²⁴Maxwell, *God Cares*, 2 vols. (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1981), vol. 1: *The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family*.

²⁵Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1955).

²⁶Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1944). This book was originally published as *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1873). The history of Smith's work on Daniel and the development of his widely used commentary, referenced above, is discussed by Roy Adams in *The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Church*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981), pp. 22-23, n. 4.

²⁷Thiele, "Outline Studies in Daniel," Pacific Union College, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

²⁸Group 1 (Anderson, Brinsmead, Price, Smith). It should be noted that since the time when *The Vision by the Hiddekel* was published in 1970 Brinsmead's views on Daniel have undergone a radical change. We are here dealing with the ultra-conservative Brinsmead of the 1960s, not the more evangelically inclined Brinsmead of the 1970s and 80s. For the latter see idem, *1844 Reexamined: Institute Syllabus 1979* (Fallbrook, CA: International Health Institute, 1979).

²⁹Group 2 (Ford, Maxwell, Thiele).

³⁰Other published historicist sources are Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, Heritage Library (Battle Creek: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1901; reprint ed., Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1977), and J. Grant Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated* (Minneapolis: [published privately], 1909). Unpublished sources at the Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C. include papers by Edward Heppenstall ("The Eleventh Chapter of Daniel: A Paraphrase and a Partial Interpretation") and William Hyde ("A Literal and Historical Application of the Explanation of Daniel Eleven"). Of special interest are the transcripts of the 1919 Bible

Conference, on file in the Archives of the General Conference, which contain extended comment on Dan 11 by such men as H. C. Lacey, C. M. Sorenson, A. O. Tate, and M. C. Wilcox. In addition the W. E. Read Personal Collection contains a paper entitled "Report on Eleventh Chapter of Daniel, with Particular Reference to Verses 36-39" by the Committee for Biblical Study and Research, approved July 21, 1953. A detailed review of these additional sources lies outside the scope of the present paper.

³¹Anderson, Brinsmead, Price, Smith.

³²Ford.

³³Maxwell, Thiele.

³⁴Onias III was at one time the legitimate, and conservative, high priest in Jerusalem. He was treacherously murdered by Menelaus, a liberal successor in office, during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. See 2 Macc 4:33-35; John Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, [1959]), pp. 403-4. The murder was subsequently avenged by Antiochus (2 Macc 4:36-38).

³⁵See Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, p. 255; Price, *Greatest of the Prophets*, p. 291; Brinsmead, *Vision by the Hiddekel*, p. 44; Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, p. 141. Our most important source of information about Tiberius is the historian Tacitus. In Tacitus' *Annals*, over and beyond such group characters as the Roman army and senate, "developing slowly and portentously over several books, tower those gigantic psychopaths, the Emperors. Claudius--uxorious, pedantic, and grotesque, with the odd appeal of those wholly devoid of dignity. Nero, the roistering young bully-boy with a taste for lechery and the arts, passing to the matricide and *folie de grandeur* of his later years. Above all, Tiberius--Tacitus' masterpiece, on which he lavished all his powers--the inscrutable countenance and the cold heart, the unwearying malevolence and the recondite lusts. In him Tacitus saw the archetype of the tyrant-Emperor, to which the sequel was Domitian. In his reign the law of treason was to unfold to an instrument of terror: then began that fearful system of spying and denunciation which so harassed the men of Tacitus' generation, reducing them all to silence, and sending the best of them to their graves. Tacitus' portrait of Tiberius is surely one of the most damaging indictments ever brought against a historical figure" (Donald R. Dudley, trans., *The Annals of Tacitus: A Modern New Translation by Donald R. Dudley*, New American Library [New York: Mentor Books, 1966], p. xiii). For a discussion of Tacitus' attitudes and biases toward his literary subjects see John Percival, "Tacitus and the Principate," *Greece & Rome*, second series, 27 (1980):119-33. For the chronology of Tiberius relative to Christ see Maxwell, *God Cares*, pp. 216-19.

³⁶Frank W. Hardy, "The Futurist Model for Interpreting Daniel," *Historicism* No. 2/Apr 85, pp. 39-41.

³⁷Idem, "The Preterist Model for Interpreting Daniel," *Historicism* No. 2/Apr 85, p. 3.

³⁸Of the futurist writers whose work was evaluated in Hardy, "Historicist Perspective" (table 16, p. 57), Leupold, Johnson, Walvoord, and Wood applied the prince figure of Dan 11:22 to Onias III. For Talbot the prince was Ptolemy VI. Keil, Lang, and Baldwin did not identify anyone as the prince, and for Ford the prince was both Onias III (the primary sense of the passage) and Christ (an extended application).

³⁹"Outline Studies," p. 138.

⁴⁰For further comment on the historical setting of this verse see Hardy, "Historicist Perspective," p. 122.

⁴¹"Outline Studies," p. 150.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 139, 148, 159, 165-71.

⁴³*God Cares*, pp. 281, 285-86. Note the absence of any reference to the "prince of the covenant" on p. 283.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 283, 286.

⁴⁵See Hardy, "Historicist Perspective," chaps. 2-4 (pp. 104-255). ⁴⁶"Reference" and "sense" are used here as technical terms. An application of one phrase to two different persons--both Onias III and Christ for example--is multiple reference; an application to one person in two different ways is multiple sense. The present use of these terms is similar to that proposed by the philosopher Frege (*Bedeutung*/"reference," *Sinn*/"sense"). See G. Frege, "On Sense and Reference," in *Logic and Philosophy for Linguists: A Book of Readings*, ed. J. M. E. Moravcsik (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), pp. 13-32. "If words are used in the ordinary way, what one intends to speak of is their reference" (*ibid.*, p. 15). "The reference of 'evening star' would be the same as that of 'morning star', but not the sense" (p. 14). Another way in which the morning or evening star could be referred to, that would convey still another sense to most persons, would be to call it the planet Venus. For discussion see Anthony Kenny, *Wittgenstein* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 29,35, 54, 58, 60-62, 95.

⁴⁷*Daniel*, p. 267.

⁴⁸See Jerome's "*Commentary on Daniel*", trans. Gleason L. Archer, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House 1958), pp. 129-30; Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," pp. 21, 23; Montgomery, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 469.