

**A Response to:
A Request for Evidence on the Islam View Interpretation of Daniel 11:28-30**

February 11, 2023

Dear Conrad & Daniel 11 Prophecy Conference Steering Committee,

This is a response to Timothy Hayden's letter dated January 6, 2023. I wish to address the challenges he made and do so quickly as requested.

1. In his paper, "The Sunday Conspiracy and the Ships of Chittim", Mr. Hayden notes there were a people called the "*Kittim*" by Jewish soldiers at the fortress of Arad in southern Judea near Beersheba. The ostrakon on which this word was inscribed in Hebrew dates to around 600 BCE, the very time that Daniel was a young man. There is absolutely no need then, to look backwards in time, over 1300 years, to try to uncover where the descendants of *Kittim*, the great-grandson of Noah settled after dispersing from Babel. We can simply understand that the place of origin for the *Kittim* mentioned on the ostrakon is also where Daniel understood the *tzim* ships to be from in Daniel 11:29. Mr. Hayden provides sufficient evidence and references in his own paper that the place understood as the land of the *Kittim* by the Jews of Daniel's day is what has been called Cyprus since Biblical times. I found this part of his paper well researched and very compelling.
2. Daniel does not provide an adjective for the kind of *tzim* ship and so why should we require this of the prophecy? Any generic *tzim* ship, or war galley which would be powered with either oars or sails would fit this description. The prophecy does not require the *tzim* ships to be made with Cypriot technology, owned by Cypriots, or manned by Cypriots. The prophecy only states that the ships depart from Cyprus before battling the King of the North's ships. I really appreciated the parallel that Mr. Hayden found in Isaiah 33 for *tzim* ships. The description in Isaiah really helps one imagine what a *tzim* ship looks like.
3. As one who sees the Battle of Lepanto in Daniel 11:29-30a, I would only need to provide the New King James Version. The description of Isaiah 33:21-23 in which we find majestic ships powered by oars and sails is an adequate depiction of the vessels used by the Ottoman navy and shown on contemporary commemorative paintings. In response to the question of why the type of ships used by the King of the North is not mentioned, I have no answer. I would just point out that Gabriel would have been more than capable of giving even the names of the leaders of these navies. It would have been so much simpler if he had! I would also point out that Gabriel did not say that the ships used by the King of the North were not *tzim*, which leaves open the possibility that there were also *tzim*.
4. Myself and others who identify the Battle of Lepanto in verses 29-30a interpret the "former" conflict as being between political Christianity and an Islamic Caliphate and the acts of aggression against God's "holy covenant" as intensified persecution of true believers following the loss by political Christianity. The "former", described in verses 25-30, would be the Crusades to take Jerusalem in 1099 CE, the eventual loss of Jerusalem in 1187, and subsequent Albigensian Crusade which began in 1209. Verse 30b then is about persecution of true believers after the Battle of Lepanto, such as the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of Huguenots which occurred the following year in August 1572.

In closing, Mr. Hayden requests evidence be provided for the position that the Battle of Lepanto fulfills Daniel 11:29-30a. I would like to point out that Mr. Hayden himself has provided very well documented evidence for challenges 1 and 2. Anyone with a Bible can read Isaiah 33 and check out a painting of the Battle of Lepanto for themselves to answer challenge 3. As for evidence for challenge 4, the history I mentioned is common knowledge. The question then becomes if one would interpret these events as against the "holy covenant" or look for some other fulfillment before and after the Battle of Lepanto. Like Mr. Hayden, I am very much looking forward to seeing the material presented by Drs. Randy & Michael Younker in published form.

In conclusion, there are several criteria in Daniel 11:29-30a that would all have to be fulfilled for a proposed interpretation to have any validity. I would like to request that Mr. Hayden, or any others critical of the Battle of Lepanto interpretation, to answer the following challenges:

1. The proposed battle would have to occur at a specific time, a *moed* in the original Hebrew. The Battle of Lepanto occurred on October 7th, 1571. It is the only battle of those proposed

on the Daniel11Prophecy website that fell on a *moed* as defined in Leviticus 23. The Battle of the Hellespont was in July 324 during the summer season when no *moed* occur, disqualifying this battle as a fulfillment of this prophecy.

2. It would have to be different than the former. The Battle of Lepanto was not about conquering Jerusalem and was less about religion, instead being more about trade. The ethnicity of the combatants fighting for the King of the South also were not Arab, but Turkish. I see no real difference between the Battle of the Hellespont and previous internal struggles for control of the Roman Empire.
3. The *tzim* ships used in the conflict would have to be naval vessels powered by oars and sails. Of course then the battle would have to be naval, some interpretations on the Daniel11Prophecy website are not. These ships would have to come from Cyprus, or *Kittim*. The war galleys that fought in the Battle of Lepanto had most recently come from the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus. Most notably, the conquest took about a year and began with the Ottoman troops landing at the Salines in Larnaca, the modern name of the ancient site of Kition! This happened on July 4th, 1570 and Cyprus wasn't fully conquered until August 4th, 1571. As the beach at Kition was capable of landing over 100,000 men, it would also be an ideal place to put these men back on the same ships to transport them to Lepanto. While further research is needed to confirm that these ships indeed left the very city of Kition to go to Lepanto, we at least know that they left the island of *Kittim* as Daniel would have called it. The idea that this prophecy points simply to Greek technology used in building the ships used by Constantine or Licinius I find less than compelling and vague.
4. The battle would need to be fought between the King of the North and King of the South. The conflict between Constantine and Licinius was an internal affair within the Roman Empire. I find no compelling evidence in scripture to identify the King of the South as anyone other than the ruler of Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar is identified in scripture as the king of the northern army (Jeremiah 25:9) and fights with Pharaoh Necho of Egypt (2 Chronicles 35:20-22). Is it not possible that the King of the South has always been Egypt from before the time of King Josiah, through the reign of the Ptolemys, the Arab Fatimid and Ayyubid Caliphates whose capital was Cairo, the Ottoman Empire who controlled Egypt, right up to a future Caliphate led by an Islamic Mahdi, where Egypt is finally conquered at the time of the end in Daniel 11:42?

I, like Mr. Hayden, believe that the time is short. My final challenge is this, how does his interpretation help guide us today, as we navigate the seas of political and religious confusion around us today? No matter what challenges lie ahead of us, we know that Yahweh sits on the real throne on the furthest sides of the north! Michael is about to stand up and calm the wind and waves on behalf of his remnant disciples.

Greetings of Peace in the Name of our Prince Yeshua,

Ryan Thompson

<https://youtube.com/@remnantrendezvous>

RemnantRendezvous@gmail.com