

## HERMENEUTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN DANIEL 11

By Pastor Marcus Alden Swearingen Bates  
Copyright © March 2018 (All Rights Reserved)

### Introduction

Daniel 11, which is located within the larger textual unit of Daniel 10-12, is arguably one of the most difficult and controversial apocalypses in Scripture. Seventh-day Adventist interpreters have given considerable attention to this chapter through the years, and this attention has resulted in the production of much written material and a wide range of interpretations. The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* presents some interpretive options for this final apocalypse in Daniel.<sup>1</sup> However, the Adventist Church has not established and does not promote any official interpretation on this challenging prophecy.

Current discussions on Daniel 11 among Adventist interpreters involve such subjects as the Eastern Question,<sup>2</sup> the apocalyptic identities of the Kings of the North and South, and the alleged prophetic role of historical trends in the Middle East involving Islam and Jerusalem. Interpretive differences among Adventist interpreters include: (1) the King of the North in Dan. 11:40 as either Papal Rome or Turkey; (2) the King of the South in Dan. 11:40 as either Atheism, Egypt, or Islam; (3) the “king” of Dan. 11:36 as either atheistic France or Papal Rome; and (4) Dan. 11:40-45 as describing the history of Turkey and Napoleonic France, or an end-time conflict involving Papal Rome.

This writer proposes that there are three reasons for the lack of interpretive unity on Daniel 11 among Adventist interpreters. First, there is an apparent lack of agreement on an appropriate hermeneutical method through which to approach this chapter. Second, there is a lack of agreement on a general historical framework for this vision in terms of when the principal kingdoms of Danielic eschatology enter the prophetic stage. Finally, there is a lack of agreement on which specific historical trends are represented by the various passages in Daniel 11. In an attempt to offer a resolution to these challenges, this paper will discuss some important hermeneutical considerations that the Daniel 11 interpreter should keep in mind when studying this apocalypse.

### Daniel 11 – A Prophetic Narrative

The vision of chapter 11 was given to Daniel in a unique fashion. Rather than using symbols such as a metallic image (Daniel 2), wild beasts (Daniel 7), or sanctuary concepts (Daniel 8-9),<sup>3</sup> the prophet received this apocalypse through a visionary conversation with the angel Gabriel (cf. Dan. 8:16; 9:21). Gabriel informed Daniel that he would “tell” him “what is noted in the Scripture of truth” (Dan. 10:21), and proceeded to convey the visionary details of Daniel 11 in a verbal, narrative fashion. Since there is no textual evidence to suggest that Daniel also saw the details of this apocalypse during this visionary experience, Daniel 11 is to be considered a prophetic narrative, which was delivered by Gabriel in a verbal manner.

Gabriel also described this apocalypse through an extensive use of personal pronouns (“he” and “him”) when discussing the activities of the Kings of the North and South. These pronouns point to both empires and key rulers within these empires simultaneously. The narrative style and use of personal pronouns have led to the suggestion that the entire vision of Daniel 11 should be understood strictly from a geographic and spatial vantage point.<sup>4</sup> This

---

<sup>1</sup>Francis D. Nichol, editor, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, vol. 4 (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1977), 864-877.

<sup>2</sup>*Bible Readings for the Home* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1949), 294-298.

<sup>3</sup>Daniel 8 and Daniel 9 form a single apocalypse, despite the fact that the details of these two chapters were given more than a decade apart. See Donn W. Leatherman, “Structural Considerations Regarding the Relation of Daniel 8 & Daniel 9,” in *The Cosmic Battle for Planet Earth*, Ron du Preez and Jiri Moskala, editors (Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 2003), 293-305.

<sup>4</sup>Example: Roy E. Gane, “Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3,” *Journal of Adventist Theological Society*, 27/1-2 (2016): 319-321.

writer proposes, however, that the narrative style and use of personal pronouns do not necessarily suggest that the entire vision should be understood strictly in a literal sense with respect to geography. The interpreter should observe that there is still extensive symbolism in this chapter, and it will be discussed below that this symbolism undergoes a transition from geographic/spatial powers to global/spiritual powers as the apocalypse progresses in its description of the principal kingdoms that are discussed in Daniel’s visions.<sup>5</sup>

**Daniel’s Apocalyptic Visions – Three Key Qualities**

Daniel’s four apocalyptic visions (Daniel 2, Daniel 7, Daniel 8-9, and Daniel 10-12) reveal three key qualities for the Daniel 11 interpreter to consider. First, each apocalypse reveals the same parallel sequence of historical empires, and these empires extend in an historicist fashion from Daniel’s contemporary day to the eschaton.<sup>6</sup> Second, these historical empires, which make up the principal kingdoms of Danielic eschatology, consist of only those kingdoms that have had direct involvement with God’s covenant people, whether OT Israel or the NT Church.<sup>7</sup> Third, each apocalypse follows a vision/explanation format, and each time element is found within the explanation section of its respective apocalypse, and consistently applies the Day/Year Principle.<sup>8</sup>

| <b>A Summary of Vision/Explanation Format of Daniel’s Apocalypses</b> |               |                    |  |  |
|---|---------------|--------------------|--|--|
| <b>Apocalypse</b>   | <b>Vision</b> | <b>Explanation</b> | <b>Prophetic Time</b>                                      | <b>Interpretation of Prophetic Time</b>  |
| Daniel 2  | 2:31-35       | 2:36-45            | N/A  | N/A  |
| Daniel 7  | 7:1-14        | 7:15-28            | 1260 days (7:25)   | 1260 years (AD 538-1798)   |
| Daniel 8-9  | 8:1-12        | 8:13-27<br>9:20-27 | 2300 days (8:14, 26-27)<br>490 days (9:24-27)              | 2300 years (457 BC to AD 1844)<br>490 years (457 BC to AD 34)                    |
| Daniel 10-12  | 10:1-12:4     | 12:5-13            | 1260 days (12:7)<br>1290 days (12:11)<br>1335 days (12:12) | 1260 years (AD 538-1798)<br>1290 years (AD 508-1798)<br>1335 years (AD 508-1843) |

| <b>A Summary of the Parallel Sequence of Historical Empires that Constitute the Principal Kingdoms of Danielic Eschatology and Extend from Daniel’s Day to the Eschaton</b> |                 |                 |                   |                      |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Kingdom</b>  | <b>Daniel 2</b> | <b>Daniel 7</b> | <b>Daniel 8-9</b> | <b>Daniel 10-12</b>  |
| Babylon   | 2:32, 38        | 7:4             | N/A               | N/A                  |
| Medo-Persia   | 2:32, 39        | 7:5             | 8:3-4, 20         | 10:1, 13, 20; 11:1-2 |

<sup>5</sup>Frank W. Hardy, “An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11,” M.A. Thesis (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1983), 16, 217-218. It will be demonstrated below that vs. 30-31 show this transition. See also Angel Manuel Rodriguez, *Daniel 11 and the Islam Interpretation*, Biblical Research Institute Releases 13 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2015), 32-36, which comments on the symbolic scope of apocalyptic prophecy, especially the passage of Dan. 11:40-45.

<sup>6</sup>Gerhard Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2004), 111.

<sup>7</sup>This point is made evident by the fact that, while the empires described in Daniel’s visions were in power, there were certainly other kingdoms that were active in other areas of the world. Therefore, it makes sense that the specific kingdoms mentioned in Daniel’s visions were those that had a direct involvement in the history of God’s covenant people, whether OT ancient Israel or the NT Christian Church.

<sup>8</sup>Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*, 111-112. For a source that discusses the biblical evidence in support of the Day/Year Principle, see William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, revised edition (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of SDA, 1992), 67-110.

|                  |                |                       |                     |                   |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Greece           | 2:32, 39       | 7:6                   | 8:5-8, 21           | 10:20; 11:2-4     |
| 4 Greek Kingdoms | N/A            | 7:6                   | 8:8, 22             | 11:4-15           |
| Imperial Rome    | 2:33, 40       | 7:7, 19, 23           | 8:9, 23-25; 9:26-27 | 11:16-30          |
| 10 Kingdoms      | 2:33, 41-43    | 7:7, 20, 24           | N/A                 | N/A               |
| Papal Rome       | 2:41-43        | 7:8, 20-21, 24-26     | 8:10-13, 23-25      | 11:30-45; 12:7-11 |
| Judgment/Kingdom | 2:34-35, 44-45 | 7:9-14, 18, 22, 26-27 | 8:13-14, 26-27      | 12:1-3, 12-13     |

The data presented above reveals that the principal kingdoms of Daniel’s apocalypses consist of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Imperial Rome, Papal Rome, and God’s kingdom. Additional details are also present, such as the divided condition of Europe (Daniel 2 and Daniel 7) and the four Greek kingdoms (Daniel 7, Daniel 8-9, and Daniel 10-12). The first two apocalypses (Daniel 2 and Daniel 7) begin their empire sequences with Babylon because Daniel was living under its rule at the time of these visions. The second two apocalypses (Daniel 8-9 and Daniel 10-12) begin their empire sequences with Medo-Persia because Daniel was living under its rule at the time of these visions.<sup>9</sup> From a hermeneutical perspective, the Daniel 11 interpreter should expect that Daniel 10-12 will reveal the very same consistency as the prior three apocalypses with respect to its empire sequence.

### Apocalyptic Prophecy – Type and Antitype

The Daniel 11 interpreter should recognize the relationship between “type” and “antitype” in apocalyptic prophecy. A “type” can be identified as an OT person, place, or entity that points to a NT parallel (an “antitype”) which can be understood in a symbolic, spiritual sense in relationship to Christ and the Church.<sup>10</sup> The concepts of “Israel,” the “temple,” and “Babylon” are three prominent examples of this principle. In OT times these three concepts were spatial, geographic, national entities, but now should be understood as global, spiritual, symbolic entities. Because of God’s covenant transfer from OT Israel to the NT Church,<sup>11</sup> “Israel” and the “temple” are now associated with the faithful, while “Babylon” is now associated with religious confusion and apostasy.<sup>12</sup>

Therefore, the Daniel 11 interpreter should learn to differentiate between “type” and “antitype” in Daniel 11, as this chapter discusses several symbols relating to end-time events that are described in national, geographic language, and yet should be understood in a non-geographic, global, spiritual, antitypical fashion. These symbols, which are discussed in Dan. 11:40-45, include the King of the North, the King of the South, the Glorious Land, Edom, Moab, Ammon, Egypt, the Libyans, the Ethiopians, and the Glorious Holy Mountain. Per the examples of “Israel,” the “temple,” and “Babylon,” the Daniel 11 interpreter should focus on identifying antitypical meanings for these symbols.<sup>13</sup> The discovery of potential antitypical meanings involves identifying modern-day spiritual parallels that are akin to the specific character temperament, disposition, and relationship to ancient Israel that these specific entities once displayed in Bible times, whether positively or negatively.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Daniel was living under the rule of Belshazzar, the last Babylonian king, when the vision portion of the third apocalypse was given (Dan. 8:1-12). Yet, when part two of the explanation was given (Dan. 9:20-27), Daniel was living under Medo-Persian rule (Dan. 9:1). Thus, the empire sequence of Dan. 8-9 begins with Medo-Persia.

<sup>10</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983); “Interpretation of Prophetic and Apocalyptic Prophecy,” in *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, Gordon M. Hyde, editor (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1974), 225-250.

<sup>11</sup>Nichol, 4:25-38.

<sup>12</sup>See Matt. 21:43; 1 Pet. 2:9; Rom. 9:6-8; Eph. 2:11-22; Gal. 3:26-29; 1 Cor. 3:16-17; 2 Cor. 6:14-18; Rev. 3:12; Rev. 14:8; 17:1-12; 18:1-4.

<sup>13</sup>Louis F. Were, *Bible Principles of Interpretation* (St. Maries, ID: Laymen Ministries, 2008), 79-82.

<sup>14</sup>Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing, 1978), 275-276; Hardy, 16, 217-218; Gerhard Pfandl, “Daniel,” *Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide* (Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, October-December 2004), 105.

A brief survey of the Glorious Holy Mountain (Dan. 11:45) demonstrates the relationship between “type” and “antitype.” In OT times, Jerusalem and Mt. Zion were both referred to as a “holy mountain” (cf. Dan. 9:16; 9:20; Joel 2:1; 3:17; Zech. 8:3), and were obviously geographic in scope. In the NT, antitypical Jerusalem on earth now refers to the faithful (cf. Luke 21:24; Rev. 11:2).<sup>15</sup> In like manner, antitypical Mt. Zion on earth is now associated with the faithful (Psa. 125:1) and a spiritual place of deliverance (cf. Joel 2:32; 3:16; Heb. 12:22; Rev. 14:1). The term “glorious” is also a reference to the spiritual dispositions of faithfulness and holiness (cf. Exo. 15:11; Isa. 11:10-16; Eph. 5:25-27). Therefore, these terms are symbols that represent God’s faithful followers.

To summarize, the terms “Jerusalem” and “Mt. Zion” are synonymous with the Glorious Holy Mountain as antitypical symbols of the faithful, who are not limited to any geographic region. Given that the Glorious Holy Mountain is also discussed just prior to the final deliverance of God’s people at Christ’s return (Dan. 11:45-12:1), it also serves as a specific antitypical reference to God’s end-time faithful. Because the 144,000 constitute God’s end-time faithful in Revelation (Rev. 7:1-8; 15:2-4), and are described as being on Mt. Zion with Christ (Rev. 14:1-5), it can be concluded that this special group is synonymous with the Glorious Holy Mountain of Dan. 11:45. This key example of the relationship between “type” and “antitype” recommends that the other apocalyptic symbols in Dan. 11:40-45 should be similarly understood in an antitypical fashion.

### Daniel 11 – Two Additional Hermeneutical Principles

There are two other important hermeneutical principles that the Daniel 11 interpreter should consider. First, Scripture is to be its own expositor and interpreter, to where texts under consideration should be examined and interpreted in comparison with other passages that use similar words and phrases.<sup>16</sup> Second, difficult passages are to be understood and interpreted through a comparison with clearer passages that discuss the same subject matter.<sup>17</sup> These two principles are extremely important, because there are clearer passages in Daniel 11 that can be interpreted through a comparison with other texts that use similar language. These clearer passages can serve as anchor points to nail down when the principal historical kingdoms of Daniel’s visions enter the prophetic narrative, and thus will help to establish a basic empire framework for the entire apocalypse as a whole.<sup>18</sup>

An examination of the “abomination of desolation” can demonstrate the operation of these two principles. This term is discussed a total of four times in the book of Daniel (Dan. 8:9-13; 9:26-27; 11:31; 12:11), as well as three times in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:20-24). In the book of Daniel, three of the four references associate this term with the “daily” (Dan. 8:9-14; 11:31; 12:11), while the fourth reference uses this term without a reference to the “daily” (Dan. 9:26-27). Since Christ mentioned this term in the Synoptic Gospels without referring to the “daily,” we can deduce that He was citing Dan. 9:26-27 in reference to Imperial Rome as the “abomination of desolation,” which destroyed the “sanctuary” and the “city” of Jerusalem in AD 70.

As stated above, the three other references to the “abomination of desolation” in Daniel (Dan. 8:9-14; 11:31; 12:11) associate this term with the “daily.” Since Adventist interpreters apply the “daily” to either paganism or Christ’s “continual” intercessory ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, the “abomination of desolation” still points to Rome, and yet finds a specific fulfillment in the history of medieval Papal Rome. Because Dan. 11:31 is one reference that uses these two terms together, the Daniel 11 interpreter can conclude that medieval Papal Rome enters the prophetic narrative at least by vs. 31, and constitutes the specific empire in power at this stage in the

---

<sup>15</sup>In Luke 21:24, Christ noted how “Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” In Rev. 11:2, John mentioned the “Gentiles” and how they would “tread” the “holy city” for “forty and two months.” The “Gentiles” in this case refer to the unfaithful, while the “42 months” are “the times of the Gentiles,” which spanned from AD 538-1798. “Jerusalem” and the “holy city” are synonymous and refer to the faithful. See LaRondelle, “Apocalyptic Prophecy,” 229, 231, 242-243; *Israel of God in Prophecy*, 13.

<sup>16</sup>LaRondelle, *Israel of God in Prophecy*, 3;

<sup>17</sup>Ron E.M. Clouzet, *Decoding Bible Prophecy* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2011), 54.

<sup>18</sup>Pfandl, *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*, 106; Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007), 395.

prophetic narrative. The “abomination of desolation” therefore serves as an example of (1) how clearer passages in Daniel 11 that have textual connections with other texts can be interpreted, and (2) how these clearer passages can identify anchor points in this apocalypse that will help to establish the basic framework for an historical empire sequence. Establishing this framework can in turn demonstrate when the principal historical empires of Daniel’s visions enter the prophetic narrative. These anchor points will be discussed below in further detail.

### **Daniel 11:1-4 – Medo-Persia, Greece, and Four Greek Empires**

The first passage in Daniel 11 that serves as an historical anchor point is Dan. 11:1-4. This text confirms that the empire sequence of this apocalypse begins with Medo-Persia (cf. Dan. 10:1, 13, 20). Gabriel mentioned the “first year of Darius the Mede” (Dan. 11:1), and then mentioned that four future Persian kings would arise (Dan. 11:2). Because Cyrus was the king of Persia when this apocalypse was given (Dan. 10:1), these four kings were to arise subsequent to Cyrus, and consisted of Cambyses (530-522 BC), False Smerdis (522 BC), Darius I (522-486 BC), and Xerxes (486-465 BC). The “realm of Grecia” is also mentioned next (Dan. 11:2), a kingdom whose “mighty king,” Alexander the Great (336-323 BC), would “do according to his will” (Dan. 11:3). This detail confirms that Greece follows Media-Persia in the empire sequence of Daniel 11.

Gabriel went on to mention that Alexander’s kingdom would “be divided toward the four winds of heaven” and “be plucked up, even for others beside those” (Dan. 11:4). These phrases predicted that, (1) the Greek empire would be divided into four sections after Alexander’s death in 323 BC, and (2) each of these four sections would eventually be conquered (“plucked up”) by another power altogether. After a coalition victory against a rival Greek general in the Battle of Ipsus (301 BC), four former generals of Alexander divided his empire into four sections. These generals consisted of Cassander (Greece, Macedonia), Lysimachus (Thrace, NW Asia Minor), Seleucus (Syria, SE Asia Minor), and Ptolemy (Egypt, Judea). These four divisions later developed into four Hellenistic empires, consisting of Antigonid Macedonia, Attalid Pergamum, Seleucid-Antiochean Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt, each of which were later “plucked up” by another power altogether, Imperial Rome.<sup>19</sup> This data confirms that four Greek empires followed Medo-Persia and Greece in the empire sequence of Daniel 11.

### **Daniel 11:5-15 – North vs. South, Part 1**

Dan. 11:5-15 discusses the first north/south conflict in Daniel 11. The term “King of the South” (Dan. 11:5) follows the division of the Greek Empire (Dan. 11:4), and refers to the southern division of this empire, which is Ptolemaic Egypt at this stage in the prophetic narrative. This empire division was also geographically located south of ancient Judah, where God’s covenant people were located at that point in history. The passage also mentions that “one” of Alexander’s “princes” (generals), the “King of the North,” would become “stronger” than the “King of the South” (Dan. 11:5-6), which can be identified as Seleucid-Antiochean Syria. Because it later conquered some of the northern territories of Alexander’s former kingdom, and was located geographically north of ancient Judah, the Seleucid-Antiochean empire serves as the “King of the North” in this text, as it warred extensively with Ptolemaic Egypt and heavily involved itself in the affairs of ancient Judah during this stage of history.

This first north/south conflict in Daniel 11 also reveals the first extensive use of personal pronouns that represent both empires and specific rulers within these empires simultaneously. Dan. 11:5-15 surveys the activities of several individual rulers within the northern Seleucid Empire and the southern Ptolemaic Empire, the textual details of which can be confirmed by the record of history. This conflict is also discussed in Daniel 11 because God’s covenant people were located between these two powers in a geographic sense, and were controlled by both empires at various stages throughout this conflict. While this description is unique to the empire sequences in Daniel’s visions, these two empires still fall within the historical period of the four Greek empires that emerged after Alexander.

Overall, the textual details show that the Seleucid-Antiochean King of the North eventually became “stronger” than the Ptolemaic King of the South, per Dan. 11:15. The chart below discusses a summary of the Seleucid-

---

<sup>19</sup>Jacques Doukhan, *Secrets of Daniel* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2002), 167-168, 171.

Antiochean kings and Ptolemaic kings that warred against each other during the Hellenistic Era, which extended from the death of Alexander to the conquest of these kingdoms by Imperial Rome:

| <b>A Summary of Daniel 11:5-15 as a Description of the Hellenistic Warfare between the Seleucid-Antiochean King of the North and the Ptolemaic King of the South<sup>20</sup></b> |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Daniel 11:5-15</b>   | <b>King of the South</b>  | <b>King of the North</b>                      | <b>Historical Details</b>   |
| Dan. 11:5   | Ptolemy I Soter<br>(reign, 305-282 BC)  | Seleucus I Nicator<br>(reign, 305-281 BC)     | Seleucus becomes more powerful than Ptolemy   |
| Dan. 11:6   | Ptolemy II Philadelphus<br>(reign, 282-245 BC)  | Antiochus II Theos<br>(reign, 261-246 BC)     | Marriage of Antiochus to Berenice<br>Both murdered by Laodice   |
| Dan. 11:7-9   | Ptolemy III Euergetes<br>(reign, 245-222)   | Seleucus II Callinicus<br>(246-225 BC)        | Revenge of Ptolemy III for Berenice<br>Ptolemy lives longer than Seleucus   |
| Dan. 11:10-13   | Ptolemy IV Philopater<br>(reign, 221-203 BC)<br>Ptolemy V Epiphanes<br>(reign, 203-181 BC)    | Antiochus III Magnus<br>(reign, 225-187 BC)   | Ptolemy VI defeats Antiochus III in the Battle of Raphia (217 BC)<br>Antiochus III defeats Ptolemy V in the Battle of Panium (200 BC) |
| Dan. 11:14-15   | Ptolemy VI Philometor<br>(reign, 181-145 BC)<br>Ptolemy VIII Euergetes<br>(reign, 169-116 BC) | Antiochus IV Epiphanes<br>(reign, 175-164 BC) | Antiochus IV invades Egypt twice<br>Antiochus IV attacks Jerusalem<br>Exits Egypt after Roman intimidation                            |

#### **Daniel 11:16-22 – The Rise of Imperial Rome**

Adventist interpreters of Daniel 11 generally agree that Dan. 11:16-22 introduces Imperial Rome into the prophetic narrative, and discusses the activities of Pompey, Caesar, Augustus, and Tiberius, as well as the crucifixion of Christ. This writer proposes that the textual data is consistent with this interpretation, and thus serves as the next historical anchor point in Daniel 11. Dan. 11:16 reveals that a new power (“he,” possibly the “robbers [breakers] of thy people” from vs. 14; cf. Dan. 2:40; 7:7, 19, 23), Imperial Rome, would “come against” the Seleucid-Antiochean King of the North (“him”) and “do according to his own will” (conquer this power), and no other kingdom would be able to “stand before him.” This conquering power of Imperial Rome would also “stand in” and “consume” the “Glorious Land,” which refers to ancient Judah, where, once again, God’s people were located at that time.

Imperial Roman involvement in the region of ancient Judah began when Pompey ended the Seleucid-Antiochean dynasty and conquered Judea in 64-63 BC. Just prior to these conquests, he had subjugated Armenia and Anatolia to the geographic north of Judea. Because Pompey had conquered Judea from the direction of geographic north, Imperial Rome serves as the next manifestation of the “King of the North” in Daniel 11, thus replacing Seleucid-Antiochean Syria at this stage in the prophetic narrative. The Imperial Roman King of the North initially subjugated the “Glorious Land” of ancient Judah during Pompey’s career, and later “consumed” this land when the Roman general and future emperor Titus destroyed the city of Jerusalem and the temple in AD 70.

Dan. 11:17-22 continues in its discussion of the Imperial Roman King of the North, surveying Caesar (vs. 17-19), Augustus (vs. 20), Tiberius (vs. 21-22), and Christ’s crucifixion (vs. 22). After “corrupting” Cleopatra, the “daughter of women” (vs. 17), Caesar would later “stumble and fall, and not be found” (vs. 19), having been assassinated in March of 44 BC. Next, Caesar’s grand-nephew Augustus (Octavian), a “raiser of taxes” (Luke 2:1) and the first official Roman emperor, would “stand up” in his “estate,” and eventually die a natural death, “neither in anger, nor in battle” (vs. 20). Augustus’ step-son, the “vile” emperor Tiberius, would “stand up” next (vs. 21), and reign from

<sup>20</sup>C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981), 284-293; Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing, 1949), 235-245.

AD 12 to 37. The “prince of the covenant,” Jesus Christ, was “broken” (crucified) in AD 31, while Tiberius was in power (vs. 22). These details confirm that Imperial Rome is the next principal kingdom in Daniel 11, and the next manifestation of the “King of the North” in this chapter.

### Daniel 11:23-29 – North vs. South, Part 2

Dan. 11:23-29 is the first of three passages in Daniel 11 in which Adventist interpreters have a difference of opinion.<sup>21</sup> The traditional view claims that this passage continues with a discussion of the Imperial Roman King of the North, and cites details from the careers of Augustus (Octavian), Mark Antony, Titus, and Constantine.<sup>22</sup> A second view claims that this passage presents a transition into the history of the medieval papacy as the next manifestation of the King of the North. The King of the South is also identified as Islam in this second view, with the understanding that the text describes the medieval crusades.<sup>23</sup> This writer proposes that the traditional view of this passage is best-supported by the textual data and historical evidence.

Since there is no textual evidence suggesting a transference to a new empire in Dan. 11:23, the King of the North in this text is still Imperial Rome. As we survey Roman history in light of its relationship with God’s covenant people, the “league” (Dan. 11:23) consists of an agreement between Rome and the Jewish nation, which was ratified in 161 BC, during the Maccabean revolt against Seleucid oppression. To fulfill the “consumption” of the “Glorious Land” per Dan. 11:16, this “league” was gradually exploited by Imperial Rome so that it could “become strong with a small people,” the Jewish people. Through this “league,” this power would “peaceably” enter the “fattest places of the province” (Judea) to later “do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father’s fathers” by destroying Jerusalem and the temple, which, as stated above, took place through the activities of Titus in AD 70 (Dan. 11:24).

Furthermore, after “scattering” the “prey,” “spoil,” and “riches,” the Imperial Roman King of the North would “forecast his devices against the strong holds” by plotting the conquest of all rival Mediterranean powers from the city of Rome as an imperial center. This policy of conquest from the imperial center of Rome would take place “for a time” (Dan. 11:24), a 360-year prophetic period,<sup>24</sup> which would find its starting and ending points in Dan. 11:25-29, a text that discusses the second north/south conflict in Daniel 11. Once again, the “King of the North” in this passage is still Imperial Rome, and since there has been no clear transference to another power, the “King of the South” must still be Ptolemaic Egypt, the last Hellenistic empire to be conquered by Rome.

In light of these details, we must identify a time in Roman history when Rome would both war against and conquer Ptolemaic Egypt, the last remaining kingdom of Alexander that stood in its path toward Mediterranean domination as an imperialistic power. The record of history demonstrates that a long period of Roman civil war entered its final phase when Octavian (Caesar Augustus, the “raiser of taxes” in Dan. 11:20) faced off against Mark Antony, who had aligned himself with the Egyptian-Ptolemaic queen Cleopatra. This confrontation is described in Dan. 11:25-28, with Octavian acting as the Imperial Roman King of the North and Antony acting as the King of the South, given his political alliance with Cleopatra. Both of these “kings” mustered up a “great” and “mighty army” to fight against each other (Dan. 11:25). Yet, Antony would “not stand” because “they that feed a portion of his meat shall destroy him,” meaning that he would lose the support of Cleopatra’s forces, and thus his “army” would “overflow” (wash away) and “many” would “fall down slain” (Dan. 11:25-26).

---

<sup>21</sup>The other two controversial passages are Dan. 11:36-39 and Dan. 11:40-45.

<sup>22</sup>Examples include Roy Allan Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel’s Prophecies* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1975), 142-148; Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 258-266.

<sup>23</sup>Examples include Gane, 320-321; Maxwell, 1:293-294; Tim Roosenberg, *Islam & Christianity in Prophecy* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2011), 47-50, 206-208; William H. Shea, *Daniel: A Reader’s Guide* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005), 250-259.

<sup>24</sup>See Dan. 7:25; 12:7; Rev. 11:2-3; 12:6, 14; 13:5. In these texts, 42 prophetic months, 1260 prophetic days, and a “time, times, and half a time” each equate to 1260 days (years), with a “time” being a single period of 360 days (years). Thus, the “time” in Dan. 11:24 can be viewed as a 360-year time prophecy, where the starting and ending points are discussed in vs. 25-29.

History shows that both leaders also made periodic attempts to reconcile during their conflict, but they would “speak lies at one table” in order to “do mischief” (Dan. 11:27), because both secretly coveted sole control of the empire. Octavian would eventually rout Antony in a decisive naval battle near Actium off the coast of western Greece in 31 BC, which led to the Imperial Roman conquest of Ptolemaic Egypt and the suicides of both Antony and Cleopatra. Following his conquest of Egypt, Octavian would “return into his land with great riches” (Dan. 11:28), which describes how, after defeating Antony and capturing the Ptolemaic treasure, he returned to Rome in 30 BC as the richest person in the world, and would later become Caesar Augustus, the first official Roman emperor (27 BC). Dan. 11:28 also describes in a general sense how the Imperial Roman King of the North would “turn his heart against the holy covenant” by persecuting Christians, and “do exploits” by conquering many lands to expand this growing empire, which are general trends that took place under several Roman emperors.

Given this victory by the Octavian-led Imperial Roman King of the North over the Antony-led Ptolemaic King of the South at Actium, the year 31 BC can be identified as the starting point for the 360-year prophecy, simply because this was the year that the last remaining kingdom from Alexander’s former empire was conquered by Rome. This passage also shows that, similar to part one of the north/south conflict (vs. 5-15), the King of the North emerges victorious over the King of the South in this second north/south conflict. The prophetic narrative also reveals that the King of the South remains dormant until the “Time of the End” (vs. 40), after which a third north/south conflict will take place. This third north/south conflict will be discussed in further detail below.

Dan. 11:29 is also a significant text, for two important reasons. First, it provides an ending point for the 360-year prophecy (the “time” of Dan. 11:24). Second, it lays the foundation for understanding Dan. 11:30. Verse 29 states that “at the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.” At an “appointed time” (at the end of the 360-year prophecy), the Imperial Roman King of the North would “return” by coming “toward” Egypt (“toward the south”), but not “to” Egypt. This move “toward” Egypt would be a peaceful move, and not be for purposes of conquest, as it was in the “former” time (during the first north/south conflict in Dan. 11:5-15), or as it will be in the “latter” time (during the final north/south conflict in Dan. 11:40).

Given these textual details, the Daniel 11 interpreter must (1) discover an event in Roman history sometime after Egypt’s conquest by Octavian in 31 BC where Rome moved “toward” Egypt (but not “to” Egypt for the purpose of conquest, as it had already conquered this power in 31 BC), and (2) identify how this move “toward” Egypt would provide an ending point for the 360-year prophecy. If we begin this time prophecy in 31 BC with the victory of Rome (“north,” Octavian) over Egypt (“south,” Antony), then the ending date of this prophecy would be AD 330. The question now becomes, what signal event in Roman history took place in this year that witnessed an Imperial Roman move “toward” the “south” of Egypt in a geographic sense? As it turned out, one such move did take place in AD 330 – the emperor Constantine dedicated the city of Constantinople in this year as the “New Rome.” As far as land travel, this event can be viewed as a move “toward” Egypt in a geographic sense.

The dedication of Constantinople in AD 330 is extremely significant for three reasons: (1) this new capital would gradually eclipse old Rome in power and prestige, and become the new imperial center of the empire; (2) the Western Roman Empire grew increasingly unstable after this dedication, especially the city of Rome itself, and the western imperial structure eventually collapsed in AD 476 after several decades of being stressed by Germanic invasions over the Rhine and Danube border regions; and (3) the resultant power vacuum in Rome and the west overall after this collapse created an opportunity for the papal power to emerge as the eventual religio-political leader of Western Europe, a point that is discussed in Dan. 11:30-31. This proposed interpretation of Dan. 11:23-29 helps to explain the prophetic “time” of 360 years (31 BC to AD 330), and forms a foundation for understanding Dan. 11:30-31, which we will discover discusses the rise of the medieval papal power.

In summary, the text of Dan. 11:16-29 surveys major events in the history of Imperial Rome as the King of the North at this stage in the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11. These historical events include: (1) Pompey’s conquest of Syria and Judea (Dan. 11:16), which identifies Imperial Rome as the next manifestation of the King of the North; (2) Caesar’s activities and assassination (Dan. 11:17-19); (3) Caesar Augustus as the “raiser of taxes” (Dan. 11:20); (4) Tiberius as the “vile” emperor, during whose rule Christ was crucified (Dan. 11:21-22); (5) the “league” between Rome and the Jewish nation, which would eventually result in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in AD 70 (Dan.



11:23-24); and (6) the prophetic “time” of 360 years (Dan. 11:24), which extended from Octavian’s victory over Antony in 31 BC (Dan. 11:25-28) to Imperial Rome’s move “toward” the “south” of Egypt through Constantine’s dedication of Constantinople in AD 330 (Dan. 11:29).

Here are some final thoughts to consider regarding Dan. 11:16-29. This writer proposes that, (1) the above interpretation is viable because each of the events in these verses falls within the scope of Imperial Roman history with respect to its dealings with God’s covenant people, and thus fits within the overall historical framework of the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11; and (2) it is quite fitting that Dan. 11:29 ends with a discussion of Constantine, as he was the first Christian emperor (at least in name) whose prolific career, advocacy of the Nicene (Catholic) faith, and dedication of Constantinople paved the way for the eventual rise and development of the medieval papal power, which, once again, will be the next historical empire to enter the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11.

### **Daniel 11:30-35 – Medieval Papal Rome**

Dan. 11:30-35 describes a transition into the history of medieval Papal Rome, the next principal kingdom that is discussed in Daniel’s visions. Dan. 11:30 states that the “ships of Chittim [Cyprus]” would come against “him,” the Imperial Roman King of the North, which means that sometime after the dedication of the city of Constantinople in AD 330, Imperial Rome would be attacked. Although the “ships of Chittim [Cyprus]” is a debated phrase, the *SDA Bible Commentary* suggests that it could describe “invaders and destroyers from any quarter.”<sup>25</sup> This source also observes that, “Some see in the ‘ships of Chittim’ a reference to the barbarian hordes who invaded and broke up the Western Roman Empire.”<sup>26</sup> Based upon these observations, this writer proposes that this phrase discusses how Imperial Rome had experienced a series of fatal attacks from numerous Germanic invaders, especially the Vandal naval empire, a rival power that viciously sacked the city of Rome in AD 455.

Dan. 11:30 goes on to say that “he shall be grieved” and “return.” Whereas the first part of verse 30 states that the Imperial Roman King of the North would be attacked, the term “grieved” could describe how this power would be severely weakened from an attack to the point of collapse. As stated above, history demonstrates that, through a series of Germanic invasions in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries, the Western Roman Empire reached the point of collapse by AD 476, when the last western Roman emperor, Romulus Augustulus, was deposed by Odovacar, a Germanic-Herulian leader who proclaimed himself king of Italy. Yet, although Rome would collapse (“be grieved”) in its imperial phase by AD 476, it would “return” to power in its papal phase by AD 538.

In essence, the Imperial Roman King of the North would “be grieved” through a loss of power in AD 476, but later “return” to power by AD 538 in the form of the Papal Roman King of the North, which is the next manifestation of the “King of the North” in Daniel 11. Dan. 11:30, therefore, is to be viewed as a transitional passage from Imperial Rome to medieval Papal Rome in the prophetic narrative, a power that would “have indignation against the holy covenant” by persecuting Christians who would not recognize its authority. It would also “have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant” by gaining information from former faithful Christians who recanted their faith in order to persecute alleged heretics. These persecuting activities took place during the medieval dark-age career of the Papal Roman King of the North, a career which extended from AD 538 to 1798.

History demonstrates that this power was successful in its persecuting activities because “arms” would “stand on his part” (Dan. 11:31). Various European armies would help to confirm its power and supremacy, the first two of which were the military forces of the Frankish king Clovis I (reign, AD 486-511) and the Eastern Roman emperor Justinian I (reign, AD 527-565). Clovis’ victory against the non-Trinitarian Visigoths (AD 507) earned him the titles of consul and patrician by the eastern emperor Anastasius (AD 508), and his Catholic baptism on Christmas day of 508 made him the first non-Roman ruler in post-Roman Europe to convert to Catholicism and provide military support to the papacy. Justinian’s military forces also supported the medieval papal power by destroying the Vandals (AD 534) and the Ostrogoths (AD 553), two rival non-Trinitarian kingdoms in North Africa and Italy, respectively.

---

<sup>25</sup>Nichol, 4:873.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

Dan. 11:31 also discusses the terms “pollute the sanctuary of strength,” “take away the daily sacrifice,” and “place the abomination that maketh desolate.” Given the fact that Dan. 8:9-14 uses these terms to describe the medieval papal power, Adventist interpreters generally agree that these three phrases relate to the papacy, a power that injected many “spiritually desolating” religious practices into the Christian faith during the dark ages, including Sunday worship and the Mass. While agreeing that this text describes medieval Papal Rome, Adventist interpreters differ in their interpretation of the phrases “sanctuary of strength” and “take away the daily sacrifice.” Some interpreters suggest that the “sanctuary” is the city of Rome and that the “daily” is paganism, while others suggest that the “sanctuary” is the heavenly sanctuary and that the “daily” refers to the “continual” intercessory ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, which the papacy has sought to obscure. Regardless, these terms undoubtedly refer to the rise of the Papal Roman King of the North during the medieval period.

Dan. 11:32-35 confirms this conclusion through a general discussion of Papal Rome’s persecuting activities during the dark ages. This power would use “flattery” to entice those who recanted their faith to “do wickedly” against the Christian “covenant,” while the “people that do know their God,” the faithful, would remain “strong” and “do exploits” by winning genuine converts to Christ (Dan. 11:32). Thus, the faithful “that understand among the people” would “instruct many” by sharing the biblical faith during those difficult times, and some would even “fall by the sword, and by flame, and by captivity, and by spoil, many days” (Dan. 11:33). God’s true followers would only receive a “little help” during this period of persecution, and have to resist any “flatteries” that might lead them to renounce their faith (Dan. 11:34). As it turned out, “some of them of understanding,” the faithful, would be “tried,” “purged,” and “made white” (persecuted and martyred) during this period, until the arrival of the “Time of the End,” which came in the year 1798 (Dan. 12:4-9).<sup>27</sup>

There are two important hermeneutical observations to be made from Dan. 11:30-35. First, unlike Dan. 11:1-29, which discusses the specific activities of geographic empires and their select rulers, Dan. 11:30-35 shifts its focus by offering a general survey of the persecuting activities of the Papal Roman King of the North during the dark ages (AD 538-1798), without discussing the specific actions of key rulers. Because the career of this power spanned 1260 years, it would seem more reasonable and efficient within the scope of the prophetic narrative to provide a general survey rather than a specific one. Second, because Papal Rome is a spiritual kingdom and not a geographic one, Dan. 11:30-35 can be identified as a transitional passage from literal, spatial, geographic powers to global, spiritual, worldwide powers. This transition suggests that all prophetic terms from this point forward in the vision should be understood as being spiritual and global (antitypical) in scope, rather than spatial or geographic in scope. This understanding should form the basis for interpreting Dan. 11:40-45.

### **Daniel 11:36-39 – The Papacy or Atheistic France?**

Most Adventist interpreters of Daniel 11 generally agree in their understanding of Dan. 11:1-35. There is, however, a difference of opinion as to the identity of the power discussed in Dan. 11:36-39, which has resulted in the promotion of two main views on this passage. One view, which constitutes the later pioneer view and minority view to date, interprets this text as introducing a new power in the form of atheistic, revolutionary France.<sup>28</sup> The second view, which constitutes the early pioneer view and majority view to date, interprets this passage as a continued discussion of the same power brought forth in Dan. 11:30-35, which, as demonstrated above, is to be identified as the medieval Papal Roman King of the North.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1911), 356. Mrs. White proposed that the “Time of the End” began in the year 1798, at which point the book of Daniel was “unsealed” per Dan. 12:4-9.

<sup>28</sup>Examples include Anderson, 152-159; Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet* (Brushton, NY: Teach Services, 1999), 240-245; Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, 280-289; Robert J. Wieland, *Daniel Reveals the Future* (Grantham, Lincolnshire, England: The Stanborough Press, 2014), 158-160.

<sup>29</sup>Examples include Russell Burrill, *Hope When the World Falls Apart* (Keene, TX: Seminars Unlimited, 2003), 293-294; Roosenberg, 208; Shea, *Daniel: A Reader’s Guide*, 261-262; Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem* (St. Maries, ID: LMN Publishing, 2002), 42; Milton C. Wilcox, *The King of the North: A Suggestive Outline Study of Daniel 11* (Mountain View, CA: M.C. Wilcox, 1910), 21-33.

The phrase, “And the king” (Dan. 11:36) does not suggest a transference to another power, but rather reveals a continued survey of the same power discussed in Dan. 11:30-35. There are clear textual parallels between this “king” and the “little horn” discussed in Daniel 7 and Daniel 8, which suggests that these two symbols describe the same historical empire, which is identified as the medieval papal power. Both symbols, (1) speak against the God of heaven (cf. Dan. 7:8, 20, 25; 11:36), (2) exalt themselves above God (cf. Dan. 8:11, 25; 11:36-37), and (3) prosper in their persecution of God’s covenant people (cf. Dan. 8:11, 24-25; 11:36). The phrase, “do according to his will” is also one that is attributed to each of the four principal kingdoms mentioned in Daniel 8 and Daniel 11, which are Medo-Persia (Dan. 8:4), Greece (Dan. 11:3), Imperial Rome (Dan. 11:16), and Papal Rome (Dan. 11:36). These key details confirm that the “king” of Dan. 11:36 is the Papal Roman King of the North. Therefore, Dan. 11:36-39 serves as a continued discussion of the papacy, and does not reveal a transference to atheistic France.

Adventist interpreters who embrace the view of atheistic France in vs. 36 have also suggested that the phrase, “nor regard any god” (Dan. 11:37) points to atheism. However, this phrase should be regarded as synonymous with the other phrases in Dan. 11:36-37 that describe how this “king” would exalt itself above God, and thus does not “regard any god” but itself. This power would also not “regard” the “desire of women,” which could refer to either required celibacy or how this power would see itself as the only true church (Dan. 11:37).<sup>30</sup> It would also “honor the God of forces” (Dan. 11:38), which means it would use military force to control conscience during the medieval period. It would also promote a “god whom his fathers knew not” (Dan. 11:38), which points to the worship of the Virgin Mary, a “strange god” that has been “increased with glory,” one that the original apostles (the “fathers” from which the papacy claims apostolic succession) did not recognize as worthy of adoration. This “king” would also “cause them” (the “God of forces” and the “strange god”) to “rule over many” and “divide the land for gain” by exercising spiritual and economic control over the masses (Dan. 11:39).

The details discussed above demonstrate that the phrase, “nor regard any god” does not point to an atheistic power, simply because this “king” would, (1) exalt itself as being equal to and above the God of heaven, and (2) exalt both the “God of forces” (military force) and a “strange god” (the Virgin Mary), both points of which show that it is not an atheistic power. Therefore, the “king” of Dan. 11:36 is clearly the Papal Roman King of the North, which is a conclusion confirmed and published by Adventist leaders in a March 1954 *Ministry* magazine article.<sup>31</sup>

This point is also inferred through an insightful statement from Ellen White:

The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that ‘shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.’ [Verses 31-36, quoted].<sup>32</sup>

In the reference above, Mrs. White included Dan. 11:36 with Dan. 11:30-35. She also seemed to infer that a majority of these verses had already been fulfilled in a historical sense by the time she penned this statement in 1904. She mentioned the rise of a specific “power” in vs. 30, and then described the activities of this “power” by quoting vs. 31-36, which means that vs. 30 and vs. 31-36 are connected and discuss the same power. In essence, Mrs. White advocated that the “king” of Dan. 11:36 is the same power that is described in Dan. 11:30, and since vs. 30 describes the rise of the Papal Roman King of the North, we can conclude that the “king” of vs. 36 is also the same power. Mrs. White also observed that much of the history already fulfilled in Daniel 11 will be repeated. This writer proposes that the repetition of history will involve how the dark-age persecuting activities of the papacy outlined in vs. 30-36 will be repeated in the passage of Dan. 11:40-45.

---

<sup>30</sup>A “woman” in prophecy represents a church. See 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:25-32; Rev. 12:17; 19:6-9.

<sup>31</sup>“A Report on the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel.” *The Ministry* (March 1954): 26. This source argues that it seems more textually consistent to equate the “king” of Dan. 11:36 with the little horn powers of Daniel 7 and Daniel 8, as well as the “man of sin/son of perdition” in 2 Thess. 2:3-4. See also page 25 of this source.

<sup>32</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, vol. 13 (Silver Spring, MD: E.G. White Estate, 1993), 394.

### Daniel 11:40 – North vs. South, Part 3

Dan. 11:40 introduces the third and final north/south conflict in Daniel 11, and begins with the phrase, “At the time of the end.” Dan. 12:4-9 clearly conveys that the “Time of the End” began at the conclusion of the 1260-year medieval rule of the Papal Roman King of the North, which extended from AD 538 to 1798. This means that the “Time of the End” arrived in the year 1798, and constitutes the last period of human history, extending from this very year to the return of Christ. Major English translations of Scripture use the term “at” in context with the “time of the end” in vs. 40, which seems to identify a specific point in time, i.e. the year 1798. This evidence suggests that Dan. 11:40-45 describes prophetic events extending from 1798 to the eschaton.

Dan. 11:40 also states that “at the time of the end” (1798), the King of the South would “push at him,” the “king” of Dan. 11:36. The word “push” (Hebrew – *nagach*) is defined as, “to gore,” “to butt with horns,” and “to war against,”<sup>33</sup> which conveys the idea that the “king” of Dan. 11:36, which is the Papal Roman King of the North, would be attacked by the King of the South in the year 1798.<sup>34</sup> The text also states that the Papal Roman King of the North would respond to this “push” from the King of the South “like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over” (Dan. 11:40). These details suggest that the King of the North would re-emerge after losing power and be victorious over the King of the South, as it did in the first two north/south conflicts described in Dan. 11:5-15 and 25-28.

Given that the papacy is the King of the North in this passage, we must now identify the King of the South. In the two earlier north/south conflicts in Daniel 11, the King of the South consisted of Ptolemaic Egypt. There is no clear transference to another power as the King of the South, so we must still identify this power as Egypt. Imperial Rome conquered Ptolemaic Egypt, so how are we to understand the “Egyptian” King of the South in Dan. 11:40? Because Dan. 11:30 signifies a transition from typical, national, geographic powers to antitypical, global, spiritual powers with the entrance of the papacy as a spiritual kingdom into the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11, we must be consistent in viewing the manifestation of the King of the South in Dan. 11:40 as a form of antitypical Egypt. Since the papacy is an antitypical power, the symbol of “Egypt” must also point to an antitypical power. We must now identify antitypical Egypt through an examination of its ancient temperament and relationship to OT Israel. Because this power was one that refused to acknowledge God and His prerogatives (Exo. 5:1-2),<sup>35</sup> acting as an enemy of God and His people (Eze. 29:1-6), we can identify antitypical Egypt as atheism.<sup>36</sup>

We must now discover what atheistic power attacked the Papal Roman King of the North in the year 1798. History will demonstrate that France was an avowed atheistic power from November of 1793 to June of 1797 during the French Revolution. Atheism as an ideology was essentially unleashed during this revolution, and although France’s atheistic identification lasted only 3½ years in a legal sense, the effects of this ideology are still being felt today.

As it turned out, the French army ended the civil power of the papacy in February of 1798, which was within a year of France’s official atheistic identification. Since France was still riding the effects of this identification well after June of 1797, we can identify France as the atheistic King of the South that “pushed” the Papal Roman King of the North in 1798. This identification, (1) is consistent with the Adventist understanding of Rev. 11:7-8, which refers to atheistic, revolutionary France as the power described as “spiritual Egypt,” and (2) is consistent with the Adventist understanding that revolutionary France, led by Napoleon, dealt a “deadly wound” to the papacy in 1798 (per Rev. 13:3), which is the event described in the first part of Dan. 11:40.

---

<sup>33</sup>James Strong, *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997), “push” (H5055). See 1 Ki. 22:11; 2 Chr. 18:10; Dan. 8:4 for textual examples on the use of this word.

<sup>34</sup>Rodriguez, 4 (see the comments in footnote 4 of this source).

<sup>35</sup>Doukhan, 173; Rodriguez, 15-17.

<sup>36</sup>Ellen White also viewed “Egypt” as a symbol of atheism in Rev. 11:7-8 with respect to the French Revolution, which is represented by the “beast” from the “bottomless pit.” See White, *Great Controversy*, 269. If antitypical Egypt is a symbol of atheism in Revelation, then, to be consistent, it must also have the same meaning in Daniel, as the two books go together. See Ellen White, *Acts of the Apostles* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1911), 585.

Going a step further, Adventist interpreters have presented some possible interpretive options for the second half of Dan. 11:40, which describes the response of the King of the North to the “push” of the King of the South. No doubt, atheism has fought an ideological battle against the Christian faith ever since it was unleashed during the French Revolution. Soviet atheistic communism undoubtedly emerged as the result of this development, and Burrill suggests that its collapse in 1990-1991 through the Cold War efforts of the papacy and the United States is a specific fulfillment of Dan. 11:40.<sup>37</sup> This historical development might constitute at least a partial fulfillment of the second half of vs. 40. However, given that, (1) there are still communist-atheistic states left in the world, and (2) atheistic ideology is the dominant worldview in western academia, the fall of Soviet communism has not resulted in the conquest of atheism, and thus does not fully satisfy the textual claims of Dan. 11:40.

To attempt to provide a satisfactory explanation, this writer proposes that the “healing” of the “deadly wound” of the papacy will not take place until Sunday legislation becomes a reality in the future as the mark of the beast.<sup>38</sup> Given this future prospect, it seems more reasonable to suggest that atheism will be finally “conquered” by the Papal Roman King of the North through an atheistic submission to Sunday legislation. This will be a spiritual and ideological conquest, one that will be enforced through the global military strength of the various nations of the earth, which is discussed in the second half of vs. 40 through details such as, “chariots,” “horsemen,” and “ships.” Therefore, the papal power will use the military strength of submissive nations to its advantage in the future, just as it did during the dark ages (per the terms “arms” and “God of forces,” cf. Dan. 11:31, 38). Every nation will eventually align with the papacy through international compliance with Sunday legislation, as also evidenced in the second half of vs. 40 with the phrase, “he shall enter into the countries, and pass over.” These details suggest that atheistic nations and individuals will not be immune to this end-time development.

We should also remember that the conquest of the papacy in 1798 did not result in the complete eradication of this power. Although it lost the ability to control civil governments, this spiritual kingdom still continued to exist and function as an institution after receiving its “push.” We should view the future conquest of atheism in a similar fashion. While the papacy might never be fully successful in eradicating atheism (at least not until Satan appears as Christ, after which there undoubtedly will not be an atheist left on earth because of the overmastering power of this deception<sup>39</sup>), prophecy does foretell that the whole world will worship the beast by submitting to its mark of Sunday legislation (Rev. 13:3, 16-17), and this submission will include both atheistic nations and adherents.

Simply put, atheism will submit to the mark of the beast when it is enforced. This writer suggests, therefore, that the first half of Dan. 11:40 describes the deadly “push” against the Papal Roman King of the North in the year 1798 by atheism as manifested in revolutionary France, while the second half of Dan. 11:40 describes the eventual spiritual conquest of atheism in the future through the enforcement of the mark of the beast. When this takes place, the antitypical, atheistic King of the South in the form of atheistic nations and individuals will be conquered by the Papal Roman King of the North through a compliance with Sunday legislation as the mark of the beast.

### **Daniel 11:41 – The Glorious Land**

Dan. 11:41 states that the Papal Roman King of the North would next “enter” into the “Glorious Land” and engage in the “overthrow” of “many countries.” Some interpreters have suggested that this term represents either geographic Israel or the United States.<sup>40</sup> To be consistent in applying the hermeneutical principle of “type” and “antitype,” however, this writer proposes an antitypical meaning for this term. Earlier in the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11 (vs. 16), the Imperial Roman King of the North “consumed” the “Glorious Land” of ancient Judea (where

---

<sup>37</sup>Burrill, 302-306.

<sup>38</sup>Louis F. Were, *Battle for the Kingship of the World* (Berrien Springs, MI: First Impressions), 59-60.

<sup>39</sup>White, *Great Controversy*, 624-625.

<sup>40</sup>Geographic Israel: see Haskell, 247; Roosenberg, 51-52, 73, 210. United States: see Hiram Edson, “The Times of the Gentiles,” *Review & Herald* (Feb. 28, 1856): 169-170; James White, “Unfulfilled Prophecy,” *Review & Herald* (Nov. 29, 1877): 172. Edson and White both equated the “Glorious Land” with the “Glorious Holy Mountain,” and proposed that both symbols represent the United States.

God’s covenant people were located at that point in history) through the military conquests of Pompey and Titus. This historical conquest is also described in Dan. 8:9 through the activities of the “little horn,” which conquered the “pleasant land.” The terms “glorious land” and “pleasant land” (which both use the same Hebrew term) are references to geographic Israel (cf. Jer. 3:18-19; Eze. 20:6, 15; Dan. 8:9; 11:16).

Once again, because apocalyptic terms described in geographic language after vs. 30 should be understood in a symbolic, antitypical fashion that is more global and spiritual in scope, we must seek to identify the antitypical “Glorious Land.” Since this term once related to the literal, geographic region where God’s covenant people were located in OT times (Dan. 11:16), this term now relates to where God’s end-time covenant people are located in a spiritual sense, which points to the Christian Church as the spiritual “Israel” of the NT dispensation (cf. Matt. 21:43; 1 Pet. 2:9-10; Gal. 3:26-29; Eph. 2:11-22; Rom. 9:6-8). The “Glorious Land” of Dan. 11:41, therefore, represents the global Christian Church, and constitutes the spiritual entity that the Papal Roman King of the North will “enter.”

This spiritual entrance will actually take place when the mark of the beast is enforced through Sunday Legislation,<sup>41</sup> and will thus constitute the second “fall” of Spiritual Babylon into apostasy (Rev. 14:8; 18:1-4).<sup>42</sup> So, not only will the atheistic world comply with the mark of the beast (per the second part of Dan. 11:40), but the Christian world will also comply (per the first part of Dan. 11:41). Dan. 11:41 also states that, when this event takes place, “many countries” would be “overthrown.” Since the word “countries” is supplied in the text, it should read that “many” would be “overthrown” in a spiritual sense when the mark of the beast is enforced, which will include both nations and individuals. The entrance of the Papal Roman King of the North into the “Glorious Land” also has several other scriptural parallels, which are shown in the chart below:

| <b>Parallel Bible Symbols that Describe How the Papal Power Will Gain Control of the Global Christian Church through the Enforcement of the Mark of the Beast</b> |                              |               |                              |
|---|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Bible Text</b>   | <b>Symbol for the Papacy</b> | <b>Action</b> | <b>Symbol for the Church</b> |
| Daniel 11:41  | King of the North            | Enters into   | The Glorious Land            |
| Daniel 11:45  | King of the North            | Plants in     | The Glorious Holy Mountain   |
| Matthew 24:15   | Abomination of Desolation    | Stands in     | The Holy Place               |
| 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4   | Man of Sin, Son of Perdition | Sits in       | The Temple of God            |

The second part of Dan. 11:41 states that some will “escape” the “hand” of the Papal Roman King of the North, namely “Edom, Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.” Some have suggested that these three terms could possibly point to modern-day Islamic nations in the Middle East.<sup>43</sup> Once again, however, to be consistent, we must understand these national, geographic terms in an antitypical, symbolic, worldwide sense, which must be based upon the temperament and relationship to ancient Israel that these three powers once practiced in Bible times. Geographically, these three nations were located outside of the borders of ancient Israel, and were often viewed as enemies. “Edom” is a symbol of Esau, the brother of Jacob (“Israel”), and was located on Mt. Seir (Gen. 25:30; 36:1, 8). “Moab” and “Ammon” were the sons of Lot by his daughters (Gen. 19:30-38), and later became enemies of ancient Israel (1 Sam. 14:47; 1 Chr. 18:11; Jer. 9:26; 25:15-29).

These three powers also formed a three-fold coalition to attack ancient Judah during Jehoshaphat’s reign (2 Chr. 20:1-30). Since these three powers, (1) were located geographically outside of the spatial borders of OT Israel, and

<sup>41</sup>Were, *Battle for the Kingship of the World*, 59-60.

<sup>42</sup>The first fall of Spiritual Babylon took place when the Protestant churches of America rejected the first and second angel’s messages of the Millerite Movement. The second and final fall of Spiritual Babylon will take place through compliance with Sunday legislation as the mark of the beast. See White, *Great Controversy*, 389-390. It is in this sense that the “King of the North” will “enter” the “Glorious Land.”

<sup>43</sup>Gane, 331-332; Roosenberg, 107-108, 210.

(2) were habitual enemies of Israel, we can conclude that “Edom,” “Moab,” and “Ammon” are symbolic of people who are outside of God’s end-time remnant when the mark of the beast is enforced. Yet, because they “escape” the “hand” of the Papal Roman King of the North, they will choose to avoid the mark of the beast and join the remnant just prior to the battle of Armageddon, which, interestingly enough, is described in Joel as the “valley of Jehoshaphat” (Joel 3:9-17). Isaiah observed how God would call people out of many nations into one faithful fold at the end of time, and these nations will include people from “Edom,” “Moab,” and “Ammon” (Isa. 11:10-16). These three terms essentially describe people outside of the end-time remnant who exit both Spiritual Babylon and the world to join the remnant when the mark of the beast is enforced (Rev. 18:1-4).<sup>44</sup>

### **Daniel 11:42-43 – Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia**

Dan. 11:42 next states that the Papal Roman King of the North would “stretch forth his hand also upon the countries,” meaning that every nation in the world will be involved and controlled in the global enforcement of the mark of the beast. Once again, this includes the “land” of antitypical “Egypt,” which still points to the ideology of atheism. The papacy will also “have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt,” which is a description of how buying and selling will be regulated only to those who receive the mark of the beast (Rev. 13:16-17). The use of the term “Egypt” reveals a re-emphasis of the fact that the atheistic world will “not escape” the enforcement of the mark of the beast, thus re-confirming the spiritual and ideological conquest of atheism by the papacy, as discussed in the second part of Dan. 11:40.

To be consistent, the “Libyans” and “Ethiopians” of Dan. 11:43 should also be understood in an antitypical sense. In Bible times, ancient Libya (also called Phut, Lubim, Lud, and Cyrene) was both a friend of God and the faithful (Matt. 27:32; Acts 2:10; 11:20; 13:1) and an enemy of God and the faithful (2 Chr. 12:1-4; 16:7-8; Jer. 46:7-10; Eze. 27:10; 30:1-5; 38:1-5; Nah. 3:7-10). In like manner, ancient Ethiopia (also called Cush and Sheba) was also both a friend of God and the faithful (Gen. 2:13; 1 Ki. 10:1-13; Psa. 68:31; Acts 8:26-39) and an enemy of God and the faithful (Gen. 10:6-10; 2 Chr. 12:1-4; 16:7-8; Jer. 46:7-10; Eze. 30:1-5; 38:1-5; Nah. 3:7-10). Given the fact that these two nations, (1) were faithful to God at times, (2) were unfaithful to God and were enemies of His people at times, and (3) will follow “in the steps” of the Papal Roman King of the North, they might be understood in an antitypical sense as describing people who were once faithful to God, but turn against Him under economic pressure, and follow “in the steps” of the papacy when the mark of the beast is enforced.

Furthermore, when the Scriptures discuss these two terms in context with the enemies of God (Eze. 30:5; 38:5), Libya and Ethiopia were also involved in a military coalition against Israel, and thus lent their military strength to the enemies of Israel in the quest to conquer both the faithful and their respective territory where they were nationally situated. Also, ancient Babylon conquered Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia, and formed a military coalition with these three powers before invading and taking Judah from the direction of geographic north (Jer. 4:6-7; 25:9; 46:1-26; Eze. 26:7; 30:1-19). Therefore, these terms might be understood in an antitypical sense as also pointing to a global military confederation under the authority of the Papal Roman King of the North (which can also be identified as antitypical, spiritual Babylon). This end-time coalition will enable the papal power to exercise control over the world when the mark of the beast is enforced on a global scale.

### **Daniel 11:44 – Northeastern Tidings**

As the Papal Roman King of the North, (1) loses power in 1798 (Dan. 11:40a), (2) regains power in the future through the spiritual and ideological conquest of the Christian and atheistic worlds when the mark of the beast is enacted worldwide (Dan. 11:40b-41), and (3) forms a global confederacy to enforce the mark of the beast in the future (Dan. 11:42-43), Dan. 11:44 discusses how God’s end-time remnant will warn earth’s inhabitants to avoid receiving the mark of the beast.<sup>45</sup> The text states that, “tidings out of the east and the north shall trouble him,”

---

<sup>44</sup>Rodriguez, 20.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid, 22-23. Rodriguez suggests that this text might parallel Rev. 18:1, which he observes constitutes a more powerful repetition of the Three Angels’ Messages of Rev. 14:6-12.

meaning that the “news” of an “announcement” (“doctrine”)<sup>46</sup> from the “northeast” will “trouble” the Papal Roman King of the North in its quest for global worship. These “tidings” consist of a global gospel announcement (Rom. 10:15), as indicated by the heavenly directions of the “east” (Eze. 46:1-3; Matt. 24:27; Rev. 7:1-4; 16:12) and the “north” (Psa. 48:1-2; Eze. 1:4-5, 26-28; Isa. 14:12-14).

In OT times, Cyrus the Great (who was a “type” of Christ; cf. Isa. 44:25; 45:1) also conquered ancient Babylon from the “east” and “north” to rescue the Jewish people from Babylonian captivity (Isa. 41:2, 25). In an antitypical sense, Christ will send a Gospel message through His faithful followers to announce His soon return and warn people to avoid receiving the mark of the beast, and those who respond to this message will exit antitypical Babylon and be rescued from destruction when Christ returns. This end-time message consists of the Three Angels’ Messages (Rev. 14:6-12), which will be given by the end-time remnant to call people out of antitypical Babylon (Rev. 18:1-4).

More specifically, the third angel’s message will function as a loud cry to call people into obedience to God’s commandments (Rev. 14:9-12), and will present the seventh-day Sabbath as the seal of God (Rev. 14:7). These northeastern “tidings” will make up the final sealing message to prepare the end-time faithful for the “time of trouble” and the final “deliverance” when Christ returns (Dan. 12:1-3). The Papal Roman King of the North will be “troubled” and seek to “go forth with great fury to destroy” the end-time faithful who proclaim this last-day sealing message. This action will constitute the “great tribulation” (Matt. 24:20-21; Rev. 7:10), which is also called the “time of trouble” (Dan. 12:1) and the “time of Jacob’s trouble” (Jer. 30:5-7).

#### **Daniel 11:45 – The Glorious Holy Mountain**

Dan. 11:45 discusses the final stage of end-time activity by the Papal Roman King of the North. In response to the “northeastern tidings” of Dan. 11:44, this antichristian power will seek to “plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain.” The word “plant” means literally to “strike in,”<sup>47</sup> and suggests that the papal power will seek to plant its religious (“tabernacles”) and political (“palace”) authority among the nations of the earth (“between the seas,” Rev. 17:15). This final attack will especially focus on the “Glorious Holy Mountain,” which, as stated above, is a symbol of God’s end-time faithful, the 144,000.<sup>48</sup> These details describe a global union of church and state at the end of time that will enforce the mark of the beast through worldwide Sunday legislation. This movement by the Papal Roman King of the North will specifically target the end-time faithful who conscientiously resist the mark of the beast.

Some translations also render the phrase, “between the seas *in* the glorious holy mountain” as “between the seas *and* the glorious holy mountain” (italics supplied). Because the Papal Roman King of the North will be unsuccessful in its attempt to force the end-time faithful (the Glorious Holy Mountain of the 144,000) to receive the mark of the beast, this alternate rendition of the passage conveys the idea that this power will seek to isolate this special group for destruction, which will culminate in the battle of Armageddon (Rev. 16:12-16).

Despite the terrible pressure to conform to the mark of the beast, God’s end-time remnant will remain faithful to Christ, receive the seal of God, faithfully endure the “time of trouble,” and experience a great deliverance as they are translated to heaven when Christ returns. Simultaneously, the Papal Roman King of the North will “come to his end, and none shall help him” when Christ “stands up” to “deliver” the faithful (Dan. 12:1). Therefore, although the Papal Roman King of the North will seek to repeat its dark-age persecuting activities (as described in Dan. 11:30-39) through these aggressive actions against the faithful at the end of time (per Dan. 11:40-45), the apocalypse of Daniel 11 reveals the eventual triumph of God’s end-time faithful followers and the final destruction of the Papal Roman King of the North and its global confederacy (as paralleled in Rev. 19:11-21).

---

<sup>46</sup>Strong, “tidings” (H8052).

<sup>47</sup>Strong, “plant” (H5193).

<sup>48</sup>See the commentary above regarding the “Glorious Holy Mountain” in the section entitled “Apocalyptic Prophecy – Type and Antitype” on pages 3-4. See also Rodriguez, 18-19. Once again, this writer proposes that the 144,000 in Revelation are analogous to the “Glorious Holy Mountain” in Dan. 11:45.



### Daniel 12:1-3 – The Final Deliverance of the Faithful

The passage of Dan. 12:1-3 describes the culmination of the end-time battle between the Papal Roman King of the North and God’s faithful remnant believers. Once the “Glorious Holy Mountain” of these faithful believers receive God’s seal, they are prepared for the final tribulation period and deliverance by Christ. Dan. 12:1 states that, “at that time,” i.e. when the papal power seeks to isolate and destroy the members of this final remnant (Dan. 11:45), “Michael” (Christ) will “stand up” in defense of the faithful after ceasing His intercessory ministry in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary when human probation closes. At that point, the “time of trouble” will commence, and the faithful, whose names are “written in the book” (the Book of Life), will be “delivered” by “Michael” (Christ) when He returns. When this deliverance occurs, there will be a resurrection of the dead (Dan. 12:2), after which the faithful will reign for eternity in the kingdom of God (Dan. 12:3). This passage brings the apocalyptic narrative of Dan. 11:1-12:3 to a hopeful, inspiring conclusion. The chart below provides a summary of Dan. 11:40-12:3, the evidence of which parallels the eschatology of the book of Revelation in a consistent fashion:

| <b>Summary of the Proposed Interpretation for Daniel 11:40-12:3</b> |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Daniel 11:40-12:3</b>  | <b>Prophetic Symbolism</b>  | <b>Interpretation</b>  |
| Daniel 11:40  | The King of the South pushes against the King of the North, who responds to this push with a vengeance  | Atheism as manifested in revolutionary France removes the papacy from power in 1798, giving it a “deadly wound”; the papacy experiences a resurgence to power (it’s “wound” is “healed”)   |
| Daniel 11:41  | King of the North enters glorious land; Edom, Moab, Ammon escape the influence of the King of the North   | The papal power controls global Christianity through Sunday legislation (the mark of the beast); those in spiritual Babylon escape this power and join God’s faithful end-time remnant   |
| Daniel 11:42  | Land of Egypt does not escape the power of the King of the North  | Atheism is conquered through its compliance with the mark of the beast (Sunday legislation)  |
| Daniel 11:43  | The King of the North gains power over silver, gold, and the precious things of Egypt; the Libyans and Ethiopians also follow in the steps of the King of the North | The papal power controls buying and selling to enforce its mark; once again, atheism complies with the mark of the beast; some Christians who were once faithful also give in to economic pressure and comply with the mark of the beast; a global coalition/confederacy is created to help the papacy enforce the mark of the beast |
| Daniel 11:44  | Tidings from the East and North trouble the King of the North; it responds with fury against many   | The loud cry of the third angel’s message is given by God’s end-time faithful to seal the remnant believers; the papacy responds with persecuting fury against this end-time sealing message   |
| Daniel 11:45  | The King of the North attacks the glorious holy mountain; the King of the North comes to a final end  | The papacy isolates and attacks the 144,000, who have received the sealing message; yet, the papacy will come to its final end and be finally destroyed by Christ when He returns  |
| Daniel 12:1   | Michael (Christ) stands up and the time of trouble takes place; God’s people are delivered by Michael   | Christ stands up for the faithful when human probation closes; He delivers the 144,000 from death when He returns the second time  |
| Daniel 12:2-3   | The dead awake from sleep<br>The faithful shine as stars forever  | There is a resurrection of the dead when Christ returns; the faithful will also reign forever in the eternal kingdom of God  |

## Daniel 11 – The Papacy, Turkey, Egypt, and Islam

As stated above, there are two general groups of Adventist interpreters on Daniel 11. While these two groups generally agree on their understanding of Dan. 11:1-35,<sup>49</sup> there is a divergence of interpretation on Dan. 11:36-39, which in turn leads to a different understanding of Dan. 11:40-45 and the identity of the King of the North. In the early years of Adventism (1847-1871), James White and Uriah Smith both agreed that the final manifestation of the King of the North was the papal power.<sup>50</sup> Sometime between 1866 and 1871, however, Smith shifted his view on the King of the North to Turkey,<sup>51</sup> which in turn influenced his subsequent interpretation of Dan. 11:40-45. Despite this shift, however, White continued to advocate that the final power in each of Daniel's visions is Rome, citing that the identification of this empire as the last power in Daniel 11 is consistent with the empire sequences of Daniel's earlier visions. The following quotations below demonstrate this point:

The field of Daniel's prophecy embraces five universal kingdoms. These are Babylon, Media and Persia, Grecia, Rome, and the eternal kingdom of God. The ground of the four perishable kingdoms . . . is covered by four distinct lines of prophecy. These are given in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven. The eleventh chapter of Daniel closes with the close of the fourth monarchy . . . The student of prophecy is thus born down the stream of time from Babylon in the high [sic] of the glory of that kingdom, past Media and Persia, the kingdom of Grecia, and the Roman Empire which comes to its end at the second coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead, out into the ocean of eternity, when the truly wise "shine as the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."<sup>52</sup>

Let us take a brief view of the line of prophecy four times spanned in the book of Daniel. It will be admitted that the same ground is passed over in chapters two, seven, eight, and eleven, with this exception that Babylon is left out of chapters eight and eleven. We first pass down the image of chapter two, where Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome are represented by the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron. All agree that these feet are not Turkish but Roman. And as we pass down, the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the beast with ten horns, representing the same as the great image, again all will agree that it is not Turkey that is cast into the burning flame, but the Roman beast. So of chapter eight, all agree that the little horn that stood up against the Prince of princes is not Turkey but Rome. In all these three lines thus far Rome is the last form of government mentioned . . . Now comes the point in the argument upon which very much depends. Does the eleventh chapter of the prophecy of Daniel cover the ground measured by chapters two, seven, and eight? If so, then the last power mentioned in that chapter is Rome.<sup>53</sup>

And there is a line of historical prophecy, where the symbols are thrown off, beginning with the kings of Persia, and reaching down past Grecia to Rome, to the time when that power "shall come to his end and none shall help him." If the feet and toes of the metallic image are Roman, if the beast with ten horns that was given to the burning flame of the great day be the Roman beast, if the little horn which stood up against the Prince of princes be Rome, and if the same field and distance are covered by these four prophetic chains, then the last power of the

---

<sup>49</sup>Some interpreters vary on Dan. 11:23-29. See footnote 23 above.

<sup>50</sup>Uriah Smith, "Italy and the Papacy," *Review & Herald* (Jan. 9, 1866): 45; "The Papacy," *Review & Herald* (Sept. 11, 1866): 116; "Waning of the Pope's Power," *Review & Herald* (April 18, 1865): 157; "Will the Pope Remove the Papal Seat to Jerusalem," *Review & Herald* (May 13, 1862): 192; James White, *A Word to the Little Flock* (Brunswick, ME: James White, 1847), 8-9. In this last source, Elder White seemed to include the earth beast of Rev. 13:11-12 as a part of the final manifestation of the King of the North in Daniel 11.

<sup>51</sup>Uriah Smith, "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review & Herald* (March 21, 1871): 108-109; "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel," *Review & Herald* (March 28, 1871): 116-117.

<sup>52</sup>James White, "The Time of the End," *Signs of the Times* (July 22, 1880): 330.

<sup>53</sup>White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," 172.

eleventh chapter, which is to “come to his end and none shall help him” is Rome. But if this be Turkey, as some teach, then the toes of the image of the second chapter are Turkish, the beast with ten horns of the seventh chapter represents Turkey, and it was Turkey that stood up against the Prince of princes in the eighth chapter of Daniel. True, Turkey is bad enough off; but its waning power and its end is the subject of the prophecy of John and not of Daniel . . . While the lines of prophecy in the book of Daniel have to do with Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome, that of John pertains to the fourth only, Rome.<sup>54</sup>

Elder Smith has given a very fine talk on the eleventh chapter of Daniel, and his interpretation seems plausible, but IF the legs of iron, and the feet of iron and clay in the second chapter represent Rome, and IF the non-descript, ten-horned beast, and the little horn of the seventh chapter represent Rome, and IF the little horn which waxed exceeding great of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter represents Rome, the King of the North represents Rome also. These are four parallel prophecies, brethren, reaching down to the coming of our Lord.<sup>55</sup>

There are two assumptions that form the basis for the Turkey view of the King of the North. First, there is a belief that the empires discussed in the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11 are strictly literal in terms of being geographic powers throughout the entire chapter. Second, Dan. 11:36-39 is not understood as a continued discussion of the dark-age Papal Roman King of the North, but is understood to constitute a shift into a discussion of the history of atheistic, revolutionary France, which subsequently applies most of Dan. 11:40-45 to the history of Napoleonic France with respect to its relationship with Turkey and Egypt (vs. 45 is still viewed as a future event).

Regarding the first assumption, this writer has proposed above that the prophetic narrative of Daniel 11 is not necessarily literal or geographic throughout the entire vision just because it was delivered in a verbal manner. The transition to dark-age Papal Rome in Dan. 11:30-35 demonstrates a shift from “type” to “antitype,” simply because Papal Rome is a spiritual kingdom that is not confined to a geographic region. Moreover, it would not make sense for the narrative to shift into a spiritual, antitypical focus in vs. 30-35, and then abruptly shift back to a geographic focus in vs. 36-45. It was proposed above that the shift to the spiritual power of the Papal Roman King of the North in vs. 30-31 signifies a transition in Daniel 11 to where all prophetic symbols described in geographic language from that point forward (vs. 30-45) are to be understood in an antitypical, global, symbolic fashion.

Regarding the second assumption, this writer has also demonstrated above that the clear textual connections in Dan. 11:36-37 with the little horn power of Daniel 7 and Daniel 8, as well as Ellen White’s specific observations in *Manuscript Releases*, 13:394, point to Papal Rome as the power described in Dan. 11:36-39. This passage contains no evidence suggesting a shift to another power altogether, but instead constitutes a continued discussion of the very same power discussed in vs. 30-35. Therefore, the “king” in Dan. 11:36 is the Papal Roman King of the North in its medieval phase, and does not describe atheistic, revolutionary France. This Papal Roman King of the North in Dan. 11:36 is also the very same King of the North described in Dan. 11:40.

As suggested earlier, these two views lead to completely different interpretations of Dan. 11:40-45. Those who embrace the Turkey view interpret Dan. 11:36-39 as describing atheistic France, and understand vs. 40 to involve a triangular war between three powers, (1) the “king” of vs. 36, (2) the “King of the North” in vs. 40, and (3) the “King of the South” in vs. 40. These interpreters view Daniel 11 as strictly geographic, and thus identify the “king” of vs. 36 as atheistic France, while the “King of the North” and the “King of the South” of vs. 40 would constitute the nations that occupy the same geographic area as did the former divisions of Alexander’s kingdom. Therefore, these interpreters identify Turkey (“north”) and Egypt (“south”) as these two powers, and allege that most of vs. 40-45 applies to the historical career of Napoleon, with a possible future Turkish capital transference to Jerusalem.

---

<sup>54</sup>James White, “Where are We?”, *Review & Herald* (Oct. 3, 1878): 116.

<sup>55</sup>White, quoted in Wilcox, 44. In this source, Wilcox cites an excerpt from a talk given by Elder White in response to a sermon on Daniel 11 preached by Elder Smith. This author concurred with James White by agreeing that Daniel’s apocalypses cover the very same sequence of world empires in parallel fashion.

Primarily promoted by influential Adventist pioneer interpreters such as Haskell, Jones, and Smith,<sup>56</sup> this view of the “Eastern Question” dominated Adventist thought until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Because Turkey, (1) failed to transfer its capital to Jerusalem (as allegedly predicted in Dan. 11:45) after the British capture of this city in 1917, and (2) ended its Turkish-Islamic Caliphate in 1924, a growing dissatisfaction with this view developed among Adventist interpreters. After Adventist thought-leaders had engaged in several discussions on Daniel 11 in the 1940s and 1950s, the *Biblical Study and Research Committee* (the forerunner to the Biblical Research Institute) published the results of a collaborative study on Dan. 11:36-39 in a March 1954 article in *The Ministry*. This study concluded that this passage discusses the papacy and not atheistic France.<sup>57</sup>

Four other significant points confirm the papal view of the King of the North in Dan. 11:36 and Dan. 11:40. First, God only discusses specific kingdoms in Danielic eschatology that have directly and decidedly impacted God’s covenant people, whether OT Israel or the NT Church. Since geographic Turkey and Egypt have not had and do not currently have a direct and significant impact on the faithful, it would not make sense for these two nations to have an apocalyptic role in Daniel’s visions. Second, as inferred by Elder White above, a discussion of Turkey and Egypt in this vision would also violate the consistency of empire sequences in Daniel’s four apocalypses. None of Daniel’s prior visions (Daniel 2, 7, or 8-9) discuss these two nations, so why would Daniel 10-12 discuss them?

Third, there are two other north/south conflicts in Dan. 11 (vs. 5-15 and 25-28), and these two conflicts only involve north and south, so it would make sense that the third north/south conflict in vs. 40 would only involve these two powers, and not a third power. Dan. 11:40 discusses Papal Rome’s involvement in a dual war between north (itself) and south, not a triangular war between three powers that excludes the papacy.<sup>58</sup> Finally, Dan. 11:40 reveals a chiasmic structure which describes the two-way conflict between the Kings of the North and South. This structure demonstrates the fact that the “king” of Dan. 11:36 is the King of the North in Dan. 11:40. The chart below expresses this chiasmic structure in terms of a dual war between north and south in vs. 40.

| <b>Chiasmic Structure of the Dual War between the King of the North and the King of the South in Daniel 11:40</b> |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Daniel 11:40a</b>  | <b>Daniel 11:40b</b>              |
| <b>A – The King of the South</b>  | <b>A’ – “Him”</b>                 |
| <b>B – Shall Push</b>   | <b>B’ – Shall Come Against</b>    |
| <b>C – “Him”</b>  | <b>C’ – The King of the North</b> |

The phenomenon of modern Islam has also led some Adventist interpreters to propose that Islam is the King of the South in both Dan. 11:23-29 and Dan. 11:40,<sup>59</sup> a conclusion which seems to be largely based upon geography and ignores the relationship between “type” and “antitype” in apocalyptic prophecy. Whereas some interpreters see Dan. 11:23-29 as depicting the medieval Crusades, this writer proposes that there are two problems with this interpretation. First, it is questionable that the historical details of the Crusades fit the textual data of vs. 23-29. Second, bringing the papacy into the prophetic narrative by vs. 23 does not fit the sequential arrangement of the chapter in a historical sense. There is no clear transference to the medieval papal power until Dan. 11:30-31, which is a parallel passage with Dan. 8:9-14 through its discussion of the terms “daily” and the “abomination of desolation,” which describe the character and activities of the medieval papacy.

<sup>56</sup>Haskell, 240-245; Alonzo T. Jones, “The Eastern Question,” *Bible Echo* (June 8, 1896): 171; Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, 280-293; See also Anderson, 159-160; Wieland, 161-162.

<sup>57</sup>See footnote 31 above on page 11.

<sup>58</sup>Rodriguez, 4 (see the comments in footnote 5 of this source).

<sup>59</sup>For an excellent critique of the Islam view, see Rodriguez, 30-31. Rodriguez presents a compelling argument for atheism in Dan. 11:40, and discusses how seeing the medieval crusades in vs. 23-29 leads to an Islamic King of the South view in vs. 40. As stated above, vs. 23-29 describe events in Imperial Roman history.

Modern Islam also does not fit the textual data of Dan. 11:40. No Islamic power “pushed” against the Papal Roman King of the North in the year 1798 (“at the time of the end”) to deal this power a “deadly wound.” This writer has proposed that antitypical Egypt best represents atheism, a view that, once again, harmonizes with the Adventist understanding of Rev. 11:7-8.<sup>60</sup> To conclude that Islam is the King of the South in Dan. 11:40 is to depend solely upon geography (and thus uses literal, national Israel as a vantage point), as modern Egypt is Islamic in spiritual orientation, which violates the relationship between “type” and “antitype.” Since the Papal Roman King of the North enters the prophetic narrative in Dan. 11:30 as a spiritual, symbolic kingdom in an antitypical sense, and remains as such for the rest of the chapter, it would be consistent to also identify the King of the South as a symbolic, antitypical kingdom. The papacy is clearly a spiritual kingdom that is not confined to geography, and thus it would seem reasonable that the King of the South should not be confined to geography either. It is simply not consistent to interpret the King of the North as the papacy in a non-geographic sense (an interpretation which does not use national Israel as a vantage point), and yet interpret the King of the South as Islam in a geographic sense. Given that OT Egypt revealed a disposition that denied God’s prerogatives, the symbolic kingdom of atheism best fits the antitypical understanding of Egypt, because this modern ideology practices this very same disposition.

The directions of the “north” and “south” provide further insight into the identification of the “south” as relating to atheistic ideology. The direction of the “north” is symbolic of where God dwells (Eze. 1:26-28; Psa. 48:2). Using the compass as an analogy, the “north” is the highest direction and position, which, in a spiritual sense, is where Christ rightly deserves to dwell, given that He deserves the highest position. Any power or person who seeks to sit in His position and assume His prerogatives is a counterfeit King of the North. Satan is the first counterfeit King of the North in Scripture (Isa. 14:12-14), and any historical empire that has attempted to conquer and control God’s people (thus assuming God’s prerogatives) is a counterfeit King of the North. As we survey the various Kings of the North in Daniel 11 – Seleucid-Antiochean Syria (vs. 5-15), Imperial Rome (vs. 16-30a), and Papal Rome (vs. 30b-45) – history reveals that each manifestation of this symbol has sought to conquer and control God’s covenant people, and thus can be identified as a counterfeit King of the North.

Given this compass analogy regarding the direction of the “north,” the “south” is the opposite of the “north.” Spiritually speaking, therefore, if the “north” is symbolic of the highest position where God is exalted and deserves to dwell, it is logical to conclude that the “south” would be the opposite of this concept, namely where God is denied altogether and finds no dwelling place. Using this line of reasoning, atheism seems to fit this analogy, while Islam does not qualify as an ideology that denies the existence and prerogatives of God.

Overall, atheism as the antitypical King of the South in Dan. 11:40 harmonizes with the Adventist understanding of the 1260-year papal rule (AD 538-1798), the deadly wound in the year 1798 by atheistic France, and the prophetic description of this atheistic power in Rev. 11:7-8. Any attempt to put Islam into the narrative of Daniel 11 seems to be based upon sensationalism. Even so, this writer proposes that modern Islam has an indirect role in end-time events. Ellen White observed that the Ottoman-Islamic attacks on Eastern and Western Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup> century kept the papal power distracted so that the Protestant Reformation could expand into wider circles of influence.<sup>61</sup> Modern Islam can have a similar purpose in these last days by serving as a distraction for the modern papacy while God’s end-time remnant continues to proclaim the third angel’s message on a global scale.

### **Daniel 11 – Final Thoughts**

This paper constitutes an attempt by the writer to, (1) present some important hermeneutical principles that should be considered by the Daniel 11 interpreter when studying this difficult chapter, and (2) present a viable interpretation for this apocalypse that is based upon the consistent application of these principles. The Daniel 11 interpreter should also keep in mind that numerous interpretations on this apocalypse have been proposed by Adventist interpreters through the years since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, and should realize that no interpretation is infallible or completely without difficulty.

---

<sup>60</sup>White, *Great Controversy*, 269.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid, 197.

This realization is very important, especially given the terse phraseology of Daniel 11. This terseness, given within the context of an extensive use of personal pronouns, creates a legitimate challenge when considering potential historical events that might be represented in any given text. Aside from a handful of clear textual markers in the chapter that point to specific historical empires, there are also a multitude of obscure passages that are expressed in a general fashion, which might suggest that there could be multiple historical events that could potentially align with the textual details of these passages. The interpreter must ultimately ask, how can one know for sure that the suggested historical event assigned to any given passage, per its textual details, is actually what God intended that text to describe? This difficulty poses a legitimate and significant challenge for the Daniel 11 interpreter.

Therefore, when proposing potential interpretations, the Daniel 11 interpreter should be careful to avoid interpretive dogmatism with respect to this apocalypse, especially when considering the controversial passage of Dan. 11:40-45. Given that this particular passage largely discusses future events (at least from the perspective of this writer), the wise counsel of James White regarding unfulfilled prophecy seems particularly prudent:

Fulfilled prophecy may be understood by the Bible student. Prophecy is history in advance. He can compare history with prophecy and find a complete fit as the glove to the hand, it having been made for it. But in exposition of unfulfilled prophecy, where the history is not written, the student should put forth his propositions with not too much positiveness, lest he find himself straying in the field of fancy.<sup>62</sup>

Despite the specific challenges of interpretive diversity, the terse wording of chapter 11, and potential speculations regarding unfulfilled prophecy, this writer believes that the Holy Spirit will bless an earnest collaboration among Daniel 11 interpreters in their quest to weigh out differing interpretations and contemplate proper hermeneutical principles that should be applied in the study of this chapter. This writer suggests that Daniel 11 interpreters should continue to engage in regular discussions about this apocalypse, with the hope of eventually discovering a viable interpretation of Daniel 10-12 based upon sound hermeneutical principles. In confirmation, Leatherman exhorts church leaders to study, pray, and collaborate regarding Daniel 11 in the following quotation below:

I cannot pretend to have a comprehensive, cogent, and consistent interpretation of the last apocalypse of the book of Daniel. I only urge that such an interpretation be sought. By collaboration, by diligent study and sincere prayer, we hope to eventually find such an interpretation. And it is to this task that I would exhort the ministry and academicians of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.<sup>63</sup>

### **Daniel 11 – Summary of Hermeneutical Considerations**

Given the data presented in this paper, this writer recommends the following eight (8) hermeneutical principles that should be recognized and applied in the study of Daniel 11:

1. **Avoid interpretive dogmatism.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should avoid being dogmatic about any given interpretation and not claim infallibility concerning his or her personal position on this apocalypse, as no proposed interpretation is completely without difficulties.
2. **Recognize the structural consistency revealed in Daniel's four apocalypses.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should recognize the structural consistency of Daniel's four apocalyptic visions in terms of their vision/explanation format. Moreover, time prophecies found within Daniel's apocalypses are also regularly located within the explanation sections of these visions, and consistently apply the Day/Year Principle. Dan. 10:1-12:4 constitutes a vision, while Dan. 12:5-13 serves as its explanation.

---

<sup>62</sup>White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," 172.

<sup>63</sup>Donn W. Leatherman, "Adventist Interpretation of Daniel 10-12: A Diagnosis and Prescription," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 137-138.

3. **Recognize the consistent historical empire sequences revealed in Daniel's prior apocalypses as an interpretive framework for Daniel 10-12.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should remember that Daniel 2, Daniel 7, and Daniel 8-9 reveal a parallel sequential consistency in terms of their discussion of the principal historical empires of Danielic eschatology, and should expect that Daniel 10-12 will reveal the very same consistency. Each empire sequence begins with Daniel's contemporary empire and extends to Christ's return. The principle of "repeat and enlarge" is also clearly revealed as each apocalypse is given. However, the repetition and enlargement of each apocalypse builds on the established historical empire sequence from each of the earlier visions, and does not deviate from this sequence.
4. **Recognize that the historical empire sequences in Daniel's four apocalypses consist only of those principal kingdoms in history that have directly and significantly impacted God's covenant people.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should understand that God only discusses principal historical empires in prophecy that have a direct and significant impact in the history of His covenant people. These empires include Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Imperial Rome, and Papal Rome. The interpreter should expect, therefore, to find a discussion of these same principal kingdoms in Daniel 10-12, starting with the Medo-Persian Empire, which was Daniel's contemporary kingdom (see Appendix below).
5. **Exercise caution when attaching historical events to the personal pronouns in Daniel 11.** Given that there is a prolific use of personal pronouns in this chapter ("he" and "him"), the Daniel 11 interpreter should exercise great care in seeking to identify historical interpretations for these pronouns, as they often discuss the activities of empires and specific rulers within these empires simultaneously. In the quest to identify specific historical fulfillments of various texts, the Daniel 11 interpreter should focus on well-established historical events. Given the terse wording of this apocalypse, the interpreter should also strive to avoid sensationalist interpretations.
6. **Recognize that the narrative delivery of Daniel 11 does not suggest or require geographic literalism throughout the entire chapter.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should realize that this final apocalypse was delivered to Daniel in a narrative fashion. However, the interpreter should realize that this delivery style does not necessarily mean that its prophetic symbols are only to be strictly understood in a geographic fashion throughout the duration of the entire vision.
7. **Recognize the relationship between "type" and "antitype" in apocalyptic prophecy.** Per the examples of "Israel," the "temple," and "Babylon," the Daniel 11 interpreter must respect the relationship between "type" and "antitype" in apocalyptic prophecy, especially when addressing the heavily-debated passage of Dan. 11:40-45. Because (a) vs. 30-31 reveals a clear transition into a global, spiritual kingdom (Papal Rome), and (b) more general details about historical empires are revealed from this point forward (vs. 30-45) in contrast with the actions of specific rulers within specific empires earlier in Daniel 11 (vs. 1-29), the remaining verses in this chapter (vs. 30-45) should be understood in an antitypical sense. When seeking to discover potential antitypical meanings for symbols that are described in geographic language, the Daniel 11 interpreter should strive to identify the ancient temperament and disposition of these symbols as to how they related to God's covenant people in Bible times, and carefully assess potential spiritual, global, ideological entities in the modern era that reflect the same disposition as interpretive possibilities.
8. **Identify the clear textual markers in Daniel 11 and build upon this basic framework.** The Daniel 11 interpreter should identify clear textual markers in this chapter that point to the principal kingdoms of Daniel's visions, and form all subsequent interpretations of interim passages within the framework of these textual boundaries. Textual markers can be identified by comparing Scripture with Scripture, which involves the process of textual comparison between clearer passages within and outside the book of Daniel that contain similar wording and subject matter. The key textual markers in Daniel 10-12 include Dan. 10:1, 13, 20, Dan. 11:1-4, Dan. 11:16-22, Dan. 11:30-37, Dan. 11:40, and Dan. 12:1-3, 7-11.

In addition to the eight (8) hermeneutical principles suggested above, this writer also recommends the following eight (8) interpretive conclusions with respect to various textual issues in Daniel 11:

1. **Daniel 11:23-29 describes events in the history of Imperial Rome.** Since Imperial Rome is discussed in Dan. 11:16-22 and Papal Rome enters the prophetic narrative in Dan. 11:30-31, it must be concluded that Dan. 11:23-29 should remain within the historical framework of Imperial Rome by discussing rulers and events in the history of this empire, given that the next empire does not enter the vision until vs. 30-31. Because vs. 24 also discusses a prophetic “time” of 360 years, it seems reasonable that Dan. 11:25-29 would discuss the starting point (31 BC) and ending point (AD 330) of this time period, both of which are key dates in Imperial Roman history. This evidence shows that vs. 23-29 does not constitute a discussion of the medieval crusades against Islam by the medieval papal power.
2. **The “king” in Daniel 11:36 is the medieval papal power.** Since Dan. 11:36-37 contains clear textual connections with Daniel 7 and Daniel 8 with respect to the little horn power, it should be concluded that the little horn power and the “king” described in Dan. 11:36-37 are the same power, which is the medieval papacy. This point is confirmed by the fact that Ellen White attributed vs. 30-35 and vs. 36 to the same power in *Manuscript Releases*, 13:394, which points to the papacy and not atheistic France.
3. **The three north/south conflicts in Daniel 11 only involve these two powers.** Because the first two north/south conflicts in Daniel 11 (vs. 5-15 and vs. 25-28) only involve the two powers of north and south, it seems consistent that the third north/south conflict in Dan. 11:40 should also only involve the two powers of north and south. This would exclude the possibility of a three-way triangular war in vs. 40, and thus excludes the Turkey view as an interpretive option.
4. **The phrase “according to his will” applies to the four principal kingdoms discussed in Daniel 8-9 and Daniel 10-12.** The phrase, “according to his will” is attributed to the four major kingdoms discussed in the visions of Daniel 8-9 and Daniel 10-12. These kingdoms are Medo-Persia (Dan. 8:4), Greece (Dan. 11:3), Imperial Rome (Dan. 11:16), and Papal Rome (Dan. 11:36). This observation helps to confirm Papal Rome as the “king” of Dan. 11:36, which is the final manifestation of the King of the North in Dan. 11:36-45.
5. **The “Time of the End” extends from 1798 to Christ’s return.** Per Dan. 12:4-9, the time period identified as the “Time of the End” constitutes the last period of human history, and began at the conclusion of the 1260-year reign of Papal Rome in 1798 and extends to the end of history. Since Dan. 11:40 describes a “push” by the King of the South against the Papal Roman King of the North in 1798, the King of the South represents atheism, not Islam, as atheistic, revolutionary France removed the papacy from power in 1798.
6. **The empires discussed in Daniel’s visions consist of only those who have been directly involved in the affairs of God’s covenant people, which excludes Turkey and Egypt as interpretive options.** Per hermeneutical principles 3-4 above, God only discusses key empires in Daniel’s visions that have had a direct and significant impact on His covenant people at any given stage in human history. Therefore, the Daniel 11 interpreter should exclude the literal nations of Turkey and Egypt as interpretive possibilities, because these nations do not fit this qualification, in addition to not being mentioned in Daniel’s earlier visions. These entities do not qualify as reasonable “enlargements” of the established empire sequence from Daniel’s earlier visions, while atheism does because of its discussion in Rev. 11:7-8. It does not seem reasonable that Dan. 10-12 would deviate from the empire sequences of Daniel’s earlier visions.
7. **A transition from national/geographic kingdoms (“types”) to spiritual/symbolic kingdoms (“antitypes”) takes place in Daniel 11:30-31.** As stated in hermeneutical principle #7 above, because medieval Papal Rome enters the prophetic narrative in Dan. 11:30-31 as a global, spiritual kingdom, this passage should be viewed as transitional in terms of viewing all prophetic symbols from this point forward in the chapter as being spiritual and antitypical in scope, and not literal or geographic in scope. This point is proven by the fact that the activities of specific rulers are no longer mentioned from this point forward in Daniel 11. General trends are mentioned in vs. 30-45, in contrast with the key actions of specific rulers in vs. 1-29.
8. **Daniel 11:40-45 constitutes an end-time repetition of Daniel 11:30-36.** Given Ellen White’s observation in *Manuscript Releases*, 13:394, Dan. 11:40-45 should be viewed as the end-time repetition of Dan. 11:30-



36 (which also includes vs. 37-39). Mrs. White observed in this source that much of the history described in Daniel 11 will be repeated, and cites vs. 30-36 specifically. Given that vs. 30-36 describes the dark-age character and persecuting activity of the papal power, vs. 40-45 should be viewed as a description of an end-time repetition of these very same dark-age activities by the papacy during the “Time of the End.”

#### Appendix – Historical Chronology of Daniel 11

| Recommended Empire Sequence of Daniel 11:1-12:3 |  |                |  |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Passage   | Historical Empire/Interpretation                                 | Passage        | Historical Empire/Interpretation   |
| Dan. 11:1-2                                     | Medo-Persia – Four Persian Kings                                 | Dan. 11:16-30a | Imperial Rome (north)  |
| Dan. 11:2-3                                     | Greece/Alexander the Great                                       | Dan. 11:30b-39 | Medieval Papal Rome (north)<br>AD 538-1798   |
| Dan. 11:3-4                                     | Four Greek-Hellenistic Empires                                   | Dan. 11:40-45  | Papal Rome (north) in the Time<br>of the End (1798-Christ’s Return)  |
| Dan. 11:5-15                                    | Two Greek-Hellenistic Empires<br>Syria (north) vs. Egypt (south) | Dan. 12:1-3    | Close of Human Probation<br>Time of Trouble/Christ’s Return<br>Final Deliverance of the Faithful<br>Resurrection of the Dead |

#### Sources Cited

Anderson, Roy Allan. *Unfolding Daniel’s Prophecies*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1975.

*Bible Readings for the Home*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1949.

Burrill, Russell. *Hope When the World Falls Apart*. Keene, TX: Seminars Unlimited, 2003.

Clouzet, Ron E.M. *Decoding Bible Prophecy*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2011.

Doukhan, Jacques. *Secrets of Daniel*. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2002.

Edson, Hiram. “The Times of the Gentiles.” *Review & Herald* (Feb. 28, 1856): 169-170.

Ford, Desmond. *Daniel*. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing, 1978.

Gane, Roy E. “Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3,” *Journal of Adventist Theological Society*, 27/1-2 (2016): 294-343.

Hardy, Frank W. “An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11,” M.A. Thesis. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1983.

Haskell, Stephen N. *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*. Brushton, NY: Teach Services, 1999.

Jones, Alonzo T. “The Eastern Question.” *Bible Echo* (June 8, 1896): 171.

LaRondelle, Hans K. “Interpretation of Prophetic and Apocalyptic Prophecy.” *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, 225-250. Gordon M. Hyde, editor. Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Israel of God in Prophecy*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.

- Leatherman, Donn W. "Adventist Interpretation of Daniel 10-12: A Diagnosis and Prescription." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 120-140.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Structural Considerations Regarding the Relation of Daniel 8 & Daniel 9," in *The Cosmic Battle for Planet Earth*, Ron du Preez and Jiri Moskala, editors, 293-305. Berrien Springs, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 2003.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. *God Cares*. Vol. 1. Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981.
- Miller, William. *Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year 1843*. Boston, MA: J.V. Himes, 1842.
- Nichol, Francis D., editor. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. Vol. 4. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 1977.
- Pfandl, Gerhard. "Daniel." *Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide*. Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, October-December 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2004.
- Rahlf's, Alfred. *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, Germany, 1935.
- "A Report on the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel." *The Ministry* (March 1954): 26.
- Rodriguez, Angel. M. *Daniel 11 and the Islam Interpretation*, Biblical Research Institute Releases 13. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2015.
- Roosenberg, Tim. *Islam & Christianity in Prophecy*. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2011.
- Shea, William H. *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*. Revised edition. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of SDA, 1992.
- Smith, Uriah. *Daniel and the Revelation*. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Italy and the Papacy." *Review & Herald* (Jan. 9, 1866): 45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Papacy." *Review & Herald* (Sept. 11, 1866): 116.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel." *Review & Herald* (March 21, 1871): 108-109.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thoughts on the Book of Daniel." *Review & Herald* (March 28, 1871): 116-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Waning of the Pope's Power." *Review & Herald* (April 18, 1865): 157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Will the Pope Remove the Papal Seat to Jerusalem." *Review & Herald* (May 13, 1862): 192.
- Stefanovic, Zdravko. *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007.
- Strong, James. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997.
- Were, Louis F. *Battle for the Kingship of the World*. Berrien Springs, MI: First Impressions.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Bible Principles of Interpretation*. St. Maries, ID: Laymen Ministries, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The King of the North at Jerusalem*. St. Maries, ID: LMN Publishing, 2002.

White, Ellen. *Acts of the Apostles*. Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1911.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Great Controversy*. Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1911.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Manuscript Releases*. Vol. 13. Silver Spring, MD: E.G. White Estate, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prophets and Kings*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 1943.

White, James. *A Word to the Little Flock*. Brunswick, ME: James White, 1847.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Time of the End." *Signs of the Times* (July 22, 1880): 330.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Unfulfilled Prophecy." *Review & Herald* (Nov. 29, 1877): 172.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Where are We?" *Review & Herald* (Oct. 3, 1878): 116-117.

Wieland, Robert J. *Daniel Reveals the Future*. Grantham, Lincolnshire, England: The Stanborough Press, 2014.

Wilcox, Milton C. *The King of the North: A Suggestive Outline Study of Daniel 11*. Mountain View, CA: M.C. Wilcox, 1910.