

# A Few Observations on the Text of Daniel 11 and Current Adventist Interpretations<sup>1</sup>

Tarsee Li  
Oakwood University

## Abstract

It is assumed that the reader will have read the previous paper, which explains the basis for the color-coded translation of Daniel 11. The present paper will go through the text and make some observations concerning its implications for current Adventist interpretations of the chapter.

## Introduction

It is with much reluctance that I present this paper this morning. The reasons for my reluctance are, first, that I have not come to a conclusion for my own interpretation, second, which may be related to the first, I have not yet had a chance to read all the relevant literature on the subject, and third, I cannot claim to be the ultimate authority on Hebrew. Nevertheless, since I agreed to do the translation of the chapter, the Daniel 11 Committee also asked me to discuss its implications for interpretation, and since I think that is a fair request, I am, therefore, obliging. This paper assumes that you have read or listened to my previous paper that explains the basis of the translation.<sup>2</sup>

Conrad Vine neatly summarized three major historicist approaches in the Adventist interpretation of Daniel 11.<sup>3</sup> These, of course, are not three interpretations, but three major approaches, within which there may be some variations in interpretation. These approaches can be listed as follows: 1) the (neo-)Uriah Smith approach, which follows closely the interpretation of the said Adventist pioneer; 2) the Atheism approach, which identifies the king of the south as

---

<sup>1</sup> Presented at the Daniel 11 Conference, Berrien Springs, MI, March 9, 2023.

<sup>2</sup> Tarsee Li, "A Color-Coded Translation of Daniel 11:2b-12:3." Paper presented at the Daniel 11 Conference, Berrien Springs, March 9, 2023.

<sup>3</sup> "The Journey Thus Far," paper presented at the Daniel 11 Conference, October 20, 2021. I attended the presentation but could not find a hard copy of it to cite.

atheism; and 3) the Islam approach, which identifies the king of the south as Islam. In what follows, I will not choose the correct approach. Nor do not intend to discuss every detail of each interpretation. I am not qualified to do that. Instead, I will simply present a verse-by-verse reading of the text along with a discussion of some of its implications.

## The Text Verse-by-Verse with Some Brief Observations

In what follows is the text, along with some observations on a few of the issues relevant to the interpretation of the chapter.<sup>4</sup>

<b>Daniel 11:2b-12:3</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>de Regt rule</b>
הִנֵּה-עוֹד שְׁלֹשָׁה מְלָכִים עֹמְדִים לְפָנַי	1	
וְהָרְבִיעִי יַעֲשֶׂה עֲשֶׂר-גְּדוֹל מִכֹּל	2	
וּבְחֹזְקָתוֹ בְּעָשָׂרוֹ יַעֲרִי הַכֹּל אֶת מַלְכוּת יוֹן:	3	^ Rule 2: subj fourth king
וְעֹמֵד מְלֶכֶךְ גִּבּוֹר	4	
וּמְשָׁל מִמְּשָׁל רָב	5	^ Rule 2: subj mighty king
וְעָשָׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ:	6	^ Rule 2: subj mighty king
וּכְעָמְדוֹ תִשָּׁבַר מַלְכוּתוֹ	7	
וְתִחָץ לְאַרְבַּע רוּחֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם	8	^ Rule 2: subj (his kingdom)
וְלֹא לְאַחֲרֵיתוֹ	9	^ C-C Reg.
וְלֹא כְּמִשְׁלוֹ אֲשֶׁר מָשָׁל	10	^ C-C Reg.

<sup>4</sup> The color coding applies to 11:5-45 (11:2-4 and 12:1-3 are assumed to be less ambiguous). The colors used in the color-coded translation are as follows:.

**King of the north**

King of the north or successor/descendant with another name

Anaphoric reference to the king of the north or successor

**King of the south**

King of the south or successor/descendant with another name

Anaphoric reference to the king of the south or successor

**Prince of the covenant**

The people of God

**The wise**

[Other colors used for other participants]

Ambiguous references are left uncolored

כִּי תִנְתֵּשׁ מְלָכוּתוֹ	For his kingdom will be uprooted,	11
וְלֵאחֵרִים מִלְּבַר־אֵלֶּה:	and it will belong to others besides these.	12 ^ C-C Reg.

Verses 2-4 do not need color-coding, since there is virtual agreement on the participants. Nevertheless, some brief comments on v. 4 are appropriate here. First, according to Uriah Smith the directions of the compass "from the standpoint of Palestine" determine who the kings of the north and south are. Therefore, Seleucus I was not originally the king of the north, but the king of the east. Instead, Lysimachus was the original king of the north, and Seleucus became the king of the north only when he defeated Lysimachus.<sup>5</sup> However, the phrase אַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם "the four winds of heaven" is not necessarily restricted to the four directions of the compass. A few other examples of this and similar expressions will suffice. In Zech 2:6 the expression "the four winds of heaven" refers to all the nations from which the exiles were to flee when they return from "the land of the north." In Eze 7:2 a similar expression, אַרְבַּע כַּנְפוֹת הָאָרֶץ "the four corners of the earth" (lit., "four wings"), refers only to the entirety of the "land of Israel." But in Isa 11:12 that same expression refers to the various nations from which the captives would return, of which at least eight different locations are mentioned in v. 11. As a side note, in the latter context the "west" referred to the Philistines and the "east" to

---

<sup>5</sup> Uriah Smith, *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek: Steam Press, 1873), 257-259.

Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites (v. 14). In Matt 24:31 and Mark 13:27 the expression ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων "[from] the four winds" is used to refer to the entire world, not just the four directions of the compass.<sup>6</sup>

Moreover, only two of the cardinal directions are mentioned specifically in Dan 11, the north and the south. Although the directions of the compass are not always based on the perspective of the land Israel,<sup>7</sup> when viewed from that perspective, north and south may refer not to the location of foreign nations but to the direction from which they are perceived to come to the land of Israel. Hence, although Babylon was east of Israel,<sup>8</sup> it is depicted in the Bible as the enemy from the north (Jer 1:13-16; 46:10, 24).<sup>9</sup> Also, the people returning from the Babylonian captivity were depicted as returning from the land of the north even though they had been scattered to the four winds of heaven (Zech 2:6). Similarly, the Lord stretches out his hand against the "north" when he destroys Assyria, more specifically Nineveh (Zeph 2:13), even though the latter is not directly north of Israel. Likewise, since ancient Egypt consisted originally of the shores of the Nile, none of it was directly south of Israel. It was mostly west and southwest of Israel.<sup>10</sup> In fact, the north end of the delta of the Nile is west of Jerusalem at almost the same degree of latitude. During the Ptolemaic era, the

---

<sup>6</sup> In the years following Alexander's death, there were several generals who fought the wars of the diadochi. Names such as Antigonus, Antipater, Craterus, Laomedon, and Perdiccas are often overlooked in the quest for only four generals. It was not until the battle of Ipsus in 301 BC that the divisions of Alexander's empire were reduced to only four.

<sup>7</sup> For example, in Daniel 8, the ram charged west, north, and south (v. 4), the goat came from the west (v. 5), and the little horn grew southward and eastward (v. 9) from the perspective of their point of origin, not from the perspective of the land of Israel, and their point of origin was in relation to the Ulai Canal where Daniel stood in his vision (vv. 2-3).

<sup>8</sup> Coincidentally, Seleucus I started out as the strap of Babylon!

<sup>9</sup> In Jer 1:13-16 the enemy from the north includes not one kingdom but "kingdoms." The plural is appropriate because the Assyrians and Babylonians did not fight alone but with the aid of their allies. For example, the Babylonians were joined by the Medes in their fight against Assyria, and the Assyrians received help from Egypt when attacked by Babylon (such as in the battle where Josiah lost his life, 2 Kgs 23:29-30).

<sup>10</sup> Towards its headwaters the Nile is more south than southwest, but that is not because it is south of Israel, but simply because it is very long in the north-south direction.

borders of Egypt stretched as far west as parts of Libya, reaching about the same degree of latitude as modern-day Haifa. Hence, Egypt was not directly south of Israel, but the Egyptians could only invade Israel from the south. Therefore, north and south are used in the Bible not only to refer to location, but also to the direction from which an invader comes, and the latter is just as literal as the former. Hence, the kings of the north and south are not necessarily located north and south of Israel, but they invaded the land of Israel through those borders.

A second observation on v. 4 is that there is a plural anaphor whose referent is singular. The phrase **מִלְּבַר-אֵלֶּה** "besides these" in the last sentence contains a demonstrative anaphor, though in this instance de Regt's rules are not applicable because it does not involve a subject or object. Although the anaphor is plural, the referent is singular, as suggested by a comparison between the two possessive sentences above: "it will not belong to his posterity" and "it will belong to others besides these." Therefore, the anaphoric plural demonstrative **אֵלֶּה** "these" is coreferential with a singular word **אַחֲרֵיֶיךָ** "end" or "posterity." The apparent disagreement in number may be ascribed to the collective sense of the word **אַחֲרֵיֶיךָ** when it denotes descendants.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> See also the word **הַחַיִּל** "the army" in v. 7, which is most likely the referent of the plural **בָּהֶם** "against them" two sentences later. Though the word **חַיִּל** is usually singular, its collective nature is seen in instances where it functions as a plural (Jer 52:8, 14). Another example of a collective word that occurs in this chapter is **עַם**, which is singular (**יִמְלֹט עַמָּךְ** Dan 12:1) but can be treated as plural in some contexts (**וּמַדּוּעַ אָמַרוּ עַמִּי** Jer 2:31) because of its collective sense. The most telling example in this chapter occurs in Dan 11:32: **עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיָו** "the people who know [plural] his [singular] God."

Jacques Doukhan argues that the word אַחֲרֵית in v. 4 does not denote "posterity" in the sense of direct descendants, but rather to "what comes after him." Hence, the chapter skips the Seleucids and Ptolemies to other kingdoms after them.<sup>12</sup> However, while it is true that the other 4 instances of the word in Daniel denote the "future" or "end" (8:19, 23; 10:14; 12:8), the use of the word in other contexts does not determine its meaning in this context. Further, in the other 4 instances the "future"/"end" is the focus of the prophecy, not something skipped over to focus on what happens after that "future." On the other hand, Doukhan admits that the "demonstrative 'these' refers to the kingdoms implied in the word" אַחֲרֵית,<sup>13</sup> resulting in an implied anaphoric relationship between אֱלֹהִים and אַחֲרֵית.

5	וַיַּחֲזֹק מֶלֶךְ-הַנִּגְבִּי	The king of the south	will be strong.	13		
	וּמִן-שָׂרָיו וַיַּחֲזֹק עָלָיו	And one of his leaders	will prevail over him [textual variant]	14	^	Rule 2: obj king of south
	וּמִשָּׁל מַמְשָׁל רַב מִמְשָׁלָּהּ:	and will rule a greater dominion than his dominion.		15	^	C-C Reg. (subj: prince)

The cantillation of the Masoretic Text (henceforth, MT) in 11:5 suggests that the expression וּמִן-שָׂרָיו "and one of his leaders" belongs to the first sentence of the verse, but the Greek translations, both the Old Greek (henceforth, OG) and Theodotion (henceforth, Theod), take it as part of the second sentence. The Latin Vulgate (henceforth, Vulg.) agrees with the Greek sentence division, but the

<sup>12</sup> Jacques Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded: An Exegetical, Historical, and Theological Study* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 2019), 79-80.

<sup>13</sup> *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 80.

Syriac Peshitta (henceforth, Syr.) follows the MT.<sup>14</sup> If the MT is followed, both the subject and the object of the second sentence are anaphoric, but if the Greek is followed, the second sentence has an explicit subject. Following the Greek versions results in a more natural sentence break, though it requires emending the verb in the second sentence from **וַיַּחְזֹק** to **יַחְזֹק**. This in turn could easily be ascribed to a scribal copying error influenced by the occurrence of **וַיַּחְזֹק** at the beginning of the verse. Hence, in this passage the sentence division of the Greek translations has been adopted.<sup>15</sup>

<p>וּלְקַץ שָׁנִים יִתְחַבְּרוּ          וּבַת מֶלֶךְ־הַנֶּגֶב תָּבוֹא אֶל־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן          לַעֲשׂוֹת מִישָׁרִים          וְלֹא־תַעֲזָר כּוֹחַ הַזְּרוּעַ          וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד זְרַעוֹ          וְתִנָּתֵן הִיא וּמְבִיאֶיהָ וְהַיְלָדָהּ וּמְחַזְּקֶיהָ          בְּעֵתָם:</p>	<p>At the end of some years <u>they</u> will form an alliance.  <b>The daughter of the king of the south</b> will come to <b>the king of the north</b> to make an agreement.          But <u>she</u> will not retain the strength of arm.          And his arm [seed?] will not stand. [textual variant]          And <u>she</u> will be given up, along with the ones who brought <u>her</u> and the one who fathered <u>her</u> and the one who supported <u>her</u> in those times.</p>	<p>16 ^ n/a          17          18 ^ C-C Reg.          19          20 ^ Rule 2: subj</p>
--	--	---

There is evidence that the MT of this verse contains several possible scribal errors, most of which cannot be easily resolved, and which are beyond the scope of this discussion. One of the variants occurs in the next to last sentence above. According to the MT

<sup>14</sup> Instances in the biblical Hebrew corpus of sentences beginning with **וַיַּחְזֹק** + noun phrase acting as subject are rare, but this does not preclude **וַיַּחְזֹק־שָׂרֵיו** from being the subject at the beginning of a clause (cf. **וַיַּחְזֹק־הַמֶּלֶךְ** in 11:35).

<sup>15</sup> Either way, most interpreters understand the phrase as referring to Seleucus I Nicator, one of Alexander's generals who for a time served under Ptolemy I Soter in Egypt.



the sentence has an anaphoric subject, "he will not stand," along with an additional specified subject וְזַרְעוֹ "and his arm." There is, however, a variant in a couple Hebrew manuscripts where the word זַרְעוֹ "his arm" occurs without the conjunction, which makes it the specified subject of the sentence. This appears to be followed by OG, Theod, and Vulg.<sup>16</sup> It has therefore been adopted in this study. Also, Theod translates the word as τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ "his seed," which suggests a different vowel-ing of the Hebrew as זַרְעוֹ, "his seed" rather than "his arm," but that is not conclusive.

7	וְעֵמֶד מִנְצֵר שְׂרָשִׁיהָ כִּנּוֹ	A sprout of <u>her roots</u> will arise in <u>his</u> place.	21	
	וְיָבֹא אֶל-הַחֲיִל	<u>He</u> will come to the army,	22	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
	וְיָבֹא בְּמַעוֹ מִלְּךְ הַצָּפוֹן	and enter the fortress of <u>the king of the north</u> ,	23	^ C-C Reg.
	וְעָשָׂה בָּהֶם	and take action against them,	24	^ C-C Reg.
	וְהִחְזִיק:	and conquer.	25	^ C-C Reg.
8	וְגַם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם עִם-נִסְכֵיהֶם עִם-כְּלֵי	Also, their gods with their cast images with their	26	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
	הַמִּדְתָּם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב בְּשָׂבִי יָבֹא מִצְרַיִם	precious utensils, silver and gold <u>he</u> will bring into		
		captivity to <u>Egypt</u> .		
	וְהוּא שָׁנִים יַעֲמֹד מִמֶּלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן:	As for <u>him</u> , for some years <u>he</u> will stay away from	27	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
		<u>the king of the north</u> .		
9	וְיָבֹא בְּמַלְכוּת מִלְּךְ הַנֹּגֵב	Then <u>he</u> will come against the kingdom of <u>the king</u>	28	^ Rule 1: subj king of north
		<u>of the south</u> ,		
	וְשָׁב אֶל-אֲדָמָתוֹ:	and will return to <u>his</u> own land.	29	^ C-C Reg.
10	וּבְנֵי יִתְגָּרוּ	<u>His sons</u> will be stirred up	30	

<sup>16</sup> The Syriac Peshitta follows mostly the MT, but not in this sentence, where it has instead ܡܢ ܗܘܝܘܬܗ ܕܗܝܘܬܗ "from the fear that she will fear."

וְאֶסְפוּ הַמִּזֶּן הַגְּדֹלִים רַבִּים	and gather a multitude of great forces.	31	^	C-C Reg.
וְכָא בּוֹא	<u>He</u> will certainly come	32	^	Rule 2: subj king of north
וְשָׁטַף	and overflow	33	^	C-C Reg.
וְעָבַר	and cross over.	34	^	C-C Reg.
וַיָּשָׁב	And again	35	^	Rule 2: subj
וַיִּתְנַרְו עַד־מְעֹזָה:	<u>he</u> will fight as far as <u>his</u> fortress.	36	^	C-C Reg.

The MT of v. 10 above switches from the plural in the first two sentences of the verse to the singular in the following sentences. The fact that the MT is problematic is reflected in the Ketiv/Qere variations. There is a Ketiv/Qere variant in the first word of the verse (Ketiv singular **ובנו** "and his son" and Qere plural **ובנָיו** "and his sons") and another one in the last sentence of the verse (Ketiv plural **ויתנַרו** "and they will fight" and Qere singular **ויתנַרְהוּ** "and he will fight"). The Ketiv singular in the first word is supported by OG, while the Qere plural is supported by Theod, which, however, omits the translation of the next word **ויתנַרו** "will be stirred up." The Syr. also has a plural, but, unlike the MT or Theod, it continues with the plural throughout the verse. In spite of the problems in the MT, this translation provisionally follows it due to the lack of other witnesses supporting the OG.<sup>17</sup> As for the singular **וְכָא** "he will come" in the third sentence of v. 10, de Regt's rule two suggests that the referent is the king of the north (v. 8), who

<sup>17</sup> Most commentaries follow the Qere and understand the sons to be the two sons of Seleucus II, i.e., Seleucus III and Antiochus III, in which case the puzzling switch from a plural subject to a singular subject is explained by the fact that Seleucus III died soon after coming to the throne and was followed by Antiochus III. It would be more natural for the verse to begin with the singular, in which case and the entire verse refers to the same ruler (that is, the short reign of Seleucus III is passed over in the account, which moves straight to Antiochus III).

comes into the south and returns to his own land in v. 9. However, since "his sons" are mentioned at the beginning of v. 10, one must conclude that the anaphoric "he" expressed in the 3ms verb וַיָּצֵא refers not to the same person as the king of the north of v. 8, but to a successor, who is, therefore, also a "king of the north."

וַיִּתְמַרְמֵר מֶלֶךְ הַנֹּגֵב	11	The king of the south	will be furious.	37	
וַיָּצֵא		He	will go out	38	^ Rule 2: subj king of south
וְנִלְחָם עִמּוֹ עַם־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן		and wage war with <u>him</u> ,	with the king of the north.	39	^ C-C Reg.
וְהָעַמִּיד הַמְּוֹן לְבָב		He	will raise up a great multitude.	40	^ Rule 2: subj
וְנָתַן הַהֶמְוֹן בְּיָדֵי:		The multitude	will be placed in <u>his</u> hand,	41	
וְנִשְׂא הַהֶמְוֹן	12	the multitude	being lofty,	42	
וְהָרָם לְבָבוֹ		and <u>his</u>	heart lifted up.	43	
וְהִפִּיל רַבָּאוֹת		He	will bring down myriads,	44	^ Rule 2: subj
וְלֹא יֵעֹז:		but <u>he</u>	will not prevail.	45	^ C-C Reg.

There is a cluster of textual variants in vv. 11-12 that have a complicated effect on the translation and the application of de Regt's rules. See Appendix B of the previous paper for a more detailed discussion. The MT has been followed here, but due to the application of the rules, the translation departs from that found in most modern translations. The following comparison illustrates the difference:

MT	NKJV	Adopted Translation
11 וַיִּתְמַרְמַר מֶלֶךְ הַנֹּגֵב	And the king of the South shall be moved with rage,	<u>The king of the south</u> will be furious.
וַיֵּצֵא	and go out	He will go out
וַיִּלָּחֶם עִמּוֹ עִם־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	and fight with him, with <b>the king of the North,</b>	and wage war with him, with the king of the north.
וַהֲעִמִּיד הַמִּזְוֹן לְרַב	<u>who</u> shall muster a great multitude;	<u>He</u> will raise up a great multitude.
וַנִּתֵּן הַהַמְזוֹן בְּיָדוֹ:	but the multitude shall be given into the hand of <u>his enemy</u> .	The multitude will be placed in <u>his hand</u> ,
12 וַנִּשָּׂא הַהַמְזוֹן	<sup>12</sup> When <u>he</u> has taken away the multitude,	the multitude being lofty,
וַיָּרוֹם לִבּוֹ	<u>his</u> heart will be lifted up;	and <u>his</u> heart lifted up.
וַהֲפִיל רַבָּאוֹת	and <u>he</u> will cast down tens of thousands,	<u>He</u> will bring down myriads,
וְלֹא יֵעֹז:	but <u>he</u> will not prevail.	but <u>he</u> will not prevail.

The translation of the NKJV in the middle column above is given as an example of the typical interpretation of the passage (partially color-coded for clarification). According to the typical interpretation of the passage, as reflected in the NKJV, the king of the north raises a great multitude, which, in the next clause, is defeated by the king of the south. Then, the following sentence mentions the taking away of the multitude. However, if the multitude is that of the king of the north, the alternating referents of the anaphors can only be inferred from the context. Therefore, in order to make the anaphoric references clear, the NKJV resorts to translating independent clauses as subordinate clauses and changing one passive verb into an active verb ("who shall muster ..." v. 11, "when he has taken away ..." v. 12), as well as adding words for clarification ("of his *enemy*" v. 11). Further, there is also a lack of chronological

sequence here, since the defeat of the multitude, the taking away of the multitude, and the casting down tens of thousands all refer to the same event.

In contrast to the typical interpretation, the column on the right side above presents the translation adopted here, which is based on de Regt's rules. The fourth sentence in v. 11 begins with the verb **וַיִּרְעַמְיָד** "he will raise up," which has an anaphoric subject expressed by its 3ms morphological form. The preceding sentence contains an anaphoric subject expressed by the 3ms morphology of the verb **וַיִּגְלַחֵם** "he will wage war" as well as a prepositional phrase **עִם** + a pronominal suffix followed by another prepositional phrase consisting of **עִם** + the king of the north. Since the preposition **עִם** "with" expresses accompaniment, the prepositional phrase is "not an object complement."<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the king of the north is not a sentence object or object complement, and the sentence can be analyzed as having no object. As a result, rule two indicates that the 3ms subject of the preceding sentence is coreferential with the 3ms subject of the current sentence. That is, it is the king of the south, the one who wages war with the king of the north, who raises

---

<sup>18</sup> See Lénart J. de Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Global and Local Participant Tracking across Clause Boundaries," in *Ancient Texts and Modern Readers: Studies in Ancient Hebrew Linguistics and Bible Translation*, ed. Gideon R. Kotzé, Christian S. Locatell, and John A. Messarra (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 76. For other examples of this use of **עִם**, see Gen 32:25, 26, 29; Exod 17:8; etc. In addition to this instance there are a few other instances in this chapter where a preposition of accompaniment expresses the sense of hostility ("against"): **עִמּוֹ** (v. 40), **אֵת** (v. 2), and the preposition **בְּ** in some expressions, including **עָשָׂה בְּ-** (v. 7), some instances of **בּוֹא בְּ-** (vv. 9, 30, cf. **בְּמִלְכּוֹת** in v. 9 and **אֵת מִלְכּוֹת** in v. 2), and possibly also **שָׁלַח יָד בְּ-** (v. 42, though the latter does not express accompaniment, cf. 1 Sam 11:3; Prov 31:19). According to *HALOT* **בְּ** I, meaning 12, "**בְּ** expresses the sharing of an act: a) (together) **with ...** ; b) hostile **against.**"

the great multitude.<sup>19</sup> The next sentence, the fifth sentence, contains the expression **נתן בְּיַד** "to place in the hand of." Although this expression often denotes defeat at the hand of enemies, the meaning of placing something under one's charge or authority also fits the context if it is the king of the south who raises this multitude.<sup>20</sup> The next sentence, the first sentence in v. 12, begins with the verb **נִשְׂאָה**, which is usually also interpreted as indicating the military defeat of the multitude ("taken away" or "carried off," etc.), hence repeating the sense of the previous sentence. However, this sentence may instead be parallel to the following sentence rather than the previous one, in which case the forms **נִשְׂאָה** and **רָם** (Qere) may be analyzed as participles. The verbs **נִשְׂאָה** "to lift up" and **רָם** "to be high" are sometimes used as synonyms in the same context expressing either exaltation (e.g., Isa 6:1; 52:13; 57:15) or pride (e.g., Isa 2:12-14). Therefore, in this context it is possible that both the multitude and the heart of the king of the south are lifted up in the sense of being proud.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the application of de Regt's rules results in a greater consistency in the anaphoric references with the king of the south globally active in vv. 11-12. It is also more chronologically coherent in that the king of the south builds up his army in v. 11, but does not defeat the king of the north until v. 12 when he brings down myriads.

---

<sup>19</sup> Daniel 11:11 is generally interpreted as a reference to the battle of Raphia in 217 BC. The fact that Ptolemy IV had a larger army at Raphia than Antiochus III would support the view that the large multitude was that of the king of the south. Nevertheless, the alternative suggested here is independent of its historical application.

<sup>20</sup> Though the idea of defeat is an appropriate meaning in military contexts (e.g., Lev 26:25; 2 Kgs 18:30; Jer 32:24; Dan 1:1), this meaning is probably an extension of the more basic meaning of this expression, which is handing something or someone over to the power of another (e.g., Job 9:24; Jer 34:3; 39:17). Accordingly, the expression can also denote placing something in or entrusting something to the charge or authority of someone (active in the Qal stem, e.g., Gen 30:35; 39:4, and passive in the Niphal stem, e.g., Gen 9:2; 2 Chron 34:16).

<sup>21</sup> This view is reflected in some older translations, such as the 1599 Geneva Bible "Then the multitude shall be proud, and their heart shall be lifted up," the 1602 Reina-Valera "Y la multitud se ensoberbecerá, elevaráse su corazón," and the 1910 Louis Segond translation "Cette multitude sera fière, et le coeur du roi s'enflera."

וְשָׁב מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	13	Then <b>the king of the north</b> will return	46	
וְהָעֵמִיד הַמִּזֹּן רַב מִן־הָרֵאשֹׁן		and raise up a multitude greater than the first.	47	^ C-C Reg. king of north
וְלָקַח הָעֵתִים שָׁנִים יָבֹוא בֹּוא בְּחִיל גָּדוֹל וּבִרְכוּשׁ רָב:		<u>He</u> will certainly come at the end of some years with a great army and much equipment.	48	^ C-C Reg.
וּבְעֵתֵים הָהֵם רַבִּים יַעֲמְדוּ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב	14	In those times <b>many</b> will stand up against <b>the king of the south</b> .	49	
וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עַמּוֹד וְנִשְׁאַוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חֲזוֹן		<b>The violent ones</b> of your people will rise up to confirm the vision.	50	
וְנִכְשְׁלוּ:		But <u>they</u> will stumble.	51	^ Rule 2: subj violent ones

The first two sentences of v. 14 have specified participants, and, therefore, de Regt's rules do not apply. The Hebrew phrase **וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עַמּוֹד** (literally, "the sons of the violent ones of your people") can be variously interpreted. The word **פְּרִיץ** comes from the root **פָּרַץ** "to make a breach," "to burst open," or "to break down." The word generally means a "violent person" (Eze 18:10). The phrase is a Hebrew construct chain, whose last word functions like a genitive. The last word "of your people" can be understood as an objective genitive, i.e., the people are the object of the violence ("the ones violent to your people"), or as a partitive genitive, i.e., the violent ones are part of the people ("the violent ones among your people"). A similar instance of a partitive construction occurs in v. 33 **וּמִשְׁכִּילֵי עָם** "the wise among the people." A number of Adventist interpreters, including Uriah Smith and Louis Were, have

understood the phrase "robbers of thy people" in the sense of an objective genitive and applied it to the Romans.<sup>22</sup> As it stands, the Hebrew text allows for both types of genitive interpretations, and in either case it is the same group that will "stumble" in the next sentence.

15	וַיָּבֹא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	<b>The king of the north</b> will come	52	
	וַיִּשְׂפֹךְ סוּלָלָה	and lay siege mounds	53	^ C-C Reg.
	וַלְכָד עִיר מְבֻצָּרֹת	and capture a fortified city.	54	^ C-C Reg.
	וְזִרְעוֹת הַנֶּגֶב לֹא יַעֲמֹדוּ וְעַם מִבְּחָרָיו	<b>The arms of the south</b> will not stand, nor <u>his</u> choice troops.	55	
	וְאֵין כֹּחַ לַעֲמֹד:	There will be no strength to stand.	56	
16	וַיַּעַשׂ תְּבָא אֵלָיו כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ	<b>The one who comes to him</b> will do according to <u>his</u> will,	57	
	וְאֵין עוֹמֵד לְפָנָיו	without anyone standing before <u>him</u> .	58	^ Rule 2: obj the one who comes (king of north)
	וַיַּעֲמֵד בְּאֶרֶץ־הַצִּבְיָה	<u>He</u> will stand in the beautiful land,	59	^ Rule 1: subj "him" (king of north)
	וְקָלָה בְיָדוֹ:	with annihilation in <u>his</u> hand.	60	

There is a stretch of verses between v. 15 and v. 40, where the designation "king of the north" does not occur. However, that does not mean that the king of the north ceases to be in the narrative in vv. 16-39. As explained in my earlier paper, major global

<sup>22</sup> Smith, *Thoughts*, 267-270; Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered* (St. Maries, ID: LMN Publishing International, 2002), 41, 89, 117.



participants are more often referenced anaphorically than by name. Since the king of the north is a major global participant, it is expected that he would be mentioned anaphorically. In fact, other than at paragraph or segment boundaries, participants are not expected to be mentioned by name or designation. Hence, it is not the absence of the expression "king of the north" in vv. 16-39 that is significant, but its unnecessary repetition that would be significant for interpretation.

There are a couple items that deserve discussion in v. 16. First, the expression "the one who comes to him" is a participial clause functioning as the subject of the sentence. Since the expression functions as a specified subject, de Regt's rules are not applicable here. Also, the fact that the participant is specified could potentially indicate a new paragraph, though there may be other reasons for the specification. However, the identity of the participant referred to is not affected by a transition. Smith interprets it as the Romans.<sup>23</sup> The fact that it has an article suggests that it is someone previously mentioned in the narrative. Further, the expression does not narrate the participant's coming, but implies that the reader already knows that he is coming. Thus, although the participial clause functions as a specified subject, the definite article within that expression has an anaphoric function in this context, and the most likely referent is in v. 15, which states that the king of the north "will come."<sup>24</sup>

Second, there is a textual variant in the last sentence of v. 16 that does not change the sentence divisions or the identity of the participants, but it cannot be passed over without a comment. As it stands in the MT it is best understood as a nominal sentence with

---

<sup>23</sup> Smith, *Thoughts*, 272-274.

<sup>24</sup> Since Smith sees the Romans as introduced in v. 14, his interpretation agrees that the participant was mentioned earlier in the narrative. However, the subject in v. 14 is plural. Further, it is unlikely that a reader would see the group in v. 14 as an antecedent to "the one who comes" in v. 16, since the narrative does not describe them as coming before v. 16.

the noun וְכָלָה "complete end" (i.e., "destruction" or "annihilation") as the subject. However, the ancient versions translate the clause with passive verbs (for more details, see Appendix B in my previous paper). The OG is unique in that it adds a word "all will be brought to an end," which translates a combination of כָּל "all" and the verb כָּלָה "to come to an end," suggesting that the translator of the OG may have conflated different understandings of the MT text. Other than OG, the translations assume that the referent is the beautiful land, which is feminine in Hebrew as well as in each of the respective languages. The Hebrew וְכָלָה could also be analyzed as a Qal 3ms verb "it will come to an end," but that is masculine not feminine, and there is no masculine singular referent for the anaphor. Alternatively, some prefer to emend the Hebrew text to וְכָלָהּ "and all of it [will be in his hand]," which is reflected in several modern translations. However, this emendation lacks textual support. Therefore, although there is textual evidence to suggest that the MT may need to be corrected, the evidence does not yield a clear alternative, and the MT reading is coherent.

17	וַיִּשְׁמוּ פָּנָיו לְבוֹא בְּתִקְוָה כָּל־מְלְכוּתוֹ	He will set <u>his</u> face to come with the strength of <u>his</u> entire kingdom.	61	^	Rule 2: subj	
	וַיִּשְׁרִים עִמּוֹ וְעָשָׂה	He will form alliances with <u>him</u> , [textual variant]	62	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who sets his face (king of north)
	וַבְּתַת הַנָּשִׁים יִתֶּן־לּוֹ לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ	and give <u>him</u> the daughter of women to destroy <u>him</u> . [textual variant]	63	^	C-C Reg.	
	וְלֹא תֵעָמַד	But <u>she</u> will not stand	64	^	Rule 1: subj	"daughter"
	וְלֹא־לּוֹ תִהְיֶה:	nor be for <u>him</u> .	65	^	C-C Reg.	

There are two significant textual variants in v. 17. I will only mention them briefly here. For more details, I direct you to Appendix B of my previous paper. The second sentence of the verse in the MT literally reads, "And equitable things are with him. And he will do." That is, the first two words form a nominal sentence functioning as a circumstantial clause to the previous sentence, while the verb at the end forms a new sentence. However, the ancient translations, OG, Theod, the Vulg., and the Syr., translate these words as a single sentence. These translations also require correcting the verb **וַיַּעַשׂה** "and he will do" to **יַעַשׂה** "he will do," which is plausible, since confusing the letters ו and י was not a rare scribal mistake, and there is at least one Hebrew manuscript with **יַעַשׂה**.

The next significant textual variant in v. 17 concerns the last word in the third sentence, **לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ**, which consists of a one-word subordinate clause with a 3fs pronominal suffix "her/it." There is some ambiguity concerning the referent of the suffix, an ambiguity reflected in the variants in the ancient translations. The simplest solution is found in the fact that the suffix is written as a 3ms suffix in a Qumran manuscript **לְהַשְׁחִיתוֹ** "to destroy him" (4Q Dan<sup>c</sup>), in which case the referent is the king of the south. The masculine suffix is supported by the OG and the Syr.<sup>25</sup> Since the Hebrew 3ms suffix is sometimes written with the letter ה instead of ו,<sup>26</sup> the differences could simply reflect different interpretations of the suffix in an unvowelled text. This is further supported by the

---

<sup>25</sup> Theod has a feminine pronoun and the Vulg. a neuter one.

<sup>26</sup> For a discussion of the phenomenon, see Ian Young, "Observations on the Third Person Masculine Pronominal Suffix -H in Hebrew Biblical Texts," *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001): 225-242.

alternation of ך and ך in the Ketiv-Qere variant in 11:10 (Ketiv **מַעֲזֵה**, Qere **מְעֵזֵה**). It should be mentioned here that the possibility remains for interpretations that follow the MT vocalization as a 3fs suffix.<sup>27</sup>

In addition to the textual variants, there is also the curious expression **וּבֵת הַנְּשִׁים** "the daughter of women," which can be variously interpreted. It consists of a Hebrew construct relationship that can be descriptive (a feminine daughter) or partitive (a daughter among women), both of which give the sense of a special daughter. Alternatively, the word **בַּת** "daughter" can denote a member of a group, just as its masculine counterpart **בֵּן** "son" ("sons of Israel" = "Israelites"). In our passage, the expression occurs as "sons of violent ones" (= "violent ones," Dan 11:14), "sons of Ammon" ("Ammonites," 11:41), and "sons of your people" (= "your people," 12:1). Thus the "daughter of women" may simply mean a member of the female gender, that is, "a woman."

In passing, I should briefly discuss the last two sentences in v. 17, which contain unspecified 3fs subjects expressed by the morphology of their respective verbs, **תִּעֲמֹד** "she will [not] stand" and **תִּהְיֶה** "she will [not] be." English translations are divided on their interpretation of the referent of the unspecified feminine subjects. Some translations render the subject as "she" (e.g., CSB, KJV, NKJV, NASB). These translations interpret the unspecified subjects as anaphoric references to the "daughter of women" in the previous sentence. Others supply the word "plan" as the subject (GNT, NCV, NIV, NLT). Since the word for "plan" does not occur in the context, these translations interpret the unspecified subjects not as anaphoric but as exophoric. That is, they refer to a participant

---

<sup>27</sup> In a personal communication, Frank Hardy expressed his preference for retaining the 3fs suffix as in the MT.

outside the text. Still others render the subject with an ambiguous "it" (CEB, ESV, RSV, NRSV). The "it" subject may either express an unspecified reference to the "plan," in which case the unspecified subject is interpreted as exophoric, or it may express an English dummy subject or placeholder, in which case the Hebrew verb is interpreted as subjectless. Of these interpretations, the exophoric one is the least likely, since the presence of a specified feminine participant in the immediate context makes it doubtful that a different feminine subject would remain unspecified.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, it would also be unusual for a 3fs verb to be subjectless when a feminine participant is specified in the immediate context. The fact that the gender and number of the subject of the last two sentences matches the object of the preceding sentence suggests that de Regt's rule one is applicable. Hence, the object of the third to last sentence, the "daughter of women," is coreferential with the subject of the next sentence, "she will [not] stand," which, in turn, is coreferential with the subject of the last sentence, "she will [not] be."

וַיָּשָׁב פָּנָיו לְאֵיִם 18	He will set his face to the coastlands [Ketiv: He will turn back his face]	66	^	Rule 1: subj	"him" (king of north)
וְלָקְדוּ רַבִּים	and capture many.	67	^	C-C Reg.	
וְהַשְׁבִּית קֶצֶין חֲרָפְתּוֹ לֹ	But <b>a commander</b> will put a stop to <u>his</u> taunt.	68			
בְּלִתֵּי חֲרָפְתּוֹ יָשִׁיב לֹ:	Rather, <u>he</u> will turn back <u>his</u> taunt on <u>him</u> .	69	^	C-C Reg.	

<sup>28</sup> There is a word for "plan" מַחְשְׁבָה that occurs in vv. 24 and 25, but it does not occur in the immediate context of v. 17. The fact that the word occurs elsewhere makes it likely that the author would have used it in v. 17 if that had been meant.

In 11:18 the last word of the next to last sentence and the first word of the last sentence לוּ בְלִי "to him, but not" are somewhat enigmatic, but, if they reflect any type of textual corruption, the other textual witnesses do not help to resolve the puzzle. The word בְּלִי is a negative adverb that often implies a contrast. However, in the above passage, it seems to have a rare function, and there is no consensus concerning its exact meaning. The word generally occurs at the beginning of a subordinate clause, but since it does not always introduce a clause,<sup>29</sup> it is not clear whether the subordinating function is inherent in this word or expressed by other clause constituents. In most instances, it is combined with a preposition (95 out of 112, and most often לְבִלִי) or follows a word in the construct state (2 instances, 1 Sam 2:2; Isa 14:6).<sup>30</sup> Of the remaining 15 instances, 11 occur in verbless expressions.<sup>31</sup> Thus, the instance in Dan 11:18 is one of only 4 instances not combined with a preposition that introduce a verbal clause. In the other 3 instances, it means "unless" or "except" (Isa 10:4; Amos 3:3, 4), but that meaning does not fit the context in Dan 11:18. My personal preference would be to emend לוּ בְלִי to לְבִלִי and translate the two clauses as, "A commander will put a stop to his taunt, without returning his taunt on him." Thereafter, the discourse would continue with the globally active king of the north as the subject (according to rule two). The emendation could be explained as a scribal error due to the occurrence of לוּ at the end of the verse.

---

<sup>29</sup> It introduces a phrase rather than a clause in Gen 21:26; 47:18; Exod 22:19 [English v. 20]; Num 11:6; 32:12; Josh 11:19; Judg 7:14; 1 Sam 2:2; Isa 14:6; Eze 16:28; Hos 13:4. In 1 Sam 2:2 and Hos 13:4 the phrase consists of a negation and בְּלִי with a pronominal suffix.

<sup>30</sup> In most of these instances it introduces a clause with an infinitive construct (82 out of 112).

<sup>31</sup> Though most of these consist of phrases, some are nominal clauses (Gen 43:3,5; 1 Sam 20:26). Moreover, the 2 instances that occur after a word in the construct also occur in nominal phrases (1 Sam 2:2; Isa 14:6). By contrast, only 1 prepositional instance occurs in a nominal phrase (Eze 16:28).

However, since there is no textual support for this emendation, the present translation retains the MT reading. For a discussion of the textual variants, see Appendix B in my earlier paper.

19 וַיֵּשֶׁב פָּנָיו לְמַעוֹזֵי אֲרָצוֹ	He will then turn <u>his</u> face back to the fortresses of <u>his</u> own land.	70	^	Rule 1: subj	"him" (king of north)
וְנִכְשַׁל	But <u>he</u> will stumble	71	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who turns his face (king of north)
וְנָפֵל	and fall	72	^	C-C Reg.	
וְלֹא יִמָּצֵא:	and not be found.	73	^	C-C Reg.	

As explained above, it is not clear whether בְּלִהְיוֹ in v. 18 introduces a subordinate clause. However, if so, the last the sentence of v. 18 would have no animate object, and rule two would apply instead of rule one. According to rule two the "commander" of v. 18 could be the subject throughout v. 19.<sup>32</sup> However, rule two also allows for the more globally active subject to be anaphorically referenced. Therefore, whether on the basis of rule one or rule two, it makes better sense to understand the referent of the anaphors in v. 19 as the king of the north.

20 וְעָמַד עַל-כַּנּוֹ מִעֲבִיר נֹגֵשׁ הַדָּר מְלָכוֹת	In <u>his</u> place will arise <b>one who sends out an exactor</b> for the splendor of the kingdom.	74
--	---	----

<sup>32</sup> This is the preference of Oliver Glanz (personal communication).

וּבְיָמֵים אֲחֵרִים יִשָּׁבֵר וְלֹא בְאַפָּיִם וְלֹא בְּמִלְחָמָה:	But in a few days <u>he</u> will be broken, but not in anger or in battle.	75	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who sends out an exactor (king of north)
21 וְעָמַד עַל-כְּנֹל גְּבוּיָהּ	In <u>his</u> place will arise a contemptible person.	76			
וְלֹא-נִתְּנָהוּ עָלָיו תְּהוֹד מְלָכּוֹת	Royal dignity was not conferred on <u>him</u> .	77	^	Rule 2: obj	contemptible person (king of north)
וּבָא בְשֵׁלְוָהּ	<u>He</u> will come in quietly,	78	^	Rule 1: subj	
וְהִחְזִיק מְלָכּוֹת בְּחֵלְקָלְקוֹת:	and will seize the kingdom by smoothness.	79	^	C-C Reg.	

The Hebrew phrase for "in his place" in vv. 20, 21 also occurs in v. 38, where the referent is not a king, and is similar to an instance in v. 7 (the same word without the preposition), where it does not indicate a replacement of an empire. Hence, the expression "in his place" simply indicates succession and does not necessarily require the succession to be from one empire to another. Though the phrase by itself does not indicate a replacement of the empire, its use in combination with other elements in the context could be suggestive. Thus, the fact that in v. 21 the usurper is not conferred royal dignity allows for (but does not require) the possible interpretation of the participant as a separate empire. The same, however, cannot be said for the succession in v. 20.

Also, the subject in v. 20 is a subordinate clause, "one who sends out an exactor." The entire subordinate clause functions as the subject of the main sentence, and the main sentence does not have an object. Hence, the one who is "broken" in the following sentence is the subject of the first sentence. That is, the one who is broken/defeated is not the exactor but the king who sent him. Consequently, the contemptible person (v. 21) arises as his successor ("in his place"), not as the successor of the exactor.



At this point, it is appropriate to make some brief remarks concerning discourse related matters. On the one hand, the fact that new participants are introduced in vv. 20-21 allows for the possibility of a paragraph or segment break here. On the other hand, the fact that both verses begin with verbs is also significant, because it expresses continuity rather than discontinuity. In other words, although the participants are new, they are successors of the king of the north, and therefore inherit the position and title of "the king of the north."

וְזָרְעוֹת הַשְּׁטָף יִשְׁטְפוּ מִלְּפָנָיו 22 The sweeping arms will be swept away before him, 80 ^ Rule 2: obj  
 וְיִשְׁבְּרוּ וְגַם נְגִיד בְּרִית: and will be broken, also **the prince of the covenant**. 81 ^ C-C Reg.

Verse 22 begins in Hebrew with the subject rather than the verb. In fact, there are several non-verb initial sentences in the following verses. However, the exact function of this and the other non-verb initial sentences must be determined by the context, which is beyond the scope of this study. At the end of the next sentence, the phrase "also the prince of the covenant" occurs.<sup>33</sup> Although the placement of a phrase at the end of a sentence can sometimes function as a means of highlighting it, it is not as prominent as at the beginning of the sentence. Besides, this sentence consists of only two elements, the verb and this phrase, which calls into question whether there is any highlighting at all. Adventists have traditionally, and as far as I know unanimously, interpreted

---

<sup>33</sup> The conjunction וְגַם "and also" expresses the addition of more information. This can take the form of an additional action (as in v. 8) or the inclusion of another sentence participant ("as well as" Gen 14:7). In the case of Dan 11:22 it expresses the inclusion of the prince of the covenant as an additional participant in the plural subject of the sentence. That is, the "sweeping arms" will be broken (defeated), and along with them the prince of the covenant.

the prince of the covenant as Jesus Christ. However, although Christ is central to the book of Daniel, and indeed central to the entire Bible, that does not mean that "the prince of the covenant" plays the most prominent role in every part of every narrative. Theological centrality does not equate with narrative prominence. We must beware of being more Christocentric than the Bible itself, lest we worship our supposedly Christocentric theology instead of the true Christ as presented in Scripture.

23	וּמִן־הַתְּחִבָּרוֹת אֵלָיו יַעֲשֶׂה מְרֻמָּה	After the making of an alliance with him <u>he</u> will practice deception.	82	^	Rule 2: subj	contemptible person
	וְעָלָה	<u>He</u> will go up	83	^	Rule 2: subj	
	וְעָצָם בְּמַעַט־גֹּיִם:	and become mighty with a small people.	84	^	C-C Reg.	

The first sentence of v. 23 begins with a subordinate clause. Within that subordinate clause, it is not clear who makes the alliance with whom. Therefore, the word "him" has not been color-coded.

24	בְּשִׁלְוָה וּבְמִשְׁמֹנֵי מְדִינָה יָבֹוא	<u>He</u> will come quietly and into the rich areas of the province.	85	^	Rule 2: subj	
	וְעָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו וְאֲבוֹת אֲבוֹתָיו	<u>He</u> will do that which neither <u>his</u> fathers nor <u>his</u> forefathers have done.	86	^	Rule 2: subj	
	בְּזָה וּשְׁלָל וּרְכוּשׁ לָהֶם יִבְזֹר	<u>He</u> will distribute to them plunder and spoil and wealth.	87	^	Rule 2: subj	
	וְעַל מְבָצְרִים יַחֲשֵׁב מִחֲשַׁבְתּוֹ וְעַד־עֵת:	Against the fortifications <u>he</u> will devise his plans, but only for a time.	88	^	Rule 2: subj	

25	וַיַּעַר כֹּחַו וּלְבָבוֹ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנִּנְבִּי בְּחַיִּל גָּדוֹל׃	He will arouse his strength and his heart against <b>the king of the south</b> with a large army.	89	^	Rule 2: subj
	וּמֶלֶךְ הַנִּנְבִּי יִתְנַרֶּה לְמַלְחָמָה בְּחַיִּל־ גָּדוֹל וְעֲצוּם עַד־מְאֹד	<b>The king of the south</b> will be stirred up for the battle with a great and very strong army.	90		
	וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד	But <u>he</u> will not stand.	91	^	Rule 2: subj. king of south
	כִּי־יִחְשְׁבוּ עָלָיו מַחְשְׁבוֹת׃	For plans will be devised against <u>him</u> .	92	^	Rule 2: obj
26	וְאֹכְלֵי פֶת־בָּנָיו יִשְׁבְּרוּהוּ׃	And <b>those who eat his provisions</b> will break <u>him</u> .	93	^	Rule 1: obj
	וַחֲיָלוּ יִשְׁטוּף	<u>His</u> army will be swept away, [textual variant]	94		
	וְנָפְלוּ חֲלָלִים רַבִּים׃	and many will fall slain.	95		

In v. 26 in the second sentence, the MT has an active verb יִשְׁטוּף "it will overflow." However, the Syr. and the Vulg. translate it as a passive, "he will be scattered/crushed." The passive meaning can be explained by a change in the vowelling of the MT from the Qal יִשְׁטוּף/יִשְׁטוּף (and several manuscripts have the shorter form, יִשְׁטוּף) to the Niphal יִשְׁטוּף. The Syriac and Latin passive translations suggest that the unvowelled Hebrew text was understood in a passive sense in at least some communities in antiquity. The present study adopts the passive meaning because it fits the context better.

27	וּשְׁנֵיהֶם הַמְּלָכִים לְבָבָם לְמַרְעַע וְעַל־שֻׁלְחָן אֶחָד כָּזַב יַדְבְּרוּ	As for <b>the two kings</b> , <u>their</u> hearts will be set on evil.	96		
	וְלֹא תִצְלַח	At the same table <u>they</u> will speak lies.	97	^	Rule 2: subj the two kings
	כִּי־עוֹד קֵץ לְמוֹעֵד׃	But it will not succeed.	98		
		For the end is still for an appointed time.	99		

וַיָּשָׁב אֶרְצוֹ בְּרִכְוֹשׁ גָּדוֹל	28	He will return to <u>his</u> land with great riches,	100	^	Rule 2: subj	contemptible person (king of north)
וְלִבּוֹ עַל-בְּרִית קָדֶשׁ		with <u>his</u> heart set against the holy covenant.	101			
וַעֲשֶׂה		<u>He</u> will take action.	102	^	Rule 2: subj	
וְשָׁב לְאֶרְצוֹ:		Then <u>he</u> will return to <u>his</u> own land.	103	^	Rule 2: subj	

Verse 28 begins with a sentence that contains an anaphoric subject "he," expressed by the 3ms morphology of the verb **וַיָּשָׁב** "and he will return," and no animate object. The immediately preceding sentence in v. 27 has a specified non-human subject **קֵץ** "the end" and no object. This is preceded by a sentence that has a 3fs subject in an impersonal/subjectless expression, which in turn, is preceded by a sentence that has a plural anaphoric subject "they," expressed by the plural verb, referring to both kings. Thus, the referent of the anaphor in v. 28 could potentially be either of the two kings. However, although the king of the south is globally active in vv. 25-26, the king of the north is the more globally active participant in the context. He is last mentioned in v. 15, which states that the "king of the north will come," and is therefore "the one who comes" in v. 16, and he continues in v. 21 as the "contemptible person" who arises as a successor "in his place." The "king of the south" (v. 14) is not explicitly mentioned again until v. 25, when "he," the king of the north, comes against him. Further, the identity of the referent of the anaphor in v. 28 as the king of the north is confirmed by the fact that he eventually comes to attack "the south" in v. 29.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> In a personal communication, de Regt explained it as follows:

Starting at least in verse 16, the king of the north is (or the successive kings of the north are) being referred to anaphorically. This continues into verse 25, making the king of the north the most active across clauses in (this part of) the discourse, with the highest continuity. Perhaps this

29	לְמוֹעֵד יָשׁוּב	At the appointed time <u>he</u> will again	104	^	Rule 2: subj
	וּבָא בְּנֶגֶב	come into <u>the south</u> .	105	^	C-C Reg.
	וְלֹא־תְהִי־כְרִאשׁוֹנָה וְכֶאֱחֶרְוֹנָה:	But the latter event will not be as the first.	106		

Verse 29 begins with a temporal phrase, which potentially marks a transition to a new paragraph or narrative segment.

However, the fact that a new segment begins here does not alter the anaphoric relationships.

The third and last sentence in v. 29 can be translated in two ways. Literally the sentence reads, "And/but it will not be as the first or as the last." However, the correct translation depends on whether it is understood to be a comparison of two events or three events. If the 3fs verb "to be" is not anaphoric, i.e., it has no feminine singular referent in the context, then the verb is subjectless. The English translation adds the subject "it" as a dummy subject or a placeholder, not an actual subject. In this case, there are only two events being compared. According to *HALOT* a comparison between the two nouns can be expressed by the repetition of the preposition כְּ "as/like" in sequence, כְּ . . . כְּ "as . . . (and) as."<sup>35</sup> That is, unlike English comparisons, where one participant is the

---

is a basis for saying that with the global references to the king of the north surpassing the slightly less global (only vv. 25b-26) references to the king of the south, it is the king of the north who is the most likely candidate for the reference in 11:28.

<sup>35</sup> Compare with the word בֵּין "between," which, in contrast to English, also occurs in pairs in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., Gen 1:4; 16:5; 30:36). The sequence can also occur as בֵּין followed by לְ (e.g., Lev 20:25). However, the preposition כְּ does not always occur in pairs.

subject of the comparison, Hebrew comparisons are sometimes expressed by repeating prepositional phrases with כִּי, and neither participant is the subject. The following is an example from 1 Kgs 22:4:

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוֹשָׁפָט אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל  
כְּמוֹנִי כְמוֹךָ "I am as you are, [lit., As I as you]  
כְּעַמִּי כְעַמֶּךָ My people are as your people, [lit., As my people as  
your people]  
כְּסוּסֵי כְסוּסֶיךָ: and my horses are as your horses." [lit., as my  
horses as your horses]

Another example occurs in Gen 18:25.

25 חָלֵלָה לְךָ מַעֲשֵׂתוֹ כַּדְּבַר הַזֶּה  
לְהַמִּית צַדִּיק עִם־רָשָׁע  
וְהָיָה כְצַדִּיק כְּרָשָׁע so that the righteous will be like the wicked. [lit., so  
that it will be as the righteous as the wicked]

The last example above is literally, "it will be as the righteous as the wicked," which is very similar to the sentence in Daniel 11:29.<sup>36</sup>

The sentence structure of these comparisons may be understood as, "And it is (not) X as Y," in which case there are only two events or

---

<sup>36</sup> For other examples, see Lev 7:7; 24:16, 22; Num 15:15; Deut 1:17; 1 Sam 30:24; Isa 24:2; Hos 4:9.

encounters being compared in Daniel 11:29, not three, and the English translation adopted here is a necessary accommodation for the requirements of English usage for the sake of clarity.<sup>37</sup>

An alternative possibility is that the 3fs verb "to be" in v. 29 is indeed anaphoric, referring to an event, the second conflict between the king of the north and the king of the south. If so, it is possible that there is a comparison of three events, the "first" in the past (vv. 25-28), the second just mentioned in v. 29, and the "last" in the future (vv. 40-45).<sup>38</sup> If so, the sentence should be translated, "But it will not be as the first or as the last."

30 וּבָאוּ בּוֹ צִיִּים כְּתִים	<b>Ships of Kittim</b> will come against <u>him</u> ,	107	^	Rule 2: obj
וְנִכְאָה	and <u>he</u> will be disheartened.	108	^	Rule 1: subj "him" (king of north)
וְשָׁב	<u>He</u> will again	109	^	Rule 2: subj
וְזָעַם עַל־בְּרִית־קֹדֶשׁ	be indignant against the holy covenant	110	^	C-C Reg.
וְעָשָׂה	and take action.	111	^	C-C Reg.
וְשָׁב	<u>He</u> will again	112	^	Rule 2: subj
וַיִּבֶן עַל־עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ:	pay attention to <b>those who forsake the holy covenant</b> .	113	^	C-C Reg.

<sup>37</sup> Special contexts may depart from the typical English syntax, such as the proverbial saying, "Like father, like son," which does not mean that a third person is similar to a father and a son, but simply that a son is like his father.

<sup>38</sup> For other examples of more than one preposition עִי with a verb "to be" that has a clear antecedent resulting in an additional participant in the sentence, see 2 Kgs 3:2; 2 Chron 30:7.

There are different views on the identity of the "ships of Kittim in v. 30. However, I will not try to resolve this question here, because the identity of Kittim does not alter the anaphoric references in the passage.

31	וְזָרְעִים מִמֶּנּוּ יֵעָמְדוּ	Arms will arise from <u>him</u>	114	
	וְחָלְלוּ הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז	and will profane the sanctuary fortress.	115	^ C-C Reg.
	וְהִסִּירוּ הַתָּמִיד	<u>They</u> will remove the continual worship	116	^ Rule 2: subj arms
	וְנָתְנוּ הַשְּׂקוּץ מְשׁוּמָם:	and set up the desolating abomination.	117	^ C-C Reg.
32	וּמְרַשְׁעֵי בְרִית יַחְנִיף בְּחַלְקוֹת	<u>He</u> will corrupt <b>those who act wickedly towards the covenant</b> with smooth words.	118	^ Rule 2: subj "he" (king of north)
	וְעַם יִדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיוּ יַחֲזִקוּ	But <b>the people who know their God</b> will be strong	119	
	וְעָשׂוּ:	and take action.	120	^ C-C Reg.
33	וּמִשְׂכִּילֵי עָם יִבְיִנוּ לְרַבִּים	<b>The wise among the people</b> will give understanding to <b>the many</b> .	121	
	וְנִכְשְׁלוּ בְּחַרְבַּ וּבִלְהָבָה בְּשִׁבְיָ וּבְבַזָּה יָמִים:	<u>They</u> will stumble by sword, flame, captivity, and plunder for some days.	122	^ Rule 1: subj the many
34	וּבְהִפְשָׁלָם יֵעֲזְרוּ עֲזָר מְעַט	When <u>they</u> stumble, <u>they</u> will be helped with a little help.	123	^ Rule 2: subj (same)
	וְנִלְווּ עֲלֵיהֶם רַבִּים בְּחַלְקֵי לִקְוֹת:	And <b>many</b> will join <u>them</u> in hypocrisy.	124	^ Rule 2: obj (same)
35	וּמִן־הַמִּשְׂכִּילִים יִפְשְׁלוּ לְצָרוֹף בָּהֶם וּלְבָרַר וּלְלַבֵּן עַד־עֵת גָּץ	<b>Some of the wise</b> will stumble to refine, purge, and make <u>them</u> white until the time of the end.	125	
	כִּי־עוֹד לְמוֹעֵד:	For it is still for an appointed time.	126	
36	וְעָשָׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ	<b>The king</b> will do according to <u>his</u> will.	127	
	וַיִּתְרוֹמֵם	<u>He</u> will exalt himself,	128	^ Rule 2: subj "the king"



וַיִּתְנַדֵּל עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹ	and will magnify himself against every god,	129	^	C-C Reg.
וְעַל אֵל אֱלֹהִים יִדְבַר נִפְלְאוֹת	and will speak amazing things against the God of gods.	130	^	C-C Reg.
וְהִצְלִיחַ עַד-כְּלֵה אֲנֵם	<u>He</u> will succeed until the indignation is finished.	131	^	Rule 2: subj ("he"--the king)
כִּי נִחְרְצָה נְעֻשְׂתָּהּ:	For what is determined will be done.	132		

The first sentence in v. 36 has "the king" as the subject. Smith suggests that this is a new participant, revolutionary France.<sup>39</sup> Since this can be considered a designation rather than an anaphor, the sentence has a specified subject and no object, and therefore de Regt's rules do not apply. However, the word הַמֶּלֶךְ "the king" has an article, and the article can have an anaphoric function. It is not "a" king, but "the" king, which implies that he is not a new participant, but one that was mentioned earlier in the narrative. Therefore, "the king" is the one that has been most globally active in the last few verses, against whom the ships of Kittim came, i.e., the contemptible person of v. 21.<sup>40</sup> Rather than introducing a new participant, the specification of "the king" may indicate the beginning of a new narrative segment that returns to talking about him after a few sentences where other participants were in focus.

וְעַל-אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָיו לֹא יִבִּין	<u>He</u> will not acknowledge the gods of <u>his</u> ancestors.	133	^	Rule 2: subj
וְעַל-חֲמֻדַּת נָשִׁים וְעַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִבִּין	<u>He</u> will not acknowledge the one desired by women, or any god.	134	^	C-C Reg.

<sup>39</sup> *Thoughts*, 315-318.

<sup>40</sup> Also, in the MT the word occurs at the end of the sentence, not at the beginning, which suggests that the participant had already been introduced to the reader. However, this point may be mitigated by the fact that Theod places the word at the beginning of the next sentence. See the discussion in Appendix B of my previous paper.

כי על-כל יתגדל:	For <u>he</u> will magnify himself above all.	135	^	Rule 2: subj	
38 וְלֵאלֹהֵי מַעְזִים עַל-כַּנּוֹ יִכְבֹּד	In its place <u>he</u> will honor the god of fortresses.	136	^	Rule 2: subj	
וְלֵאלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יָדָעוּ אֲבוֹתָיו יִכְבֹּד בְּזָהָב וּבְכֶסֶף וּבְאַבְנֵי יָקָרָה וּבַחֲמֻדוֹת:	A god whom <u>his</u> ancestors did not know <u>he</u> will honor with gold and silver and precious stones and desirable things.	137	^	C-C Reg.	
39 וְעָשָׂה לְמִבְצְרֵי מַעְזִים עִם-אֱלֹהֵי נֹכַר אֲשֶׁר הִכִּיר	<u>He</u> will take action against the strongholds of fortresses with a foreign god, whom <u>he</u> recognizes.	138	^	Rule 2: subj	
וְרָבָה כְבוֹד	<u>He</u> will increase honor.	139	^	Rule 2: subj	
וְהִמְשִׁילֵם בְּרַבִּים	<u>He</u> will make them rule over the many,	140	^	Rule 2: subj	
וְאַדְמָה יַחֲלֶק בְּמַחִיר:	and apportion the land for a price.	141	^	C-C Reg.	
40 וּבַעֲתָ קֵץ יִתְנַגַּח עִמּוֹ מֶלֶךְ הַיָּמִינִים	At the time of the end <u>the king of the south</u> will join in combat with <u>him</u> .	142			
וַיִּשְׁתַּעַר עָלָיו מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים וּבְאַנְיֹת רַבּוֹת	But <u>the king of the north</u> will storm against <u>him</u> with chariots, horsemen, and many ships.	143	^	Rule 2: obj	king of south
וּבָא בְאַרְצוֹת	<u>He</u> will enter countries,	144	^	C-C Reg.	(king of north)
וְשָׁמַר	and overflow,	145	^	C-C Reg.	
וְעָבַר:	and cross over.	146	^	C-C Reg.	

Verse 40 begins with a temporal phrase, indicating a transition to a new paragraph or segment of the narrative. The start of a new segment is also the reason why the kings of the south and north are specifically mentioned again. As I argued in my previous paper, the use of anaphors does not constitute an underspecification, but rather the re-occurrence of a name or designation constitutes an overspecification. Specifying the participants by name or designation is one of the ways in which a narrative introduces a new segment. The reappearance of the king of the south in the narrative after a long gap (he is mentioned v. 25, and "the south" is

mentioned in v. 29) and the resumption of the north-south conflict constitutes the topic of the new narrative segment. However, a transition to a new segment of the narrative does not affect the anaphoric references.

The first sentence of v. 40 has a specified subject, "the king of the south," and no object or object complement, since עִמּוֹ "with him" expresses accompaniment. Since de Regt's rules do not apply, the identity of the pronominal suffix "him" must be inferred from the context, which suggests that it is coreferential with the "he" of previous verses, which is the king of the north because "the king" of v. 36 is also the contemptible person of v. 21. Though this sentence has no animate object, the next sentence has the expression עָלָיו "against him," which functions as an object, and therefore rule two applies, and the subject of the first sentence is the referent of the anaphor in the second sentence. That is, the object of the second sentence is the king of the south.<sup>41</sup>

As for nature of the combat, the Hebrew verb יִתְנַנֵּחַ "join in combat" comes from a root that denotes an animal goring with its horns (Exod 21:28; 1 Kgs 22:11). This is the only occurrence in the *hithpael* stem, which usually denotes reflexive or reciprocal action. The form of the verb neither requires a specific amount of time for the action, nor a victor in the conflict. However, the context supplies that information. That is, the king of the south initiates the conflict, and the king of the north eventually defeats him.

41 וְכָא בְּאַרְץ הַצְּבִי He will enter the beautiful land.

147 ^ Rule 2: subj

---

<sup>41</sup> Smith (*Thoughts*, 326-330) understood the verse to depict a conflict of Egypt (king of the south) and Turkey (king of the north) against France ("the king" of v. 36). However, as explained earlier, the king in v. 36 was the king of the north. Further, since v. 40 is the beginning of a new narrative segment, the participants are specified again by designation, and there is no specification for a third king.

וְרַבּוֹת יִפְּשְׁלוּ	Many (lands) will fall,	148	
וְאַלֶּהָ יִמָּלְטוּ מִיָּדוֹ אֶדְוֹם וּמוֹאָב וְרֵאשִׁית בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן:	but these will escape <u>his</u> hand, Edom, Moab, and the leaders of the Ammonites.	149	
42 וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ בְּאַרְצוֹת	<u>He</u> will stretch his hand into (other) lands,	150	^ Rule 2: subj
וְאַרְץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא תִהְיֶה לְפָלִיטָה:	and the land of <u>Egypt</u> will not escape.	151	
43 וּמִשְׁלַל בְּמִכְמֹנֵי הַזָּהָב וְהַכֶּסֶף וּבְכָל חֲמֻדוֹת מִצְרַיִם	<u>He</u> will rule over the hidden treasures of gold and silver and over the precious things of <u>Egypt</u> ,	152	^ Rule 2: subj
וּלְבָיִם וְכַשְׂמִים בְּמִצְרַיִם:	with the Libyans and Ethiopians in <u>his</u> footsteps.	153	
44 וּשְׂמֻעוֹת יִבְהַלְּהוּ מִמִּזְרָח וּמִצָּפוֹן	But reports from the east and the north will frighten <u>him</u> .	154	^ Rule 2: obj
וַיֵּצֵא בְּחֵמָה גְּדֹלָה לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְהַחֲרִים רַבִּים:	<u>He</u> will go out with great fury to destroy and to exterminate many.	155	^ Rule 1: subj "him" (king of north)
45 וַיִּטַּע אֶתְחֵלֵי אֶפְרָתָו בֵּין יַמִּים לְהַר־ צְבִי־קָדֵשׁ	<u>He</u> will plant <u>his</u> royal tents between the seas and the holy beautiful mountain.	156	^ Rule 2: subj
וּבֹא עַד־קֵצוֹ	But <u>he</u> will come to <u>his</u> end,	157	^ Rule 2: subj
וְאֵין עֹזֵר לוֹ:	with no one to help <u>him</u> .	158	^ Rule 2: obj

These verses continue the narrative after the victory of the king of the north over the king of the south until his final end. In the second sentence of v. 41, the word "lands" is added in parenthesis, because the Hebrew word וְרַבּוֹת "many" is feminine, and therefore refers to lands or countries rather than people (cf. the masculine רַבִּים "many" [people] in v. 44). The context of vv. 41-43 deals with the countries, the beautiful "land" (אֶרֶץ v. 41) the other "lands" (אַרְצוֹת v. 42), and the "land" of Egypt (אֶרֶץ v. 42). There is a listing

of some countries that escape (Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites, v. 41) and some that do not (Egypt, v. 42, Lybians and Ethiopians, v. 43).

<p>12 1 וּבָעֵת הַהִיא יֵעָמֵד מִיכָאֵל הַשָּׂר הַגָּדוֹל הָעֹמֵד עַל-בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ</p>	<p>At that time Michael the great prince who stands over the sons of your people will arise.</p>	<p>159</p>
<p>וְהִיְתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נִהְיִיתָ מֵהַיּוֹת גּוֹי עַד הָעֵת הַהִיא</p>	<p>There will be a time of trouble which has not been since a nation came to be until that time.</p>	<p>160</p>
<p>וּבָעֵת הַהִיא יִמָּלֵט עִמָּךְ כָּל-הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בַּסֵּפֶר :</p>	<p>At that time your people, all who are found written in the book, will be delivered.</p>	<p>161</p>
<p>2 וְרַבִּים מִיֹּשְׁבֵי אֲדָמַת-עָפָר יִקְיִצּוּ אֶלֶּה לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם וְאֶלֶּה לְחַרְפּוֹת לְדָרְאוֹן עוֹלָם: ס</p>	<p>Many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will wake up, some to eternal life and some to shame and eternal contempt.</p>	<p>162</p>
<p>3 וְהַמְּשֻׁבְּלִים יִזְהָרוּ כְּזֹהַר הַרְקִיעַ וּמִצְדֵי קַיִּי הַרְבִּים כִּכְּכֹכְבִּים לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד : פ</p>	<p>The wise will shine like the glow of the firmament, the ones who turn the many to righteousness like the stars forever and ever.</p>	<p>163</p>

There is no need for color-coding in 12:1-3, since there are no anaphoric references and there is no disagreement on the identity of the participants. Verse 1 begins with a temporal phrase, indicating a transition to a new paragraph or segment of the narrative. The same temporal phrase occurs again in the last sentence of the verse, after which there are two non-verb initial sentences, suggesting that the last three sentences list these final events without any implied chronological sequence.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the color-coded translation, as explained in my earlier paper, was not designed as the final definitive translation in all respects but rather simply as a translation that clarifies the identity of the participants. Further refinements are certainly in order, and, as you can see, some of the observations made here go beyond the color-coding.

In this paper I attempted to explain some of the implications of the Hebrew text of Daniel 11:2b-12:3. I have tried to be fair to all interpretive approaches, and if I failed in any way, please, forgive me. I could not settle all interpretive issues, and I do not claim to have the last word on the Hebrew text, as I am still learning. This research is not intended as the end of the discussion, but as a helpful resource for further study and discussion.

## References

- De Regt, Lénart J. "Anaphoric Accessibility in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Global and Local Participant Tracking across Clause Boundaries." Pages 63-78 in *Ancient Texts and Modern Readers: Studies in Ancient Hebrew Linguistics and Bible Translation*. Ed. Gideon R. Kotzé, Christian S. Locatell, and John A. Messarra. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 71. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Linguistic Coherence in Biblical Hebrew Texts: Arrangement of Information, Participant Reference Devices, Verb Forms, and Their Contribution to Textual Segmentation and Coherence*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 28. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2019.
- Doukhan, Jacques. *Daniel 11 Decoded: An Exegetical, Historical, and Theological Study*. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 2019.
- Gane, Roy E. "Genre Awareness and Interpretation of the Book of Daniel." Pages 137-148 in *To Understand the Scriptures: Essays in Honor of William H. Shea*. Edited by David Merling. Berrien Springs: The Institute of Archaeology, Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3." *JATS* 27 (2017): 294-343.
- Li, Tarsee. "A Color-Coded Translation of Daniel 11:2b-12:3." Paper presented at the Daniel 11 Conference, October 20, 2022.
- Rodríguez, Ángel Manuel. *Daniel 11 and the Islam Interpretation*. Silver Spring: Biblical Research Institute, 2015.
- Roosenberg, Tim. *Islam and Christianity in Prophecy*. Hagerstown: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 2011.

- Smith, Uriah. *Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel*. Battle Creek: Steam Press, 1873.
- Vine, Conrad. "Interpretations of Daniel 11." Nov. 9, 2020.
- Witcombe, John C. *Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad*. Helena: Prophecy Waymarks Publications, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eastern Question Answered!* Helena: Prophecy Waymarks Publications, 2020.
- Were, Louis F. *Power Unlimited: Righteousness by Faith and the Final Conflict*. Berrien Springs: First Impressions, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*. St. Maries, ID: LMN Publishing International, 2002.
- Young, Ian. "Observations on the Third Person Masculine Pronominal Suffix *-H* in Hebrew Biblical Texts." *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001): 225-242.