

# An Exegetical Study of Selected Verses in Daniel 11

Engel Yoder

July 2020; eryoder1@lrmutual.com

Prepared for the Daniel 11 Conference, October 2020, Village SDA Church, Berrien Springs, MI

The objective of this paper is fourfold: (1) to show where Rome enters the prophecy of Daniel 11; (2) to show where the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70 is in the prophecy; (3) to show where the papal phase of Rome enters the prophecy; and (4) to show that the “breaking” of the “prince of the covenant” in v. 22 is *not* in reference to the crucifixion of Christ in A.D. 31.

## Imperial Rome Enters the Prophecy

Daniel’s final prophetic revelation in Daniel 10–12 constitutes the third explanation of Daniel’s true vision of chapter 8.<sup>1</sup> Recognizing this is critical to our understanding of chapter 11. This being the case, we fully expect chapter 11 to parallel chapter 8 at its key juncture points, and these points are the transition points of the major world powers in view — *i.e.* the ram of vs. 3–4 (Medo-Persian Empire), the goat with a large horn of vs. 5–7 (Alexander the Great’s Greek Empire), the four horns that replaced the large horn of v. 8 (the four divisions of the Greek Empire), and finally the little horn that grew “exceedingly great” of vs. 9–12 (Rome).

Since the prophecy of Daniel 11 begins in the reign of Medo-Persia, the first transition point between powers is that between Persia and Greece in v. 3 (Greece being explicitly mentioned to v. 2). The second transition point is between Alexander’s empire and its four-way division after Alexander’s death. This point is easily found in v. 4. The third and final major transition point is between the four-way division of the Greek Empire and Rome. Where this point is found in Daniel 11 is a point of controversy as, beginning with v. 5, the prophecy launches into a lengthy discourse on two of the four Greek divisions, and just where this discourse ends and Rome is introduced is not as readily apparent as were the previous transition points.

By way of determining the controverted transition point, let’s parallel the verses that show the preceding transition point where there is consensus among students of prophecy:<sup>2</sup>

### Daniel 8:8

**8 Therefore the he goat** (the Greek kingdom) **waxed very great; and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven.**

### Daniel 11:4

**4 And when he** (the Greek kingdom) **shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those.**

From these verses the two prophecies diverge. Daniel 8:9 goes directly to the next transition point by introducing the power of Rome, while Daniel 11:5 begins the detailed elaboration on two of the four Greek divisions. This being the case, when Rome finally enters the prophecy in Daniel 11 we would expect its entrance to parallel Daniel 8:9. And in our view, there is one verse in Daniel 11 that stands out as paralleling Daniel 8:9, and this is v. 16.

### Daniel 8:9

**9 And out of one of them came forth a little horn** (Rome), **which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant (tsebi) land.**

### Daniel 11:16

**16 But he** (Rome) **that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious (tsebi) land, which by his hand shall be consumed.**

<sup>1</sup> Daniel had but two true visions — the first coming in the first half of Dan 7 and the second coming in the first half of Dan 8. The first vision received an immediate explanation in the second half of Dan 7 and the second vision received an immediate explanation in the second half of Dan 8. But then the second vision received a second explanation some ten years later in Dan 9, and finally a third explanation after another two years in Dan 10–12.

<sup>2</sup> All Scripture quotes are from the KJV unless otherwise indicated.

First we will note that vs. 5–15 of Daniel 11 relate an ongoing war between the two principal divisions of the Greek Empire — the Seleucids and the Ptolemies — respectively called “king of the North” and “king of the South.” In this section of the prophecy at least one of these kings is mentioned by name in every verse except two — vs. 10 and 12. But beginning with v. 16 and going all the way to the end of the chapter in v. 45 the specific mention of either of these kings seldom occurs — only twice, to be exact, in vs. 25 and 40. So in vs. 5–15 at least one of these kings is mentioned by name in 9 of the 11 verses, and in vs. 16–45 at least one of these kings is mentioned by name in a mere 2 of the 30 verses. The abrupt cessation of either of these kings being mentioned in v. 16, then, suggests a significant paragraph break between verses 15 and 16.

Secondly we note that vs. 5–15 describe a back-and-forth seesaw conflict between the two relatively equal forces of the kings of the North and South, each of which experience both victory and defeat at various points throughout their history. Though v. 15 describes a final victory of the king of the North over the king of the South, we would expect the introduction of Rome into the prophecy, in parallel with the dreadful fourth beast of Daniel 7 (Rome) that was “strong exceedingly” (v. 7) and the little horn of Daniel 8 (Rome) that “waxed exceeding great” (v. 9), to depict the introduction of a fully dominate new world power, and this is precisely what we have in v. 16. That is, verse 16 tells us that a “he” “shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him.” This describes a power of greater strength than what was previously attributed to either of the kings of the North and South.

Consistent with the idea that the wording of v. 16 (“shall do [*ʿasah*] according to his own will [*ratsown*]”) introduces a power greater than that ascribed to either of the kings of the North and South, the introduction of the Greek Empire in v. 3 used precisely the same wording, saying the “king” would “do [*ʿasah*] according to his will [*ratsown*].” Likewise the introduction of the Medo-Persian Empire in the parent prophecy of Daniel 8:4, saying the “ram” “did [*ʿasah*] according to his will [*ratsown*].” And likewise the subsequent reference to religio-political Rome in Daniel 11:36, saying the “king” “shall do [*ʿasah*] according to his will [*ratsown*].” Each case of *ʿasah ratsown* refers to a world power *doing* its unrivaled and uncontested *will*, whereas in the Seleucid/Ptolemy conflicts the kings of the North and South continually rivaled and contested each other. That is, they rivaled and contested each other until v. 15 when “the arms of the south shall not withstand” those of the North. But v. 15 is immediately followed by v. 16 describing a power that would *ʿasah ratsown* to the extent that “none shall stand before him,” and this, to be consistent, introduces a power that supersedes and surpasses even the victorious forces of the North.

But thirdly and most significantly, the principal parallel between Daniel 11:16 and Daniel 8:9 is the common use of the Hebrew word *tsebi* — meaning *glorious, beautiful*. In connection with the word “land,” *tsebi* is commonly used in reference to the land of Israel.<sup>3</sup> And it is almost unanimously agreed among theologians that the “pleasant land” in Daniel 8:9 and the “glorious land” in 11:16 indeed refer to the land of Israel. This is indicated in some Bible versions by the capitalization of the terms — *i.e.* “Beautiful Land” and/or “Glorious Land.”<sup>4</sup>

If Rome indeed enters Daniel 11 in v. 16, then we would expect the last part of v. 16 to fit this historical context. Let’s see if it does.

**16 But he (Rome) that cometh against him (the king of the North of v. 15) shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him (Rome): and he (Rome) shall stand in the glorious land (the land of Israel/Palestine), which by his (Rome’s) hand shall be consumed<sup>3617</sup>.**

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.* Eze 20:6, 15; 26:12; Jer 3:19. The word “land” is present in Dan 11:16 and assumed in 8:9.

<sup>4</sup> *E.g.* NASB, NIV, NKJV.

That imperial Rome “stood in,” or “occupied,” Palestine is a historical fact; that Rome “consumed” Palestine with its persecuting “hand,” initially in the form of economic taxation and ultimately in the form of the military siege and destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, is also a historical fact. Let’s note the warning of this ultimate destruction which Christ gave His disciples in Matthew 24:15–16:

**15 When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)**

**16 Then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains:**

That the “abomination of desolation” here refers to imperial Rome in the form of its armies is evident from the wording of this same warning in Luke 21:20–21:

**20 And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.**

**21 Then let them which are in Judæa flee to the mountains ....**

The Spirit of Prophecy makes it clear:

When the idolatrous standards of the Romans should be set up in the holy ground, which extended some furlongs outside the city walls, then the followers of Christ were to find safety in flight. *The Great Controversy*, 26.

It is understood that the words “whoso readeth” in Matthew 24:15 mean “whoever reads the book of Daniel.”<sup>5</sup> But exactly which text in Daniel was Christ referring to? In the KJV the specific term “abomination of desolation” is found only twice in Daniel — in 11:31 and 12:11. However, according to the *SDA Bible Dictionary*, in the Hebrew text this term is also found “with insignificant grammatical differences” in 8:13 and 9:27.<sup>6</sup> Since Daniel 8:13, 11:31, and 12:11 cannot be associated with the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, it is generally agreed that 9:27 is the specific text in Daniel to which Christ referred in Matthew 24:15.<sup>7</sup> However, we should not overlook the similarity of terms in Matthew 24:15 and Daniel 11:16.

In Matthew 24:15 Christ warned that the abomination of desolation would “stand in the holy place.” Understanding Daniel 11:16 as we do, this verse tells us that imperial Rome would “stand in the glorious land.” As the subject of both verses is imperial Rome, and since Christ was referring His listeners in Matthew 24:15 to Daniel 9:27, it is evident that all three of these verses refer to essentially the same historical time period — Daniel 9:27 and Matthew 24:15 referring specifically to Rome’s destruction of Jerusalem (described in Matt 24:15 as Rome standing “in the holy place”), and Daniel 11:16 referring generally to Rome’s occupation and consumption of Palestine (described as Rome standing “in the glorious land”).

Additional evidence that Daniel 11:16 refers to the total submission of Palestine to the Romans which was especially marked by the destruction of Jerusalem is found in the Hebrew word translated “consumed” in this verse. Strong’s definition:

<sup>5</sup> Cf. DA 234.

<sup>6</sup> SDABD 7.

<sup>7</sup> This view is supported by the fact that Dan 9:26 parallels 9:27, and v. 26 plainly foretells the destruction of Jerusalem (“and the people of the [Roman] prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary”) while Luke 21:20 parallels Matt 24:15, and Luke 21:20 plainly speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem (“when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh”). This being the case, the reference in Matt 24:15 to “the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet” naturally refers to the abomination of the Roman army causing the desolation of Jerusalem in Dan 9:27.

3617. **kalah**, *kaw-law'*; from 3615; a *completion*; adv. *completely*; also *destruction*:—altogether, (be, utterly) consume (-d), consummation (-ption), was determined, (full, utter) end, riddance.

Understanding the context and timeframe of v. 16 as we do, we can be sure that the Hebrew word *kalah* found in this verse is in reference to the utter subjugation of Palestine to the Romans — the ultimate consummation of which being the destruction of Jerusalem. But the destruction of Jerusalem symbolized the end-time destruction of the world.

The ruin of Jerusalem was a symbol of the final ruin that shall overwhelm the world. The prophecies that received a partial fulfillment in the overthrow of Jerusalem have a more direct application to the last days. We are now standing on the threshold of great and solemn events. A crisis is before us, such as the world has never witnessed. *Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing*, 120–121.

This being the case, it should not be surprising to find that Scripture uses the word *kalah* in reference to the end-time destruction of the world. We find one such reference in Isaiah 28:21–22:

**21 For the LORD shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work; and bring to pass his act, his strange act.**

**22 Now therefore be ye not mockers, lest your bands be made strong: for I have heard from the Lord GOD of hosts a consumption<sup>3617</sup>, even determined<sup>2782</sup> upon the whole earth.**

The *SDA Bible Commentary* comments on v. 22:

**A consumption, even determined.** Literally, “a decision to annihilate,” that is, to eradicate sin and to extirpate sinners from the earth. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 4:212.

The specific *kalah* (“consumption”) here describes God’s final judgment on sin and sinners that God has “determined” will come “upon the whole earth.” It seems reasonable to understand, then, that this judgment, of which the seven last plagues will constitute a significant part,<sup>8</sup> is what the ruin of Old Jerusalem symbolized, and it is the general *kalah* of Palestine (of which the ruin of Jerusalem was the ultimate act) that is referred to in Daniel 11:16. But Isaiah speaks in yet another place of the *kalah* God has “determined,” or “decreed.” Isaiah 10:22–23:

**22 For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption<sup>3631</sup> decreed<sup>2782</sup> shall overflow with righteousness.**

**23 For the Lord GOD of hosts shall make a consumption<sup>3617</sup>, even determined<sup>2782</sup>, in the midst of all the land.<sup>9</sup>**

While the immediate context of these verses applies to ancient Israel, the *SDA Bible Commentary* comments on v. 22: “The apostle Paul applies this verse to *the Lord’s great final work on earth*.”<sup>10</sup> Paul does this in Romans 9:27–28:

**27 Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved:**

**28 For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.**

And the Commentary further comments on the “consumption” (*kalah*) of v. 23: “Literally, ‘a burning,’ one that would consume everything (see ch. 28:22).” We have already quoted Isaiah 28:22

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *GC* 627.

<sup>9</sup> The Hebrew word translated “consumption” in v. 22 (*killayown*) is closely related to *kalah* (“consumption”) in v. 23. Both words come from the primitive root *kalah* (3615) and they share the meaning *consumption*.

<sup>10</sup> *4BC* 155 (emphasis supplied).

above, where *kalah* refers directly to God's "strange work" and "strange act" (v. 21) that would come on the day Paul described in 1 Thessalonians 1:7–8:

**7 ... when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels,  
8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the  
gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:**

Of course, applying the *decreed consumption* of Isaiah 10:22 to "the Lord's great final work on earth" harmonizes perfectly with the *determined consumption* of Isaiah 28:22 that will come "upon the whole earth."

Returning to Daniel 11, the last phrase of v. 16 — "shall be consumed (*kalah*)" — could be understood to point forward in time. Therefore, though this verse refers to the destruction of Jerusalem indirectly by speaking of the coming ultimate consumption of the "glorious land," it is our view that in the chronological flow of Daniel 11 it is actually v. 20 that refers directly to the destruction of *Jerusalem* (the ultimate *kalah* in its historical application) and it is v. 36 that refers directly to the end-time destruction of the *world* (the ultimate *kalah* in its eschatological application).

Looking at Daniel 11:36, here we find the word *kalah* in the form of its primitive root (*Strong's* #3615) and translated "accomplished." The part of v. 36 that we are concerned with reads:

**36 And the king (the Roman power) ... shall prosper till the indignation<sup>2195</sup> be accomplished<sup>3615</sup>: for that that is determined<sup>2782</sup> shall be done.**

It would appear that the "indignation" that is "determined" here is identified in Zephaniah 3:8:

**8 Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the LORD, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination<sup>4941</sup> is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation<sup>2195</sup>, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy.**

This "indignation" is also referred to in Isaiah 26:20 and even more specifically identified in v. 21. Isaiah 26:19–21:

**19 Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.**

**20 Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation<sup>2195</sup> be overpast<sup>5674</sup>.**

**21 For, behold, the LORD cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain.**

Comments from the Spirit of Prophecy apply vs. 20–21 here to the time of the seven last plagues which fall between the close of human probation and the second coming of Christ:

If the righteous were now left to fall a prey to their enemies, it would be a triumph for the prince of darkness. Says the psalmist: "In the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion: in the secret of his tabernacle shall He hide me." Psalm 27:5. Christ has spoken: "Come, My people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." Isaiah 26:20–21. *The Great Controversy*, 634.<sup>11</sup>

That the destruction of Jerusalem as foretold by Christ in Matthew 24 was a symbol of the destruction to befall the world at the end of time is, in Adventism, an accepted fact; and that

<sup>11</sup> Also cf. 4BC 204–205.

Matthew 24 has dual applications throughout is also an accepted fact. Referring to the prophecy of Matthew 24/Mark 13/Luke 21, Inspiration states:

The prophecy which He uttered was twofold in its meaning; while foreshadowing the destruction of Jerusalem, it prefigured also the terrors of the last great day. *Ibid.*, 25.<sup>12</sup>

In our view, while the consumption (*kalah*) of the “glorious land” in Daniel 11:16 pointed immediately forward to the destruction of Jerusalem in v. 20, it pointed ultimately forward to the final accomplishment (*kalah*) of the “indignation” referred to in v. 36.

A criticism of locating the entrance of Rome in Daniel 11:16 is the fact that Rome must merely be understood to be the referent of the pronouns “he” in the verse and that a new character in the prophecy requires being introduced with a noun, not a mere pronoun. I do not have an answer for this other than to point out that a new character is clearly introduced in v. 20 (“Then in his place one will arise” [NASB]) and this character is identified merely with a verb (“who will send” [NASB]). That is, this new character is not identified with a noun indicating who he is but with a verb indicating what he does. In the same way, Rome can be introduced in v. 16 merely with a verb indicating what he does. He is the one “that cometh against him,” with the “him” being the last Greek king standing in v. 15.

Now we will note that there is nothing in Daniel 8 that distinguishes two of the four divisions of the Greek Empire as becoming major characters in world history, such as the kings of the North and South are portrayed in Daniel 11; thus, we view the inclusion of these two opposing kings in Daniel 11 as an unexpected addition to, and diversion from, the parent prophecy of chapter 8. This being the case, we understand the kings of the North and South as being characters exclusively unique to Daniel 11, and as such, neither of them should be equated with the major characters of Daniel 8 — *e.g.* the little horn. If we are correct on this, then, when Rome enters Daniel 11 it enters singularly as the little horn of Daniel 8, not also as a king of the North succeeding the Seleucids. This understanding explains why the explicit title “king of the North” is found only once in the final 30 verses of Daniel 11 (v. 40) even though Rome is the principal character of this entire section.

In our view, Daniel 11:16 not only introduces the power of Rome but also picks up the prophetic flow that vs. 5–15 diverted from. While the restored flow is that of being the third explanation of the parent prophecy and true vision of Daniel 8, in the prologue to this explanation Gabriel informed Daniel that this final explanation will focus primarily on how the coming events would affect “thy people in the latter days” (Dan 10:14). Thus, once Rome enters the prophecy we would expect the prophecy to revert to the prophetic focus of Daniel 8 and to relate history that would particularly concern God’s people as they would be affected by the Roman “little horn” power. And this is what we see v. 16 doing by its reference to “the glorious land” and this land being “consumed.”

Having made our case for the entrance of Rome in v. 16, we now go to our second objective: identifying the verse that describes the destruction of Jerusalem.

### The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple

Given the fact that Daniel 9 foretells in plain language the destruction of “the city and the sanctuary” (v. 26; *i.e.* Jerusalem and the Temple) and that Daniel 9 is the second explanation of the vision of Daniel 8, and given the widely accepted view that Daniel 11 is the third explanation of the vision of Daniel 8, we could well expect Daniel 11 to parallel Daniel 9 and also foretell the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. And as we have already indicated, we believe Daniel 11 in fact does this in v. 20:

<sup>12</sup> Also cf. DA 628–629.

**20 Then shall stand up in his** (the Roman emperor's) **estate one that causeth an exacter**<sup>5065</sup> **to pass over**<sup>5674</sup> [margin] **in the glory**<sup>1925</sup> **of the kingdom: but within few days he** (the one that causes an exacter to pass over) **shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.**

As noted in the quote of Isaiah 26:19–21 above, the Hebrew word *abar*, rendered “be overpast” in v. 20, is given the identifying number 5674 in *Strong's Concordance*. Though this Hebrew word is used in a wide variety of ways, when it comes to its use in Daniel 11:20 Wigram's *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* harmonizes with the margin of the KJV and translates it as “that causeth ... to pass over.” This is the word the main text renders “raiser.” While the marginal wording is, in our view, the preferred translation, whichever translation is accepted it still remains that it is the same Hebrew word that is found in both Daniel 11:20 and Isaiah 26:20.

As also noted previously, Isaiah 26:20 is an invitation to God's people, because probation for the Gentiles has now closed, to completely disassociate themselves from the wicked and to “hide” themselves until the “indignation” (the punishment of the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity [v. 21] in the form of the seven last plagues) “be overpast” (*abar*).<sup>13</sup> Now we see that there is also something in Daniel 11:20 that is caused “to pass over” (*abar*). We have already supposed that this “something” is the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Since the destruction of Jerusalem “prefigured ... the terrors of the last great day” (GC 25), and because the “indignation” spoken of in Isaiah 26:20 refers to the seven last plagues,<sup>14</sup> the fact that the word *abar* is found in both Daniel 11:20 and Isaiah 26:20 harmonizes with our supposition that Daniel 11:20 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. Though it does not confirm it, it at least concurs with it. Now let's try to determine exactly what this “something” is that is caused “to pass over” in Daniel 11:20.

This “something” is described in the KJV margin as “an exacter” and in the main text as “a raiser of taxes.” Let's look at Strong's definition of the Hebrew word itself:

5065. **nagas**, *naw-gas'*; a prim. root; to *drive* (an animal, a workman, a debtor, an army); by impl. to *tax*, *harass*, *tyrannize*:—distress, driver, exact (-or), oppress (-or), X raiser of taxes, taskmaster.

The “X” sign preceding the words “raiser of taxes,” according to *Strong's Concordance*, “denotes a rendering in the A. V. that results from an idiom peculiar to the Heb.” Though not knowing exactly what the idiom is in this particular case, we *can* note that the idea “to tax” in this definition is “by implication” only; it could just as well imply “to harass” or “to tyrannize.” But it appears that the primary definition is “to drive” (as in “to drive a debtor”). It also seems that this Hebrew word as used in the context of Daniel 11:20 refers to someone who is “an exacter” (the words chosen in the margin) or “an oppressor.” Therefore, a logical rendering of the idea expressed in v. 20 would be: A debt collecting exacter (*nagas*) who passes over (*abar*). Now the next logical question is: Who is the debtor? or, Who does this debt collector pass over? The phrase in v. 20 that answers this question is “the glory of the kingdom.”

The term “the kingdom” here is from the same Hebrew word rendered “kingdom” in every other instance where the word “kingdom” is found in Daniel's account of this vision — Daniel 10:13; 11:4, 9, 17, 21. These instances refer to the kingdoms of Persia, Greece, Egypt, and Rome. Therefore, by itself the term “the kingdom” in v. 20 cannot be used to identify a specific kingdom as it is a generic term used as a general reference to any kingdom. Nevertheless, the precedence has been set that the word “kingdom” in this prophecy refers to the domains of the dominate world

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the GC 634 quote above.

<sup>14</sup> As does the “indignation” of Zeph 3:8 and the context we have given the “indignation” of Dan 11:36. Cf. the quotes of these verses, and our comments, on p. 5.

political power reigning at the time. Following this precedence, then, the “kingdom” in v. 20, since the time [as we understand it] is the first century A.D., would be the kingdom of imperial Rome. Given this deduction, the term we must use to identify the specific object this debt exacter passes over is “the glory of the kingdom [of imperial Rome].”

The Hebrew word from which the words “the glory of” are translated in Daniel 11:20 is used only this once in the entire Old Testament. Strong’s definition:

1925. **heder**, *heh'-der*; from 1921; *honour*; used (fig.) for the *Capital* city (Jerusalem):—glory.

Here we have a very specific identification for what is referred to by the term “glory” in Daniel 11:20 — “the *Capital* city (Jerusalem).” But though Jerusalem was considered “the glory of” the kingdom of Israel, considering the considerable investment the Romans made in replenishing the Temple during their occupation of Palestine there is also a real sense in which the Romans considered Jerusalem and the Temple the “glory” of their *own* kingdom. Perhaps this Spirit of Prophecy statement is relevant here:

The temple had long been the pride and glory of the Jewish nation. The Romans also prided themselves in its magnificence. A king appointed by the Romans had united with the Jews to rebuild and embellish it, and the emperor of Rome had enriched it with his gifts. Its strength, richness, and magnificence had made it one of the wonders of the world. *The Desire of Ages*, 575.

It seems the New American Standard offers a good translation of Daniel 11:20. In the following quote of this verse the footnote in the NAS is included:

**20 Then in his** (the Roman emperor’s) **place one will arise who will send an oppressor through the Jewel of his kingdom ....**

⌋Lit., *adornment*; i.e., probably Jerusalem and its temple

Here we have “Jerusalem and its temple” suggested as what was “probably” being referred to by the Hebrew word *heder*, here translated “Jewel.” But though this translation comes close, in our view the best translation is offered by *The New Brown–Driver–Briggs–Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*. The *B–D–B Lexicon* is coded to *Strong’s Concordance*; note how its discussion of *heder* renders Daniel 11:20:

**1925 ... n. [m.] ornament, adornment, splendour**, only cstr. ... Dn 11:20 *splendour of (the) kingdom*, cf. AV RV, i.e. Judaea, or perh. Jerusalem acc. to Leng Hi Meinh; but rather *royal splendour ... i.e. an exacter who shall cause the royal splendour to pass away*.

This rendering states: “an exacter who shall cause the royal splendour to pass away.” But even better, we would render it: *an exacter who shall cause the ornament of the kingdom to pass away*. The *B–D–B Lexicon*, like *Strong’s Concordance* and the NAS, also offers Jerusalem as a possible identity of the “ornament” or “royal splendour” of the kingdom. Thus, we believe the city of Jerusalem and its temple was in fact what is specifically referred to by the word *heder* (meaning “ornament, adornment, splendour” and rendered “royal splendour” in the *B–D–B*, “Jewel” or “adornment” in the NAS, and “glory” in the KJV) in this verse, and that the “kingdom” Jerusalem and its temple were the “ornament,” “Jewel,” or “glory” of was in fact the kingdom of the Roman Empire.

This view harmonizes with the way the Roman general Titus viewed the Jewish Temple. The historian Josephus recorded the discussion Titus had with his advisors regarding the Temple’s fate when they brought Jerusalem under siege in A.D. 70. Some thought it should be destroyed outright, since it was a rallying point of Jewish nationalism. Others thought it should be preserved; but if the

Jews employed it as a military fortress, then it should be destroyed and the Jews would bear the responsibility.

But Titus said, that “although the Jews should get upon that holy house, and fight us thence, yet ought we not to revenge ourselves on things that are inanimate, instead of the men themselves;” and that he was not in any case for burning down so vast a work as that was, because this would be a mischief to the Romans themselves, as it would be *an ornament to their government* while it continued. *The Works of Josephus*, book 6, ch. 4, par. 3 (emphasis supplied).

Of course, as we know and as Josephus goes on to relate, some of Titus’ soldiers — the “people of the prince that shall come” (Dan 9:26)<sup>15</sup> — in the heat of battle and in direct violation of orders, burned the Temple to the ground. But as noble as Titus appeared to be in his desire to preserve the Temple, he was attempting to prevent what was divinely decreed would happen. Jesus Himself prophesied this in Luke 21:5–6.<sup>16</sup>

**5 And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he said,**

**6 As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.**

Moreover, we believe Titus was attempting, albeit unknowingly, to prevent the consummate fulfillment of Daniel 11:20.

We will note that neither the NAS nor the *B–D–B Lexicon* apply the context of monetary taxation to v. 20 as many commentators do who prefer the main text of the KJV (which reads, “a raiser of taxes”) over the rendering of the margin which we prefer (“one that causeth an exacter to pass over”). These commentators see in v. 20 the Roman taxation of Palestine in 4 B.C. which took Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem at the time of Christ’s birth. But, again, according to Strong’s definition of the Hebrew word here (*nagas*), the meaning of taxation is *by implication only*; and in our view a mere implication is by itself a weak basis for applying the context of economic taxation to this verse. Exacting a debt, which is all we see v. 20 to be saying, can come in forms other than economic taxation. And to be sure, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70 was the ultimate *exacting* on the national *debt* of Israel for rejecting God’s repeated appeals to accept the gift of His Son. In what more forceful language could God convey to both the nation of Israel and the world the fact that Israel had forever forfeited her status as God’s elect?

The destruction of Jerusalem is a fearful and solemn warning to all who are trifling with the offers of divine grace and resisting the pleadings of divine mercy. Never was there given a more decisive testimony to God’s hatred of sin and to the certain punishment that will fall upon the guilty. *The Great Controversy*, 36.

Given the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 fulfilled the destruction of “the city and the sanctuary” prophesied in Daniel 9:26, and given the fact that Jesus specifically identified the circumstances surrounding the destruction of Jerusalem as being prophetically significant,<sup>17</sup> it certainly seems that the significance of this event is such that we would expect its inclusion in the prophetic account of “what shall befall thy people in the latter days” (Dan 10:14) much more than the mere event of Caesar Augustus’ decree to economically tax his empire in 4 B.C. Moreover, as

<sup>15</sup> Adam Clarke’s commentary on Dan 9:26: “By the ‘prince’ Titus, the son of Vespasian, is plainly intended; and ‘the people of that prince’ are no other than the Romans, who according to the prophecy, destroyed the sanctuary, ... the holy place or temple, and, as a flood, swept away all till the total destruction of that obstinate people finished the war.”

<sup>16</sup> Also Matt 24:2; Mark 13:2. Also cf. 1 Kgs 9:6–9; Luke 19:41–44.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. our comments regarding Matt 24:15–16 and Luke 21:20–21 on p. 3.

noted at the beginning of this section, because Daniel 11 is the third explanation of the true vision of Daniel 8, and because Daniel 9 is the second explanation, we could well expect to find commonality between Daniel 11 and 9, just as we expect it between Daniel 11 and 8. And because the destruction of Jerusalem is a significant part of Daniel 9, it is only natural to find it in Daniel 11.

It is evident from the NAS translation of Daniel 11:20, as well as the margin of the KJV, that the emperor's successor would actually send someone *else* to Jerusalem to be its "oppressor" or "exacter." The following provides a clear account of events in Palestine during this period.

#### THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM<sup>18</sup>

In A.D. 66, the Roman procurator, Florus, made some mistakes, but when the Jews appealed to Agrippa (the one who earlier had listened to Paul — Acts 26:28), they were told to forget it. Stones were thrown at him as he left town. It was August, 66. For the next four years Jerusalem was to know no peace as Jew fought Jew or Roman within and without its walls.

Some of the Jews immediately seized parts of Jerusalem, and fighting broke out among them. The Roman garrison in the fortress Antonia was slaughtered. Ananias the high priest and his brother, descendants of the Annas who condemned Christ, were slain by Jewish factions, who then turned on one another. In retaliation, Florus slew 20,000 Jews in Caesarea. Jews, then attacked cities throughout Judea, and dilatory Cestius Gallus, legate of Syria, decided to do something. Heading south with 30,000 troops, he burnt Joppa, and then surrounded Jerusalem. Just as the Jewish moderates were about to hand over the city, he unexpectedly withdrew. Encouraged, the Jews set off in pursuit, and Cestius lost much equipment, all his siege engines, and nearly 6,000 soldiers. "Running and singing," the Jews returned to Jerusalem and to a terrible fate. It was the end of October, 67 [*sic, it was the end of Nov., 66*].<sup>19</sup>

February 68, Nero appointed his best general, Vespasian, to command the Roman armies [*Nero probably appointed Vespasian to this position in Dec., 66; Vespasian landed on the Phoenician coast in April, 67*].<sup>20</sup> This was a wise decision, for Vespasian quickly took Jotapata, Joppa again, and all of Galilee. At that point, 30,000 Jews were sold into slavery.

Heading south toward Jerusalem, 15,000 Jews were slain at the Jordan, — but then on June 9, Vespasian learned that Nero had committed suicide [*Nero committed suicide June 9, 68*]. Hurrying to Rome, he became enmeshed in battles for the emperorship, which he won 18 months later, in October 69.

By that time, all Judea, except Jerusalem, was under the control of his thirty-year old son, Titus. On May 10, A.D. 70 with 65,000 men, Titus arrived at Jerusalem. Fanatical Jews within and determined Romans without, hastened its destruction. Every type of horror and savagery was experienced within its walls before Titus gained control of it, 139 days later.

Yet thirty-nine years before, Christ had foretold this destruction, and warned His followers to keep the Sabbath faithfully (Matthew 24:20) and flee when the Roman armies had arrived (verse 16). This they did, when Cestius unaccountably withdrew from the city in October, A.D. 67 [*actually Nov., 66*].

Jerusalem, itself, had been divided into three sectors, each under its own rebel force, and each fighting the other. With the help of battering rams, banks, 75-foot towers, and hurling machines, the Romans took the Antonia by the end of July, and the Temple in

<sup>18</sup> This is taken from the unnumbered page preceding p. 18 of the second edition (1985) of Pilgrims' Books publication of *The Great Controversy* and was included in this edition by the publishers. A very similar account, much of it word-for-word but with more historical details added, is found in Harvestime Books special edition (2010) of *The Great Controversy*, 43–44. As indicated in our quote, we believe both accounts have some dates wrong.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the Chronological Table at <http://www.josephus.org/warChronology2.htm>.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galilee\\_campaign\\_\(67\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galilee_campaign_(67)). Accessed 6/26/19.

August. Three more weeks, and all Jerusalem was burned to the ground. 1,100,000 Jews died during the siege.

Now let's read the first part of v. 20 again, this time inserting all specific identifications:

**20 Then shall stand up in his** (the Roman emperor Nero's) **estate**<sup>3653</sup> **one** (Vespasian) **that causeth an exacter** (Titus) **to pass over** [margin] **in the glory** (Jerusalem) **of the kingdom** [of Rome]: ....

As in v. 16, if we are correct in our interpretation of the first part of v. 20 we should expect the last part to fit this context. Let's see if it does.

**20 ... but within few days he** (the Roman emperor) **shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.**

The Hebrew word translated "few" here (*ʿechad*) occurs 952 times in the Old Testament; however, it is translated "few" in the KJV only three times.<sup>21</sup> This suggests that the translation "few" conveys an idea not intended by Gabriel, and we suggest a better translation for this word in this verse would be "certain" or "some."<sup>22</sup> This conveys the idea that the time period referred to is not limited to just a relative few days; instead, it designates a period of unspecified duration that could, therefore, be many days.

We understand that the "he" who, within a certain number of days, is "destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle" is not in specific reference to Vespasian. Rather, it is in general reference to the *station* or *office* or *place* of pagan Rome's emperorship as the caesars were superseded by the popes who rise to power in the next verse. The Hebrew word translated "estate" in v. 20 (as well as the one in v. 21) carries this meaning. Strong's definition (underlined emphasis supplied):

3653. **ken**, *kane*; the same as 3651, used as a noun; a *stand*, i.e. pedestal or station: — base, estate, foot, office, place, well.

Thus, we understand v. 20 to say that Nero's place as leader of the pagan Roman kingdom was acquired by Vespasian, then, after an unspecified number of days, this place was acquired by the "vile person" of v. 21. "[N]either in anger, nor in battle" accurately describes the way ruling authority was transferred within the Roman Empire from the caesars and the state of Rome to the popes and the church of Rome. That the prophecy jumps from the first century emperors in v. 20 to the fourth century popes in v. 21 follows the way it jumped from the Persian king Ahasuerus in v. 2 to the Greek king Alexander in v. 3 with no allusion to the nine intervening Persian kings whatsoever. Obviously, apocalyptic prophecy only takes notice of the principal characters engaged in the spiritual warfare.

In our view, the abomination of desolation in its first phase was, in fact, imperial Rome, and its "standing" in the "holy place" was imperial Rome's armies surrounding "the glory of the kingdom" — Jerusalem.<sup>23</sup> Also in our view, while v. 20 marks the end of Daniel 11's account regarding the Roman abomination of desolation in its *first* phase, v. 21 marks the beginning of the account regarding this abomination in its *second* phase. And as it relates to the third objective of this paper, it is to this significant second phase of the Roman abomination-of-desolation power that we now turn our attention.

<sup>21</sup> Gen 27:44; 29:20; Dan 11:20. The idea of *few* fits the context of the Genesis texts very well, but to interpret *ʿechad* as "few" in an apocalyptic prophecy like Dan 11 is highly suspect, as the context of the prophecy is a matter left entirely in the hands of the interpreter.

<sup>22</sup> The KJV translates it in one of these two ways 16 times.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. again Matt 24:15 and our comments on p. 3.

## Papal Rome Enters the Prophecy

Edwin Thiele's introductory remarks to his commentary on Daniel 11:21–45 bear repeating:

*To assist in understanding Daniel 11:21–45 a comparison of the points in Daniel 8 with those in Daniel 11 might be of value. Concerning the identification of the first powers in these two chapters there is no question, because Gabriel expressly mentions Medo-Persia and Grecia as being the powers involved. That being the case, the third great power in each chapter could only be Rome.*

In Daniel 7 the great and terrible beast is imperial Rome and the little horn that springs from it speaking great things against the most High and striking down the saints of the most High is papal Rome. The fact that papal Rome is here set forth as an appendage springing forth from imperial Rome and constituting an integral part of that power shows that God looks upon the second power as being only an outgrowth of the first. This is again revealed in Daniel 8 where *the little horn represents both pagan and papal Rome*. In God's sight both constituted the antichrist which made war on Him and on His people.

In Daniel 7 only a few details are given of the little horn, — it was diverse from the other horns that sprang from the great and terrible beast, it had a mouth that spoke great words against the Most High, it would think to change times and laws, and the saints would be given into his hand for 1260 years. Ultimately it would be destroyed unto the end.

In Daniel 8 more details are given. The little horn waxed great to the host of heaven, it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground and trampled on them, he magnified himself against the Prince of the host, he took away the daily, cast down the place of the sanctuary, cast truth to the ground, practiced and prospered, destroyed the mighty and holy people, caused craft to prosper in his hand, and finally would be broken without hand.

In Daniel 11 many of these details are repeated and many more details are added. *From verse 21 to verse 45 numerous new items are revealed concerning the activities of this power, from the time when it would first stand up to the time of the end, and the ultimate hour when he would come to his end and none would help him.*

Since Gabriel explicitly pointed out that the vision of Daniel 8 was for many days, for the time of the end, “in the last end of the indignation” (Daniel 8:17, 19, 26), the major thrust of this vision can hardly be Antiochus Epiphanes whose activities covered only a few years in the second century before Christ.

The same is true with Daniel 11. Concerning the things there revealed Gabriel had said that they would pertain to what would befall Daniel's people “in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days.” That being true the main content of this vision is for the benefit of the world today.

A comparison of the specific details of Daniel 8 and Daniel 11 reveals the fact that these two chapters are covering the same ground and are dealing with the same powers. The parallels with the little horn are striking. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 136 (emphasis supplied).

Now let's look at Daniel 11:21:

**21 And in his (the Roman emperor's) estate<sup>3653</sup> (his place of leadership) shall stand up a vile person<sup>0959</sup>, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.**

Thiele's commentary on this verse is also worth repeating:

In his estate shall stand up a vile person v 21

Jerusalem Bible. “In his place there will rise a wretch: he will not be given royal honours, but will insinuate himself into them in his own time and gain possession of the kingdom by intrigue.”

Moffatt. “In place of him a despicable creature shall arise, one on whom the royal honour is not conferred but who comes when men are off their guard and gains the kingdom by crafty promises.”

New English Bible. “A contemptible creature will succeed but will not be given recognition as king; yet he will seize the kingdom by dissimulation and intrigue in time of peace.”

In these words a good description is given of a new power that would arise in Rome to take the place of the emperor. *This is the papal power*. The Hebrew term here employed is “basah” which denotes a despicable creature who is to be looked upon with loathing and contempt. Thus it was with *the antichrist* who set himself up in the name of Christ but who is actually the enemy, engaged in his contemptible activities of subversion against the true Christ and His people.

Not given the honour of the kingdom v 21

The picture is of a new power that would differ from the previous power in that it was not originally of a kingly nature but it would attain to royal prerogatives by its activities of craft, guile and dissimulation. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 138 (italics supplied).

While non-Adventist commentators typically identify the “vile person” here as Antiochus Epiphanes, and while most Adventist commentators identify him as Tiberius Caesar, C. Mervyn Maxwell concurs with Thiele in identifying him as the pope and that v. 21 begins a new paragraph in the prophetic narrative:

There being no punctuation or paragraph divisions anywhere in the Hebrew of this chapter, we can assume a major paragraph break between verses 20 and 21.

Augustus founded not only the Roman Empire but also the *position of Roman emperor*. Because of this, the word “augustus” quickly became a synonym for “emperor,” and every emperor was known as an augustus. ...[I]n the fifth and sixth centuries after Christ, the head of the Roman state was succeeded by the head of the Roman Church; that is, the “augustus” was succeeded by the “Holy Father.” The “**contemptible person**,” then, who was to arise in the place of Augustus, was the medieval pope — viewed, like all other leaders in Daniel 11, from the angle only of his hostilities. *God Cares*, 1:283 (all emphasis original).

More recently, another Adventist theologian concurs with this application of the “vile person” of v. 21. In a paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> International Bible Conference,<sup>24</sup> Dr. Carlos Mora concludes:

In light of the study of this second section, we can conclude that Daniel 11 presents the three last universal empires — Persia, Greece, and Rome — including the papal power of history, represented by the ‘vile’ of 11:21, that continues until the end of the prophecy. “Guidelines for the Interpretation of Daniel 10–12: Applications and Implications,” 19.<sup>25</sup>

As with the line of Roman emperors occupying the “estate” of leadership in the Roman Empire, reference to the “vile person” in Daniel 11 is not limited to an individual pope. Instead, we suggest that this term refers to the line of popes who would now occupy the same “estate” in the Empire as did the emperors.

<sup>24</sup> This conference was sponsored by the SDA Biblical Research Institute and was held in Rome, Italy in June 2018. The conference papers are posted at <https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/content/fourth-international-bible-conference-0>.

<sup>25</sup> Dr. Mora divides Dan 11 into “two great sections ... the first 20 verses refer to the pre-Christian era, and the following verses present the Christian era.” He does this by recognizing v. 20 as alluding “indirectly to the birth of Jesus because it points to Caesar Augustus and his census [*sic*] and tax decree” (p. 7). While we differ with Mora’s view of v. 20, we concur with him in placing the entrance of imperial Rome in v. 16 and papal Rome in v. 21.

Now let's seek biblical support for identifying the "vile person" as the papal power. First, the Hebrew word translated "vile person" is *bazah*, a verb meaning *to despise, disdain, or hold in contempt*. Strong's definition:

0959. **bazah**, *baw-zaw'*; a prim. root; to *disesteem*:—despise, disdain, contemn(-ptible), + think to scorn, vile person.

*Bazah* is found 43 times in the Old Testament, and though principally a verb (a few times a predicate adjective), in Daniel 11 it is uniquely employed as a noun, usually translated "vile person" or "contemptible person."<sup>26</sup> But does this unique noun in Daniel's prophecy appropriately depict the medieval pope? We think Malachi provides the answer.

After the Lord initially rebuked the "priests, that despise [*bazah*] my name" (Mal 1:6) and who in essence say, "The table of the LORD *is* contemptible [*bazah*]" (v. 7) by offering blind, lame, and sick sacrificial offerings (v. 8), He completes His rebuke in Malachi 2:7–9:

**7 For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts.**

**8 But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts.**

**9 Therefore have I also made you contemptible<sup>0959</sup> [*bazah*] and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law.**

If the Lord *makes* a person contemptible/vile (*bazah*), then it can truly be said that that person is contemptible/vile in a noun sense. Of course, it would be particularly egregious if the person God makes *bazah* was a "messenger of the LORD of hosts" serving in a priestly capacity.

Merging this noun context of *bazah* with the view that the "vile person" of Daniel 11:21 is the medieval pope, we have a perfect fit. In like manner as the priests of Malachi's day, the medieval pope "departed out of the way" by presumptuously standing before God's people as their intercessory High Priest and causing "many to stumble at the law" by even going so far as to presume to change God's "times and law" (Dan 7:25). It certainly seems, then, that Malachi provides textual support for the view that the "vile person" of Daniel 11:21 is the medieval pope. Indeed, we equate this "vile person" with the "man of sin" of 2 Thessalonians 2:3.

As we have done with vs. 16 and 20, let's now see if the remaining part of v. 21 fits the context of the "vile person" being the medieval pope. By way of doing this, after looking again at the second paragraph of Thiele's quote on p. 12, we ask: What is the common root of the little horn of Daniel 8 that imperial and papal Rome share? Without doubt, it is paganism; and with this thought in mind, let's look at Daniel 11:21 again, now with more parenthetical comments:

**21 And in his estate** (in the Roman emperor's place as leader of pagan Rome) **shall stand up a vile person** (the pope), **to whom they** (the pagans) **shall not give the honour** (shall not openly recognize as a civil king) **of the kingdom** [of pagan Rome]: **but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the** [leadership of the] **kingdom** [of pagan Rome] **by flatteries.**

The emperor of Rome's "estate" the pope stands up in is, in our view, the principal position of leadership in the pagan world. Whereas we have understood the "kingdom" of v. 20 to refer to the political kingdom of the Roman Empire, the Roman Empire, like that of the preceding empires of Greece, Medo-Persia and Babylon, can be characterized as a *pagan* empire; and thus we understand the "kingdom" of these verses to include the sphere of paganism. And thus we understand Daniel 11:21 to describe the time in history when the face of paganism transitioned from that of imperial

<sup>26</sup> Dr. Mora points out that it is only the word "vile" that is the literal translation of *bazah*; the word "person" is assumed by the translators (his fn. 17, p. 8).

Rome to that of papal Rome. This began the Pergamos period of church history described in Revelation 2:12–17.

The Pergamos period of church history may be thought of as beginning about the time the emperor Constantine espoused the cause of the church, in A.D. 313 — or his own professed conversion in 323 — and ending in 538 .... It was during this period of time that the papacy consolidated its position as the religious and political leader of Western Europe ..., and that Satan established his “seat” within the Christian church. The papacy was a skillful blend of paganism with Christianity. This period may well be termed the Age of Popularity. *SDA Bible Commentary*, 7:749.

We believe this period began when the pope, thanks to Constantine, emerged as the religious leader of Western Europe, and it ended when the pope, thanks to Justinian, emerged as the co-political leader of Western Europe. Also, the term “Age of Popularity” can be attributed to the fact that Constantine made orthodox Christianity the “politically correct” religion. This political favoritism then led the church to commit two sins that, according to Revelation 2:14, characterized the Pergamos church: (1) Balaam’s inducement to commit “whoredom with the daughters of Moab” (Num 25:1); and (2) eating meat sacrificed to Moabite gods. In the context of Christian church history, these two sins reflect the embracing of pagan idolatry.

These two sins led to a mixture of paganism with true religion. ...This emperor [*Constantine*] pursued a policy of blending paganism and Christianity at as many points as possible, in a studied attempt to unite the diverse elements within the empire and thus strengthen it. The favorable, even dominant, position he accorded the church made it a prey to the temptations that always accompany prosperity and popularity. Under Constantine and his successors, almost all of whom continued his favorable policy, the church rapidly became a politico-ecclesiastical institution and lost much of its former spirituality. *Ibid.*

If there was a specific event that marked when the papacy “obtain[ed] the kingdom [*of pagan Rome*]” in Daniel 11:21, we suggest it was Constantine’s Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325. This imperial council, the first ever convened by a Roman emperor, simultaneously renounced Arianism and formulated the Nicene Creed, which then became a law of the Empire. But while Constantine designed to use the papal church to advance his own political power, little did he know he was flirting with the power Paul called the “mystery of iniquity” (2 Thess 2:7) which, when this church–state relationship matured to the point of legal marriage, would take the state’s political power to herself.<sup>27</sup>

Perhaps we should ask: When the compromise between paganism and Christianity occurred, were the pagans Christianized? Or were the Christians paganized? Our answer: On the surface the pagans appeared to be Christianized, but because true Christianity cannot compromise and still remain true, in actuality the Christians were paganized; that is, papal Rome was Christian on the surface and pagan at heart.

Most of the Christians at last consented to lower their standard; and a union was formed between Christianity and paganism. Although the worshippers of idols professed to be converted and united with the church, they still clung to their idolatry, only changing the objects of their worship to images of Jesus, and even of Mary and the saints. *The Great Controversy*, 43.

<sup>27</sup> We concur with Thiele that the point of legal marriage between Roman church and state is depicted in v. 23 as “the league.” “The league was between imperial and papal Rome, between the church and the state.” *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 139.

Thus it could be said that “Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror” (GC 50). The pagans were not converted to Christianity, but merely to a type of “Christianized” or “baptized” paganism. “Generally speaking, medieval Christianity was more pagan in form and in spirit than it was Christian” (7BC 751). Thus, with the compromise between paganism and Christianity, not only did the compromising *Christians* look to the bishop of Rome as their leader, the compromising *pagans* looked to him as *their* leader as well. And thus, we view imperial Rome as being merely the first form of what is called pagan Rome, while papal Rome is the second; and thus both forms fulfill what Inspiration terms the “abomination of desolation.”

Given the significance of the transition within the Roman Empire from imperial control to papal control of the empire’s cultic pagan practices, we would expect this development to be noted in the parent vision of Daniel 8; and we believe we see it in Daniel 8:12a (NKJV):

**12 Because of transgression, an army was given over to the horn to oppose the daily sacrifices ....**

In our view, the “army” (“host”; KJV) here refers to “Most of the Christians” in the GC 43 quote above; “given over to the horn” refers to these Christians lowering their standards and joining themselves with the papal phase of Daniel 8’s little horn; and the “transgression” refers to the pagan idolatry that was, and still is, central in the worship practices of the Roman Catholic Church and that opposed and, indeed, replaced *the true worship of God by God’s people* referred to as “the daily” (*hattamid*).<sup>28</sup> Now let’s note the last part of Daniel 11:21 one more time:

**21 ... but he (the pope) shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom [of pagan Rome] by flatteries.**

Like the last part of v. 20,<sup>29</sup> the words “come in peaceably” in v. 21 well describe the unique means by which the popes ascended from within the Roman Empire to depose the emperors as Satan’s leaders of his abomination-of-desolation pagan kingdom. Obviously, the ecclesiastical nature of the papacy precluded the “normal” method of “obtaining the kingdom” — by military conquest. And that this unique influence the papacy enjoyed remains to this day a force in the world to be reckoned with is well illustrated by the following 20<sup>th</sup> century story related by Malachi Martin:

Britain’s Prime Minister Churchill, the story went, was urging on Stalin the importance of that very policy that Litvinov and so many others did in fact take up: As allies, Churchill reportedly argued, the British and Soviets ought to try somehow to co-opt Pope Pius into the war effort. In caustic contempt, Stalin is supposed to have replied, “How many divisions can the Pope supply us?”

As the story continued, after the war Churchill recounted the exchange to Pius XII. Rather than insist upon the obvious — on the fact that, despite his open contempt, Stalin had mustered world pressure in an effort to gain Vatican support — Pius is said to have replied, “Tell my son Joseph that he will meet my divisions in eternity.”

Whether that story is accurate in all or any of its details, it points up a great deal about the power that was later placed in John Paul’s hands when he accepted the papacy. Any world leader who discounts the eternal revelations on which papal power claims to be based flirts with problems. But, at the same time, any world leader who takes the Roman Pontiff as possessing only the spiritual weapons of the unseen world and the afterlife with which to deal in practical, this-worldly matters is making a strategic error of great proportions. *The Keys of This Blood*, 131–132.

<sup>28</sup> That the *daily* in Daniel’s prophecies is the true worship of God by God’s people, see my paper “The Daily” at [www.daniel11prophecy.com/documents](http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/documents). Also cf. Roy Gane, *Who’s Afraid of the Judgment?*, 39; Martin Proebstle (PhD dissertation), *Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9–14*, 206–232.

<sup>29</sup> Which reads: “... he (*the Roman emperor*) shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.”

So how did the popes come to depose the emperors as leaders of the Roman world if it was not by the employment of divisions like those Stalin asked about? Gabriel described it: “by flatteries.” That is, by subtle and crafty deceit: by compromising and melding Christian principles with those of paganism so that Christianity and paganism were no longer at *odds* with one another but were in fact in *harmony* with one another; by *winning* the allegiance of the pagans by giving them precisely what they wanted — idols to worship — and by *retaining* the allegiance of the Christians by making the idols “Christian” ones. The strategy of flattery: incorporate unsound doctrines, superstitious rites, and idolatrous ceremonies into the faith and worship of the church, all the while clothing it in the sanctimonious garb of a pretended Christianity. Teach the people that salvation comes through the “pay off” system of indulgences. Teach them it is the Church, not the Bible, that is the ultimate ecclesiastical authority. Teach them that the pope is virtually God on earth who holds in his mortal hands “the power of the keys” of heaven and hell. Bring the pagan masses to a point of total submission to the papacy through fears stemming from their own ignorance and you have effectively positioned yourself into the place of their supreme authority; and you have thus snatched control of the pagan world from the emperors of Rome by the subtle deceit of “flatteries.”

In our view, the “flatteries” of Daniel 11:21 parallels the “sinister schemes” and “cunning ... deceit” (NKJV) of Daniel 8:23, 25. Now let’s see if the context we have given v. 21 carries to v. 22:

**22 And with the arms of a flood shall they** (God’s covenant people) **be overflowed from before him** (papal Rome), **and shall be broken**<sup>7665</sup>; **yea, also the prince of the covenant** (Christ).

Edwin Thiele comments on this verse:

With the arms of a flood v 22

New English Bible. “He will sweep away all forces of opposition as he advances, and even the Prince of the Covenant will be broken.”

Moffatt. “The opposing forces shall be swept before him and shattered, and so shall God’s high-priest.”

The power that was ultimately to develop into the imposing *papal structure* began with an artful show of innocence in the church of Christ, but in the days when it was first beginning to manifest itself it was already detected as a force of evil. To the leaders of Ephesus Paul said, “of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them” (Acts 20:30). To the Thessalonians he wrote, “the mystery of iniquity doth already work” (2 Thess 2:7). And John wrote that “the spirit of anti-christ” which they had heard should come was even then already in the world (1 John 4:4). From its small, seemingly saintly beginnings this rising force was to grow into an overwhelming flood sweeping everything before it. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 138 (emphasis supplied).

Regarding “the arms of a flood” by which God’s people were “overflowed” and ultimately “broken,” we have, in our view, this account:

What was the origin of the *great apostasy*? How did the church first depart from the simplicity of the gospel? By conforming to the practices of paganism, to facilitate the acceptance of Christianity by the heathen. The apostle Paul declared, even in his day, “The mystery of iniquity doth already work.” 2 Thessalonians 2:7. During the lives of the apostles the church remained comparatively pure. But “*toward the latter end of the second century* most of the churches assumed a new form; the first simplicity disappeared, and insensibly, as the old disciples retired to their graves, their children, along with new converts ... came forward and new-modeled the cause.” — Robert Robinson, *Ecclesiastical Researches*, ch. 6, par. 17, p. 51. *To secure converts*, the exalted standard of the Christian faith was lowered, and as the result “*a pagan flood*, flowing into the church, carried with it *its customs*,

*practices, and idols.*” — Gavazzi, *Lectures*, page 278. *The Great Controversy*, 384–385 (emphasis supplied).

We see the pagan flood beginning as a trickle “toward the latter end of the second century” that turned into an overflowing flood by the fourth. But while God’s church was “overflown” and “broken” by the flood of Daniel 11:22, God provided His church with a place of refuge from this same flood as it continued to flow many centuries later and as prophesied in Revelation 12:15–16:

**15 And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.**

**16 And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.<sup>30</sup>**

In our view, the entrance of papal Rome as the “vile person” of v. 21 brought an overflowing pagan flood in v. 22 that threatened the survival of God’s true church — God’s true church being “the host of heaven” the little horn would “cast down” and trample (Dan 8:10), as well as “the mighty and the holy people” the little horn would “destroy” (Dan 8:24). And so it is in the context of what we understand to be fourth century church history that we now go to the fourth and final objective of this paper.

### The “Breaking” of the Prince of the Covenant

Most Adventist commentators follow the lead of Uriah Smith and, more recently, Dr. William Shea and hold that the “breaking” of the “prince of the covenant” in Daniel 11:22 refers to Christ’s crucifixion. Many are confident enough about this as to regard v. 22 as an “anchor text” around which everything preceding and everything following must relate — *e.g.* after setting forth his reasons for applying the crucifixion of Christ to v. 22,<sup>31</sup> Dr. Shea concludes:

This gives us a *chronological fixed point* from which to interpret the historical flow of the prophecy in Dan 11. Everything that precedes Dan 11:22 must precede the execution of Christ by the Romans, when they broke the prince of the covenant. Furthermore, everything that follows v 22 must correspondingly be fulfilled after the crucifixion of Jesus. *With this fixed point in mind*, we must seek to discover where the prophecy of Dan 11 locates events and activities related to the little horn of Dan 8. *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, 48–49 (emphasis supplied).

Obviously, very much depends on what we identify as an anchor text and we must take great care in identifying a text as such, for if we err here then every subsequent attempt to interpret the surrounding verses will be predicated on a mistake and doomed to failure. In the case of Daniel

<sup>30</sup> Cf. 7BC 812.

<sup>31</sup> Dr. Shea summarizes his reasons: “There are three points of contact between Dan 9:24–27 and Dan 11:22. The word for ‘flood’ is common to both of these passages, but is not found elsewhere in Daniel. The same is true of the word *nagid* (‘prince’). The word for ‘covenant,’ although found elsewhere in Daniel, is found only in these two passages in combination with the word *nagid* for ‘prince.’ In light of the three linguistic links between these two passages, it is evident that they should refer to some of the same events in one way or another.” *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, 48 (DARCOM, Vol. 1, 1982). While holding great respect for Dr. Shea, I beg to differ with this analysis. Regarding the word “flood,” just because this word is common to both passages does not necessarily mean the contexts of the two passages are the same. Actually, the “flood” of Dan 9:26 relates to the destruction of “the city and the sanctuary,” not the crucifixion of Christ; thus, Dan 9 itself places its “flood” in a different context from the crucifixion. Regarding the word *nagid* (“prince”), we will comment on this shortly. And regarding the word “covenant” in connection with *nagid*, this hinges on what we do with *nagid*. While Dr. Shea bases the interpretation of Dan 11:22 principally on its common use of the words *flood*, *prince*, and *covenant* with Dan 9:24–27, we base it principally on the meaning and application of the word *broken* in this verse, coupled with the context and chronological flow of the preceding verses.

11:22 and as Dr. Shea notes, fixing the crucifixion of Christ in v. 22 requires the entrance of the papal phase of Rome to come somewhere after v. 22, and we will look for all events and activities related to papal Rome to come after v. 22. But we have just seen that some Adventist scholars place the entrance of the papal power in v. 21. Of course, this means that either papal Rome does not enter in v. 21 as a minority believe, or v. 22 is not the anchor text Dr. Shea and the majority believe.

It is true that the Hebrew word for “prince” in v. 22 (*nagid*) is the same word found in the phrase “Messiah the Prince” of Daniel 9:25, and Daniel 9:25–27 describes the Messiah’s work in the 70<sup>th</sup> week [of Daniel’s 70-week prophecy] in which He would be “cut off” (v. 26), or crucified. However, we do not believe we need limit references to Christ as the “Prince of the covenant” to the time of His covenant work in Daniel’s 70<sup>th</sup> week. Certainly, papal Rome has always taken a keen interest, always negatively, in God’s holy covenant. This negative interest is seen in Daniel 11:28 where “his heart shall be against the holy covenant” and in v. 30 where Rome has “indignation against the holy covenant” and even conspires with “them that forsake the holy covenant.” This being the case, if we are correct that papal Rome rises to power in v. 21, it would not be surprising if, in this initial rise to power, she in some way attacked God’s holy covenant. And we believe v. 22 describes the result of the papacy’s earliest frontal attack on God’s holy covenant. And thus this verse, even though its historical period is some three centuries into New Testament times, naturally speaks of the *figurative* “breaking” of God’s people — the beneficiaries of God’s covenant — as well as of the Prince of the covenant Himself. Now more of Thiele’s comments on v. 22:

Christ is the Prince of the covenant. In Daniel 9:25–27 He is the Messiah the Prince who was to confirm the covenant and was to be cut off. It was under imperial Rome during the reign of Tiberius Caesar that Christ was crucified, but it was under papal Rome that the opprobrious measures against the Prince of the covenant would be taken. *Outline Studies in Daniel*, 138.

Despite the prevailing Adventist view of considering Daniel 11:22 an anchor text that stamps A.D. 31 and the time of imperial Rome on this verse, as we have already indicated we concur with Thiele, Maxwell, and Mora in placing this verse in the time of papal Rome;<sup>32</sup> a word study of the Hebrew word translated “broken” in v. 22 further explains why. Strong’s definition (underlined emphasis supplied):

7665. **shabar**, *shaw-bar*’; a prim. root; to *burst* (lit. or fig.);—break (down, off, in pieces, up), broken ([hearted]), bring to the birth, crush, destroy, hurt, quench, X quite, tear, view [*by mistake for* 7663].

There is no mention here of “to die” or “to be put to death”; on the contrary, included in this definition is “bring to the birth.”<sup>33</sup> And of the 149 times *shabar* is found in the Old Testament it is not once employed in direct reference to death. In the great preponderance of cases it simply means precisely what the English translation says — *break* or *broken*. Moreover, in Exodus 22:10 *shabar* (translated “be hurt”) is employed *in contrast with* the word “die” in the same verse.<sup>34</sup>

Looking at how *shabar* is used in the prophecies of Daniel, it is used to describe the breaking of a political power at the transition point when a rising new power takes over. These occurrences

<sup>32</sup> Cf. their quotes again on p. 13. We concur with Thiele and Maxwell that the “prince of the covenant” in v. 22 is Christ. Dr. Mora, on the other hand, states that “The ‘prince of the covenant’ (11:22) cannot be Jesus” (his fn. 15, p. 6), and he refers the reader to Doukhan, *Secrets of Daniel*, 145–146 (he probably meant *Daniel: The Vision of the End*, 145–146).

<sup>33</sup> As in the single case of Isa 66:9: “Shall I bring to the birth [*shabar*], and not cause to bring forth? saith the LORD: shall I cause to bring forth, and shut *the womb*? saith thy God.”

<sup>34</sup> Ex 22:10: “If a man deliver unto his neighbour an ass, or an ox, or a sheep, or any beast, to keep; and it die, or be hurt [*shabar*], or driven away, no man seeing *it*.”

are the breaking of the ram's two horns in Daniel 8:7; the breaking of the goat's great horn in 8:8, 22; 11:4; the breaking of the little horn in 8:25; the breaking of imperial Rome at the transition to papal Rome in 11:20;<sup>35</sup> and the breaking of a power by the king of the South in 11:26. Aside from Daniel 11:22, these are the only verses in Daniel in which the word *shabar* is employed, and each case clearly describes the breaking, or bringing to an end, of a *political power*. And in our view, this political context is significantly different from that of the breaking of God's covenant people and the Prince of the covenant Himself in v. 22. This is reinforced by the fact that it is natural to speak of a political power being *broken* when its power comes to an end, but it is *not* natural to speak of a political power being *put to death* when its power comes to an end.

All things considered, in our view, applying the *shabar* of the Prince of the covenant in Daniel 11:22 in the literal sense of Christ's crucifixion cannot be defended exegetically. But in harmony with Strong's definition and other scriptural texts,<sup>36</sup> Thiele and Maxwell apply *shabar* here in the *figurative* sense of Christ being *brokenhearted*. One example of *shabar* being translated in this context is in David's classic prayer of repentance — Psalm 51. In v. 17 of this psalm David employs *shabar* twice:

**17 The sacrifices of God are a broken<sup>7665</sup> spirit: a broken<sup>7665</sup> and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.**

Scripture not only uses the word *shabar* in reference to a humble spirit and heart, but to a heart broken with grief. Jeremiah experienced this in Jeremiah 23:9:

**9 Mine heart within me is broken<sup>7665</sup> because of the [false] prophets ....**

The reason the false prophets broke Jeremiah's heart was because they broke God's people. Jeremiah 14:15–17:

**15 Therefore thus saith the LORD concerning the prophets that prophesy in my name, and I sent them not, yet they say, Sword and famine shall not be in this land; By sword and famine shall those prophets be consumed.**

**16 And the people to whom they prophesy shall be cast out in the streets of Jerusalem because of the famine and the sword; and they shall have none to bury them, them, their wives, nor their sons, nor their daughters: for I will pour their wickedness upon them.**

**17 Therefore thou shalt say this word unto them; Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease: for the virgin daughter of my people is broken<sup>7665</sup> with a great breach<sup>7667</sup>, with a very grievous blow.<sup>37</sup>**

The Hebrew word translated “breach” in v. 17 is *sheber* (7667) which is taken from its primitive root *shabar* (7665). These words are very similar in meaning and appear to be used interchangeably. They are used together again, this time each translated “hurt” in Jeremiah 8:21. Here Jeremiah describes himself as being *shabar* because his people are *sheber*. Jeremiah 8:21–22:

**21 For the hurt<sup>7667</sup> of the daughter of my people am I hurt<sup>7665</sup>, I am black; astonishment hath taken hold on me.**

**22 Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there? why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?**

<sup>35</sup> As noted on p. 11, we read v. 20 this way: “... but within few days he (*the Roman emperor*) shall be destroyed [*shabar*], neither in anger, nor in battle.” We will now point out that the use of *shabar* in v. 20, consistent with its use in Dan 8:7, 8, 22, 25; 11:4, 26, affirms the view that v. 20 describes the transition between imperial and papal Rome.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. Ps 34:18; 51:17; 61:1; 69:20; 147:3; Jer 23:9.

<sup>37</sup> The expression “the virgin daughter” in v. 17 is, according to the *SDA Bible Commentary*, “A poetic personification for Judah, with particular reference to its capital city, Jerusalem.” 4BC 414.

Jeremiah goes on to describe in the next three verses his feelings in his “hurt” as well as the condition of his people in their “hurt.” Jeremiah 9:1–2:

**OH that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!**

**2 Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging place of wayfaring men; that I might leave my people, and go from them! for they *be* all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men.**

Speaking on behalf of his nation in apostasy, Jeremiah also laments in Jeremiah 10:19–22:

**19 Woe is me for my *hurt*<sup>7667</sup>! my wound is grievous: but I said, Truly this *is* a grief, and I must bear it.**

**20 My tabernacle is spoiled, and all my cords are broken: my children are gone forth of me, and they *are* not: *there is* none to stretch forth my tent any more, and to set up my curtains.**

**21 For the pastors are become brutish, and have not sought the LORD: therefore they shall not prosper, and all their flocks shall be scattered.**

**22 Behold, the noise of the bruit is come, and a great commotion out of the north country (*i.e.* ancient Babylon, which typified spiritual Babylon, of which the Church of Rome is the mother church),<sup>38</sup> to make the cities of Judah desolate, *and* a den of dragons.**

Like the experience of Jeremiah and the heart cry of his nation, we can be sure that the heart of Christ was also broken over the condition of Jerusalem and His chosen people. In Ezekiel 6:9 the Lord Himself cries:

**9 ... I am broken<sup>7665</sup> with their whorish heart, which hath departed from me, and with their eyes, which go a whoring after their idols: and they shall lothe themselves for the evils which they have committed in all their abominations.**

Of course, Christ’s heart has been broken by the apostasy of His church in every age. Witness His experience on the original Palm Sunday. Luke 19:41–44:

**41 And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and *wept* over it,**

**42 Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things *which belong* unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.**

**43 For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side,**

**44 And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.**

Inspiration comments on this occasion:

Jesus gazes upon the scene, and the vast multitude hush their shouts, spellbound by the sudden vision of beauty. All eyes turn upon the Saviour, expecting to see in His countenance the admiration they themselves feel. But instead of this they behold a cloud of sorrow. They are surprised and disappointed to see *His eyes fill with tears, and His body rock to and fro like a tree before the tempest, while a wail of anguish bursts from His quivering lips, as if from the depths of a broken heart.* What a sight was this for angels to behold! their loved Commander in an agony of tears! ... In the midst of a scene of rejoicing, where all were paying Him homage, *Israel’s King was in tears; not silent tears of gladness, but tears and groans of insuppressible agony.* The multitude were struck with a sudden gloom. Their acclamations were silenced. Many wept in sympathy with *a grief they could not comprehend.* *The Desire of Ages*, 575 (all emphasis supplied).

<sup>38</sup> That the Church of Rome constitutes the mother church of spiritual Babylon, cf. Rev 17:3–6.

We concur that the Prince of the covenant was *shabar* in A.D. 31, but it wasn't at His crucifixion. It was five days *before* His crucifixion — during His triumphal entry on Palm Sunday. Note what immediately follows the paragraph just quoted:

*The tears of Jesus were not in anticipation of His own suffering.* Just before Him was Gethsemane, where soon the horror of a great darkness would overshadow Him. The sheepgate also was in sight, through which for centuries the beasts for sacrificial offerings had been led. This gate was soon to open for Him, the great Antitype, toward whose sacrifice for the sins of the world all these offerings had pointed. Near by was Calvary, the scene of His approaching agony. Yet *it was not because of these reminders of His cruel death that the Redeemer wept and groaned in anguish of spirit.* His was no selfish sorrow. The thought of His own agony did not intimidate that noble, self-sacrificing soul. *It was the sight of Jerusalem that pierced the heart of Jesus* — Jerusalem that had rejected the Son of God and scorned His love, that refused to be convinced by His mighty miracles, and was about to take His life. *He saw what she was in her guilt of rejecting her Redeemer, and what she might have been had she accepted Him who alone could heal her wound.* He had come to save her; *how could He give her up?* *Ibid.*, 575–576 (emphasis supplied).

“It was the sight of Jerusalem that pierced the heart of Jesus,” just as it was the condition of Jerusalem that broke the heart of Jeremiah.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, commenting again on Jesus' heart cry on Palm Sunday, Inspiration compares it to the heart cry of Jeremiah:

Prophets had wept over the apostasy of Israel and the terrible desolations by which their sins were visited. Jeremiah wished that his eyes were a fountain of tears, that he might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of his people, for the Lord's flock that was carried away captive. Jeremiah 9:1; 13:17. What, then, was *the grief of Him whose prophetic glance took in, not years, but ages!* *The Great Controversy*, 21 (emphasis supplied).

As the hearts of both our Lord and His “weeping prophet” Jeremiah were broken by the apostasy and subsequent judgment of God's people, so should the hearts of God's true people today be broken — *shabar* — as they discern the successful workings of the great enemy of Christ and His church.

In our view, the Hebrew word *shabar* is used in Daniel 11:22 to describe the condition of both the true people of God and the Prince of the covenant Himself at the onset of the Great Apostasy — *i.e.* at the “falling away” and historical manifestation of the “man of sin” Paul speaks of in 2 Thessalonians 2:3–4:

**3 Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day* (the second coming of Christ) *shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed* (manifested), *the son of perdition;***

**4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped (*i.e.* he exalts himself to a position to receive the worship due only to God); so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God (*i.e.* the church of God), *shewing himself that he is God.***

These verses clearly describe the activities of the little horn in Daniel 8:11, 25:

**11 Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince [*sar*] of the host (Christ, the “captain [*sar*] of the host of the Lord” [Josh 5:14]<sup>40</sup>), and by [better, *from*] him (Christ) *the daily sacrifice* (the true worship of God by God's people)<sup>41</sup> was taken away ....**

<sup>39</sup> See again the quote of Jer 14:17 and fn. 37 on p. 20. We will also note that as Jeremiah foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem (v. 16) by the Babylonian army, so Jesus foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army.

<sup>40</sup> Before Whom Joshua immediately “fell on his face to the earth, and did worship.”

<sup>41</sup> See fn. 28 on p. 16.

**25 And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes ....**

All of this depicts no small skirmish in the “great conflict” (Dan 10:1)<sup>42</sup> — the Great Controversy between Christ and Satan — and “what shall befall thy people in the latter days” (Dan 10:14). The effects were huge. With the “standing up” of the little horn against Christ, the Christian world was plunged into the Dark Ages when untold millions were martyred for their faith, and multitudes more succumbed to the deceptive flatteries of the “vile person” man of sin and lost connection with their Prince. Certainly, one way to hurt Christ is to temporally “cast down” (Dan 8:10) and physically persecute His people, but a much more effective way is to cause His “army/host” to be “given over” (Dan 8:12; NKJV) to their eternal ruin.<sup>43</sup> Little wonder, then, that it was prophesied that when the little horn would effectively begin its most insidious work that Christ would be “broken” as a result. All things considered, we read Daniel 11:22 like this:

**22 And with the arms of a [pagan] flood shall they (God’s New Testament covenant people) be overflown from before him (the “vile person” medieval pope), and shall be [heart]broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant (Christ).**

We understand Daniel 11:22 to say that the people of God in general were “overflown” by the “arms of a flood” of false doctrines and idolatrous ceremonies imposed on them by papal Rome (spiritual Babylon).<sup>44</sup> As a result, God’s true and discerning people who were not misled by these deceptions were figuratively *shabar* — *broken*. “That was a time of deep anguish to the faithful followers of Christ” (GC 43). But Christ Himself would also have been heartbroken by this apostasy on the part of His beloved church. And as the papacy set up a false sanctuary and the New Testament false prophets (principally in the form of the “contemptible” [“vile person”]) led God’s church back into the abyss of spiritual darkness, we can be sure that the heart of our Lord was grieved more deeply than we can know.

We believe Daniel 11:22 depicts (1) the beginning of the Great Apostasy of the New Testament church as she repeats the history of the apostasy of the Old Testament church and departs from her holy-covenant relationship with God by accepting the idolatry and practices of paganism (“with the arms of a [pagan] flood shall they be overflown”), and (2) what this apostasy does to the hearts of God’s faithful people — “and [they] shall be broken.” But God’s faithful people were not the only ones grief stricken and heart “broken” by this apostasy. As we might expect and as v. 22 concludes, “yea, also the prince of the covenant.”

## Conclusions

We have come to four conclusions in this paper: (1) that Rome enters the prophecy of Daniel 11 as the “he” in v. 16 “that cometh against him”; (2) that the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in A.D. 70 is depicted by the “exacter” who passes over “in the glory of the kingdom” in v. 20; (3) that the papal phase of Rome enters as the “vile person” in v. 21; and (4) that the breaking of the “prince of the covenant” in v. 22 is *not* in reference to the crucifixion of Christ in A.D. 31. Instead, the breaking of the Prince applies figuratively to the heartbreaking of Christ over the Great Apostasy in Christ’s New Testament church that became fully developed by the fourth century.

<sup>42</sup> CSB, ESV, MKJV, NASB, RSV; “great war” (NET, NIV); “great warfare” (ASV, HNV, WEB).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the quote of Dan 8:12 and our related comments on p. 16.

<sup>44</sup> See again the quote of Jer 10:22 on p. 21.