

# Navigating the Ships of Kittim

## Type and Antitype in the Apocalypses of Balaam and Daniel<sup>1</sup>

By Brendan Valiant<sup>2</sup>  
[withgirdedsword@gmail.com](mailto:withgirdedsword@gmail.com)

### A Voyage of Discovery

A consensus interpretation of the eleventh chapter of Daniel continues to elude Seventh-day Adventism at the present time, though there are hopeful signs on the horizon. At the 2018 Daniel 11 Symposium, the opportunity was provided for expositors to present a variety of historicist viewpoints for this chapter. Follow-up conferences in 2019 began an earnest examination of the passage, considering hermeneutical issues and beginning the process of excising interpretations that were not faithful to the text. These conferences have also provided the opportunity for scholars of this passage to cross-examine one another's hypotheses.

Part of the difficulty in interpreting Daniel 11 is that the chapter becomes increasingly vague as the discourse progresses. There is presently among scholars a coalescing towards a united view up to verse 22. It is after this point that there is a greater diversity of interpretation. While all Adventist expositors arrive at the same point by the beginning of chapter 12, there are many paths to arriving there. Attempts to move backwards from this terminus have brought clarity to sections such as verses 32-39, where an increasing majority sees the actions and character of the Papal power described.

The remaining two sections, verses 23-31 and 40-45 feature periods of conflict between the Kings of North and South. It's no surprise that these conflict pericopes are the last major areas of disagreement within Adventist interpretation over the identity of the King of the South. The identification of the King of the North in the second half of the prophecy as Rome in its Imperial and/or Papal phases continues to increase in dominance, leaving the identification of the King of the South as the major divide. The two main views that have come to prominence as to the identity of the King of the South in the second half of the chapter are the 'Islamic/Crusades view' and the 'Neo-Pagan/Atheism view'. In the interests of full disclosure, I currently work from the hypothesis that the 'Neo-Paganism view' best fits the text, though I am certainly open to modifying or abandoning this view in the light of further evidence.

As a participant at the 2019 Daniel 11 Conference, I had the opportunity to speak with many of the other scholars who have laboured over this passage, including many who hold to the 'Islamic/Crusades view' of the latter King of the South. In many of these discussions I sought to understand the key pillars of this interpretation and invariably the response was that the understanding of fulfillment of the "ships of Kittim" in verse 30 was fundamental to their conclusions. In examining this topic, this paper will build on my contribution from last year's conference and further test the framework introduced there.<sup>3</sup>

In this paper, we are explorers, seeking the tools and equipment necessary to chart a course through the currents of history, avoiding the reefs and shoals of faulty assumptions, and ensuring that we are always driven forward by the winds of historical context while maintaining our course by employing sound hermeneutic principles. This voyage holds great promise for adventure and discovery as it will literally take us off the map as we search for lost lands and mysterious ancient peoples. Along the way we will encounter exotic wildlife like peacocks, elephants and hippopotami. We will traverse the length and breadth of the ancient Mediterranean and immerse ourselves in the culture of ancient textile practices and pottery styles. When the winds of evidence are favourable, it will be smooth sailing. When the available evidence is limited, we might need to get below deck, heave on the oars and create our

---

<sup>1</sup> All Bible quotes are from ESV unless otherwise stated.

<sup>2</sup> With special thanks to reviewers, proof-readers and all-around research assistants, Dr. Michael Younker, Dr. Samuel Núñez, Dr. Cheryl des Jarlais, Guy Whitworth, Kendall Miles, Sami Wilberforce, Sarah Holloway and my dear wife Alina Valiant.

<sup>3</sup> Brendan Valiant, *The Broken Messiah-Prince of the Covenant: Hermeneutic Doorway between Type and Antitype in Prophetic History*, (Unpublished paper presented at the Daniel 11 Symposium in Berrien Springs, 2019). Paper is available at [http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/uploads/1/1/3/7/113721993/brendan\\_valiant\\_daniel\\_11\\_hermeneutics\\_paper\\_2.pdf](http://www.daniel11prophecy.com/uploads/1/1/3/7/113721993/brendan_valiant_daniel_11_hermeneutics_paper_2.pdf). The video presentation can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QRiW5r9yEHM>.

own investigative momentum. At other times, we will need to brave the rough seas and contrary winds of opposing theories before we reach our desired shore. Like any adventure, the rewards will be worth the risks.

### Taking Depth Soundings: Who, what or where is Kittim?

Before we weigh anchor and hoist the sails, it would be prudent to survey the possible options put forward for understanding the word “Kittim”. In the Bible, this word always appears in the plural form as either *Kittiyim* (כִּתִּיִּים) or *Kittiyim* (כִּתִּיִּים). Some Bible dictionaries suggest the meaning of the word to be “Bruisers”<sup>4</sup>. This proposed meaning appears to derive from related Hebrew words *kāṭiyt* (כָּתִיַּת) and *kāṭat* (כָּתַת). This etymology is uncertain, and no other scholars appear to have carried this further.

The word Kittim first appears as part of the Table of Nations in Genesis 10, a son of *Yāwān* (Javan) and a grandson of *Yepet* (Japheth). This genealogical information is repeated in Chronicles. Kittim is next mentioned in a prophecy of Balaam as recorded in the book of Numbers. Finally, Kittim is mentioned in one passage of each of the four major prophets – Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. Outside of the Biblical Canon, Kittim is mentioned in the apocryphal book of Maccabees as well as in several of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the writings of Josephus and in several ostraca inscriptions. We will examine each of these data points on our voyage.

Scholarly discussion about Kittim tends to focus on one of two considerations – geographic or ethnic. That is to say that some scholars focus on where Kittim was as a place, while others focus on who the Kittim were as a people. This paper will explore both sides of this interpretative doubloon, however most expositors favour one or the other approach, looking for the identity of Kittim in either a location or a people group. Attempts at pinpointing a geographic location for Kittim range from a single city to the whole of the Mediterranean. The narrowest identification for Kittim is the city or city-state of Kition in eastern Cyprus. Others extrapolate out to the entirety of Cyprus as being Kittim. Still, others consider Kittim to be a reference to countries and islands of the Aegean and/or the eastern Mediterranean. Some have considered Kittim to refer to the Apennine Peninsular. Still others have appealed to Kittim as being a general reference to the wider Mediterranean. Common to all of these views is the idea that Kittim is a coastal location/locations. Attempts at identifying Kittim as a specific ethnic group have focused on five main peoples – the Hittites, the Phoenicians, the Philistines (or wider “Sea-Peoples”), the Greeks and the Romans.

Some of the above hypotheses are supported by a greater weight of evidence than others. There is also some significant overlap between some views, especially between the toponymic and ethnonymic views. To ensure that our journey takes the most efficient course, there are a few proposals that can be summarily dismissed as being too shallow to allow passage. We will eliminate these below.

#### *Roman/Italian Kittim?*

The identification of Kittim with the Romans or the Apennine Peninsular comes from very late, extra-canonical sources. In the Septuagint of Daniel, often considered more like a paraphrastic targum, the Hebrew Kittim is translated as “Romans”. The *Targum Onkelos* reads “Romans” as explanation of Numbers 24:24. The *Habakkuk Commentary* as well as other fragments among the Dead Sea Scrolls also uses Kittim as epithet for the Romans. By the time the Vulgate was translated in the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D., the Roman view was the dominant view in Christendom.

There is little early corroborating evidence that might be adduced for this identification, though there are some toponyms that have been proposed as cognates. Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the first century B.C. mentions a city in Latium named Cetia.<sup>5</sup> The 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. historian Stephanus of Byzantium mentions another city among the Volsci called Echeta.<sup>6</sup> Aristotle wrote of a river near Cumae called the Cetus.<sup>7</sup> These appeals are at best tenuous and at worst are stretches of the linguistic imagination. The location of these two cities and the river is not known, neither is their etymological origin. The references are all late, and therefore there is no evidence coming to us from within a millennium of the time when Moses penned the first Biblical reference to Kittim. For these reasons, the ‘Roman hypothesis’ as to either the toponymic or ethnonymic identity of Kittim can be dismissed as highly implausible.

<sup>4</sup> Francis Brown. *The Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew And English Lexicon: with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic: Coded with the Numbering System from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, 8.520.

<sup>6</sup> Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica*, 292.7. See also Diodorus Siculus, *Library*, 20.32.1; 23.3.1. Polybius, *Histories*, 1.15.1.

<sup>7</sup> Aristotle, *On Marvellous Things Heard*, 93.

Despite this however, keeping this later usage in mind will be helpful for understanding how the term “Kittim” developed through the late antiquity.

### *Hittite Kittim?*

The ‘Hittite hypothesis’ is almost entirely based on a proposed etymological link between *kittiy* (כִּיִּי) and *ḥittiy* (חִיִּי). This would require a phonetic evolution between the two names, even though both are found in the writings of Moses. It is far more likely that the Hittites come from the Hamitic line through *Hēṭ* (חֵט) and that their name derives from this progenitor. In support of this is the fact that many of the descendants of Canaan in Genesis 10:15-18 are found in later lists of Canaanite inhabitants (eg. Exodus 34:11; Joshua 12:8) where Hittite is a natural substitute for Heth. Though there was a region in Cilicia known as Ketis in Ptolemy’s *Geography* of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D., this reference is long after the decline of the Hittite empire.<sup>8</sup> This alleged connection may be tossed overboard as it is both impossible from a Biblical perspective and devoid of any historical corroboration.

### *Philistine Kittim?*

Another proposed contender for the identification of the Kittim is the Philistines. The primary impetus behind this identification is an attempt at interpreting the fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy in Numbers 24:24 as the settlement of the Philistines within the coastal areas of the southern Levant. The Philistines have been widely connected to the Peleset, known from Egyptian texts to have been a group among the “Sea Peoples”. This ‘Philistine hypothesis’ suffers the same genealogical pitfall as the previous option as like the Hittites, they are also descended from the Hamitic line, with the Philistines said to have descended from two sons of Mizraim – Casluhim (Genesis 10:14) and Caphtorim (Amos 7:9).

There are other significant problems in seeing the Philistine occupation of lower Palestine as part of the fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy. According to conventional chronology, the raiding and subsequent migration of the Philistines as part of the Sea Peoples into the region of the Pentapolis would have occurred between 1200-900 B.C., following the collapse of the Late Bronze Age. The problem with these dates is that according to the Bible, there were Philistines in the Levant from as early as the time of Abraham and Isaac (Genesis 21: 32-34; 26:1-18) and the establishment of the Pentapolis was complete by the time of Moses and Joshua (Exodus 13:17; 23:31; Joshua 13:2-3) in the late fifteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

With this in view, it is possible that the Philistines in Canaan were a satellite of those from Crete (or vice versa). This may be attested by the Minoan and Mycenaean pottery and other fragments found in this part of Canaan. A late migration of Philistines from Crete may have taken place due to displacement at the collapse of the Late Bronze Age, but these migrants would only be joining an already established Philistine settlement. Outside of the attempt to tie the Philistines as part of the Sea Peoples in fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy, there is no credible linguistic evidence to connect the Philistines to the Kittim.<sup>9</sup> This also goes for the other Sea Peoples. There is no explicit cognate link between Kittim and any of the other groups that made up this confederacy.<sup>10</sup> Combined with the genealogical information from the Bible which puts the Philistines as descended from the Hamitic line rather than the Japhetic line of the Kittim, this rules out this identification. With these options concluded to have little weight, it is time to turn to more plausible suggestions.

## **Shore Leave – Exploring Kition and Cyprus**

Perhaps the most well-known and longstanding identification of Kittim is as the city of Kition and possibly by extension the entire island of Cyprus. This theory deserves a more extensive treatment due to its prevalence in Biblical interpretation. The earliest known attribution of this identification comes from a statement by Josephus.

Javan, son of Japhet, also had three sons: of these Halisas gave his name to his subjects the Halisaeans - the modern Aeolians - and Tharsos to the Tharsians; the latter was the ancient name of Cilicia, as is

---

<sup>8</sup> Ptolemy, *Geography*, 5.8.3.

<sup>9</sup> Shea proposed a reading of the Izbet Saqah Ostrakon to read Kittim, but most scholars conclude that this inscription is random, unintelligible text, possibly by someone practicing writing. See "The 'Izbet Şartah Ostrakon," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 28/1 (Spring, 1990): 59-86; Cf. Lawrence J. Mykytiuk, "Is Hophni in the 'Izbet Şartah Ostrakon," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 36/1 (Spring 1998): 69-80.

<sup>10</sup> Ethnonyms associated with the Sea Peoples include Denyen, Ekweš, Lukka, Peleset, Shekelesh, Sherden, Teresh, Tjeker, Weshesh.

proved by the fact that its principle and capital city is called Tarsus, the *Th* having been converted into *T*. Chethimos (Χέθιμος) held the island of Chethima (Χέθιμα) - the modern Cyprus - whence came the name *Chethim* (Χέθιμ) given by the Hebrews to all the islands and to most maritime countries; here I call to witness one of the cities of Cyprus which has succeeded in preserving the old appellation, for even in its Hellenized form Cition (Κίτιον) is not far removed from the name of Chethimos.<sup>11</sup>

In this interpretation, Josephus omits one of the sons of Javan - *Dōdāniym* (Dodanim). Josephus' characteristic treatment of the Table of Nations is to deal with it according to his contemporary understanding, while giving explanations as to the impacts of Hellenization through transliterated names. This he does here. It is peculiar to note that in this treatment, Josephus sees the Hebrew *kittiyim* (כִּיִּיִם) transliterated as Chethim (Χέθιμ) as distinguished from the city Kition (Κίτιον). This shows at the very least some interchangeability between the *kappa* and *chi* sounds as well as the *tau* and *theta* sounds when transliterating.

It must be remembered that Josephus writes one and a half millennia after Moses, and that nations had shifted significantly by this stage. As one scholar writes, "Some of his identifications still hold, while others now seem arbitrary or misguided."<sup>12</sup> Just because Josephus draws a link between a name in the Table of Nations and an ethnic group or place name, does not necessarily mean that that link is correct. Franxman writes,

Cyprus is not the altogether common understanding in Jewish sources of the locale in which Javan's third son settled. Greece or Italy are much more usual. We have seen how Jos. manipulates "Kition" to make his identification, though indeed he may have in mind the more common understanding when making his remark on how "Chethim" is usually understood by speakers of Hebrew.<sup>13</sup>

There is certainly no corroborating evidence that Cyprus was known by Chethima, even by other Jews of this period, by which time some associated it with the Macedonians (see next section) and others with the Romans. Josephus does have one further off-hand mention of the Kiteis (Κιτιέων) but it does little to further prove his identification.<sup>14</sup> Due to the prevalence of Josephus' alleged Kition-Kittim connection we will now look at whether there is any supporting evidence.

Kition is an ancient city that was located on the south-eastern coast of Cyprus where the modern city of Larnaca sits. As to the antiquity of its name, "from the fifth to the third century B.C. the name Kition (or Kitians) appears in the Phoenician form of *Kt* or *Kty* in inscriptions on Cyprus itself and even abroad in inscriptions in Athens, Delos, Demetrias, Rhodes, and Carthage."<sup>15</sup> While these inscriptions clearly attest that the name Kition was in use for the Cypriot city as early as the fifth century B.C., some have claimed earlier references throughout the Mediterranean based on circumstantial evidence.

The earliest alleged references to Kition are from three Ugaritic texts referencing "*Kt*" dating to the late 13<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>16</sup> On face value, it does seem to be the same as the later Phoenician *Kt* to assume a connection, however on closer inspection, there is nothing that connects this *Kt* to the location or even direction of Cyprus. Each of the three tablets with this term simply refer to "sons of *Kt*" (*bn kt*) or in one text the "sons of women of *Kt*" (*bn amht kt*). In the latter instance this occurs in contrast to "sons of Egypt" (*wbn mšrym*), indicating that *Kt* is likely a place.

One text, however, challenges the idea that this *Kt* indicates Kition or Cyprus. One of the tablets contains a list of freemen, "The heading of the second column is 'men from Kition' (*bn kt*), and the list contains 23 names-most of them Hurrian, the rest Canaanite."<sup>17</sup> The fact that none of the names are Cypriot or Greek at a time when the area of

---

<sup>11</sup> Flavius Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, 1.127-8.

<sup>12</sup> Menko Vlaardingerbroek, *Mesopotamia in Greek and Biblical Perceptions: Idiosyncrasies and Distortions*, (PhD Thesis: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2014) 140.

<sup>13</sup> Thomas W. Franxman, *Genesis and the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Flavius Josephus*, (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979) 107.

<sup>14</sup> Flavius Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, 1.283.

<sup>15</sup> Marguerite Yon and William A. P. Childs, "Kition in the Tenth to Fourth Centuries B. C.," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 308 (November, 1997): 9-17.

<sup>16</sup> See Stanislav Segert, "Kition and Kittim," in Dietrich Sörenhagen and Paul Åström (ed.), *Periplus. Festschrift Für Hans-Günter Buchholz Zu Seinem Achtzigsten Geburtstag Am 24. Dezember 1999* (Jonsered: Paul Åström Förlag, 2000): 165-172; also Marguerite Yon, *Kition dans les Textes: Testimonia Littéraires et Épigraphiques et Corpus des Inscriptions (Kition-Bamboula, Vol. 5)* (Paris: ADPF Editions ERC), 2004.

<sup>17</sup> J. Brian Peckham, *Phoenicia: Episodes and Anecdotes from the Ancient Mediterranean*, (Winona Lake, Indiana: Penn State University Press, 2014) 128.

Kition was under Mycenaean control is problematic to the idea that this is speaking of Kition. Hurrian influence in Cyprus and Kition is limited.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the Hurrian names likely indicate that *Kt* in the Ugaritic texts is linked to the Hittite or Hurrian kingdoms to the north or east, rather than Kition to the west. The Hurrian kingdom of Mitanni was annexed by the Assyrian kingdom during the mid-13<sup>th</sup> century. One of the prominent cities of Mitanni was Kahat, known for its temple of the storm god Teshub, known in the Levant by the name Hadad.<sup>19</sup> Much of our knowledge of Hurrian comes from Ugarit, indicating that they shared cultural ties. The sons of *Kt* may have been refugees from the Hurrian city Kahat, which had been conquered by Adad-nirari of Assyria during the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. These refugees could have settled as freemen in the city of Ugarit. Another theory is that *Kt* may be the same as the *Kuti*, also known from the victory texts of Adad-nirari.<sup>20</sup>

Other proposed attestations of an early Kition are as weak as the references to *kt* from Ugarit. Two jar handles have been found inscribed with *kt*, one at Tell el-‘Ajjul and the other at ‘Akko. The link to Kition is exceptionally weak as the pottery has not been shown to have originated there. Colless offers that these instances of *kt* may be related to the Akkadian *kutu*, meaning pot.<sup>21</sup> Another proposed reference is an arrowhead found near Sidon dated to the late 11<sup>th</sup> or early 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C. The arrowhead is inscribed on both sides and the transcription is *ḥṣ kty//mšq ‘bdy*.<sup>22</sup> The translation of *ḥṣ kty* is “arrow of Kty”. The reverse side, *mšq ‘bdy* is translated “cupbearer of Abday”. It is clear that *kty* is a proper name, possibly Kitay, and based on his position as cupbearer, held an important role, possibly in a royal or noble family. Despite the speculation that Kitay means “inhabitant or citizen of Kition” it is solely based on the similarity between *kty* and the later Phoenician name for Kition, separated by six centuries.

A final proposed early witness to Kition comes from the 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Dupont-Sommer believed there was a reference to Kition in the Nora Stone from Sardinia. He translated the lines ‘*ML KTN*’ as “Its mother city is Kition”.<sup>23</sup> Cross, however, believes the stone should read “Milkaton, son of Subna”, with Milkaton as a proper name in place of these letters.<sup>24</sup> All of these supposed supports for an early origin of the name Kition prior to the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. are based on questionable readings and come with absolutely no clear links to Cyprus. The connections appear to be solely based on the interpretations given to the texts absent of any evidentiary support.

There is some possibility that *Kt/Kty* may be derived from a longer name. An inscription from Esarhaddon at Nineveh dated to 673/672 B.C. lists ten kings of Cyprus. Eight of these can be easily associated with known locations, but Kition is not there under its later Phoenician name. Some scholars believe that Kition may be represented by the longer name Qarti-hadast, a Phoenician name meaning “New City”. There is some debate over whether this could be *Kt/Kty/Kition*, but persuasive arguments for connecting the two are put forward by Gjerstad,<sup>25</sup> and Yon.<sup>26</sup> As the name Carthage is a transliteration of Qarti-hadast, it might make sense that the name of the Cypriot Qarti-hadast was changed or shortened to avoid confusion with the later, more prominent “new city” of that name in North Africa.

The area in which Kition was located contains evidence of human habitation dating back to the Neolithic archaeological period. The first archaeologically attested settlement occurs in the Late Bronze Age, though it is likely that a few Early Bronze Age habitations were levelled to build the town. Tombs have been found which may date as early as 1800 B.C.<sup>27</sup> The Late Bronze Age excavations have shown evidence of commerce with Egypt and the Levant,

---

<sup>18</sup> Few inscriptions have been attested of Hurrian names. Only one has been found on a bowl at *Hala Sultan Tekke*. Vassos Karageorghis, *The End of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus*, (Nicosia: Pierides Foundation, 1990) 16-17. Attempts to decipher the Cypro-Minoan have included a proposal linking it to Hurrian, but this has linguistic and methodological problems. Arthur Bernard Knapp and A Marchant, “Cyprus, Cypro-Minoan, and Hurrians,” *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus* (1982) 15–30.

<sup>19</sup> Alberto R. W. Green, *The Storm God in the Ancient Near East*, (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns) 2003.

<sup>20</sup> E. A. Wallis Budge, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria* (London: Kegan Paul, 2005) 4-6.

<sup>21</sup> B. C. Colless, “The Proto-Alphabetic Inscriptions of Canaan,” *Abr-Nahrain* 26 (1991) 18-66.

<sup>22</sup> Robert Deutsch and Michael Heltzer, *Forty New Ancient West Semitic Inscriptions* (Tel Aviv, Israel: Archaeological Center Publication, 1994) 16-18. Deutsch and Heltzer read *mšl ‘bdy* but the *lamed* has been revised more recently to a *qop*, see P. Kyle McCarter Jr., “Pieces of the Puzzle,” *Biblical Archaeological Review* 22/2 (March/April, 1996) 40.

<sup>23</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, “Nouvelle lecture d’une inscription phénicienne archaïque de Nora, en Sardaigne” (*C.I.S.* I, 144) in *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 92 (1948): 12–22. See also, Charles R. Krahmalkov, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2001) 5.

<sup>24</sup> Frank Moore Cross, “An Interpretation of the Nora Stone,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 208 (December, 1972): 13-19. See also Nathan Pilkington, “A Note on Nora and the Nora Stone,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 365 (February 2012):. 45-51.

<sup>25</sup> Einar Gjerstad, “The Phoenician Colonization and Expansion in Cyprus,” *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*, (1979): 233.

<sup>26</sup> Marguerite Yon, “Le Royaume de Kition: Epoque archaïque,” *Studia Phoenicia* 5 (1987) 366-7

<sup>27</sup> Vassos Karageorghis, *Kition: Mycenaean and Phoenician Discoveries in Cyprus*, (London: Book Club Associates, 1976) 24.

but also high Mycenaean influence and presence.<sup>28</sup> Locally made Mycenaean-style pottery speaks to the presence of Achaean Greeks by at least the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>29</sup> Evidence for the arrival of Phoenician settlers does not come until the mid-9<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>30</sup>

At times this city was important enough to be considered one of the autonomous city-states of Cyprus, but at no time is it known to have exerted power over the entire island. If its identification with Qarti-hadast is correct, then it was one of ten city-states during the time of Esarhaddon. That is the extent of its known political influence. At no point does Kition appear as the name for the entirety of Cyprus. However, there are other names that the island appears to have been known by – Kuprios, Alashiya and Iadnana.<sup>31</sup>

Kuprios is a name that features in Linear B texts from Knossos. It is regarded in these texts as either a proper name or as an ethnic adjective (i.e. the Cypriot).<sup>32</sup> It appears that this is the Mycenaean name for the Island. The self-referential name for the Island has been hypothesized to have been Alashiya. Knapp, a strong proponent of this theory states, “The earliest indisputable references to *Alashiya* appear during the PreBA 2 period, in 19<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century BC cuneiform texts from Mari, Alalakh, and Babylonia”.<sup>33</sup> Copper is frequently mentioned in relation to Alashiya, which was a major export of ancient Cyprus. The Amarna letters usually dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> century B.C. feature several that are addressed as coming from or are written about Alashiya. Petrographic and chemical analysis of the clay shows that they originate from Cyprus, either near Kalavassos or Alassa.<sup>34</sup>

It has been credibly proposed that Alashiya was a kingdom that spanned most or all of the entire island of Cyprus during the Bronze Age. At times it was a vassal to other nations, such as the Hittites. Many texts from Ugarit also reference Alashiya.<sup>35</sup> The same petrographic and chemical analyses have been performed on these, giving similar results to the Amarna letters. This casts further doubt that the *kt* found in the Ugaritic tablets refers to the island of Cyprus.

The name Alashiya is very close to the brother of Kittim, *'Eliyšāh* (Elishah - Genesis 10:4). A prominent Alashiya as found in the Amarna letters would have been known to Moses at the time he wrote Genesis. The toponym Alashiya continued all the way through to the Hellenistic period as attested in a recently published ostrakon from the Idalion archives. The publishers of this ostrakon conclude, “the name Alashiya was given to the whole of Cyprus in the Phoenician language, at least at the end of the fourth century BCE and probably earlier.”<sup>36</sup> This means that the designation persisted during the time of Ezekiel, and there is good evidence that it would have included the area of Kition.

Ezekiel mentions Elishah as a source of blue and purple dye (Ezekiel 27:7). The *murex trunculus* shells used for the production of this colour dye have been found in large quantity at Hala Sultan Tekke on Cyprus, further strengthening an identification with this island.<sup>37</sup> Hala Sultan Tekke is an archaeological site in modern day Larnaca, very close to ancient Kition. Thus, at the time of the exile when Kition was an established and attested city, the name Elishah and not Kittim was clearly used by the Hebrews to refer to Cyprus. So, if Cyprus is not to be identified with Kittim but with his brother Elishah, where then does Kittim come in?

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, 26-57.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 51.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, 95. See also Andreas Demetriou, “Phoenicians in Cyprus and their Hellenisation: The Case of Kition,” *Archaeologia Cypria (Κυπριακή Αρχαιολογία) IV* (2001), 136.

<sup>31</sup> Iadnana is a later name it is known by in neo-Assyrian inscriptions.

<sup>32</sup> Arthur Bernard Knapp, *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus: Identity, Insularity, and Connectivity*, (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008) 304.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, 307

<sup>34</sup> Yuval Goren, et al., “The Location of Alashiya: New Evidence from Petrographic Investigation of Alashiyan Tablets from El-Amarna and Ugarit,” *American Journal of Archaeology* 107/2 (April, 2003): 48–75. See also Yuval Goren et. al., *Inscribed in Clay: Provenance Study of the Amarna Tablets and Other Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, (Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology) 2004.

<sup>35</sup> Knapp, *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus*, 318-323.

<sup>36</sup> Maria Giulia Amadasi and José Ángel Zamora, “The Phoenician Name of Cyprus: New Evidence from Early Hellenistic Times,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 63 (Spring, 2018) 89.

<sup>37</sup> David S. Reese, “Shells, ostrich eggshells and other exotic faunal remains from Kition” in Vassos Karageorghis and Martha Demas (ed.) *Excavations at Kition: The Pre-Phoenician Levels, Volume 5.2* (Nicosia, Cyprus: Nicosia Printing Works, 1985): 340–415. See also, David S. Reese, “The EM IIA Shells from Knossos, with Comments on Neolithic to EM III Shell Utilization,” *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 82 (1987); Robert R. Stieglitz, “The Minoan origin of Tyrian purple,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 57 (1994): 46–54.

Returning to Josephus' statement examined at the start of this section, it is apparent that his Cition (Kition) cannot be the primary meaning of Chethimos at all, nor even the entire island of Cyprus. His name for the island, Chethima, is never called that anywhere else prior to Josephus' own usage. Josephus' account also claims that "the name *Chethim* [is] given by the Hebrews to all the islands and to most maritime countries". It is clear that this broader application must be the primary referent in Josephus' mind when he looked at the Biblical Kittim and not Kition or Cyprus. The Kition connection appears to have originated with Josephus or within his smaller circle, as it stands alone in this time period.

Due to the lack of any corroborating evidence connecting Kition and Kittim, it is probable that Josephus' testimony is a case of false friends. "False friends is a term coming from language teaching and referring to pairs of words in two languages that are perceived as similar but have different meanings."<sup>38</sup> Josephus appears to have been drawing a linguistic connection that never existed in earlier times. Josephus might have just as easily drawn a link between Kittim and one of the other city-states of Cyprus – Khytri – though this too was of a much later founding than the writings of Moses. After summarizing the Biblical references to Kittim, Hill concludes that,

in that and in all earlier passages there is nothing specifically equating Kittim with Cyprus, it must be admitted that in some cases at least the earlier Hebrew writers, and not merely the later, may have been vague about the locality, and included in the connotation of the term any land farther westwards. However, the existence in Cyprus of the Phoenician foundation (Kition, Citium) was enough for later writers, from Josephus onwards, who traced a connexion between the city and the Hebrew name.<sup>39</sup>

Subsequent interpreters have perpetuated Josephus' identification uncritically giving the appearance over time of plausibility. Many following the course of Josephus have also been guilty of seeing false friends, seeing references to Kition in obscure combinations of the component consonants in stones, tablets, pottery fragments and arrowheads. Ultimately, the name of the city at its foundation by Mycenaean Greeks is unknown. Moreover, based on archeological evidence, it is unlikely that any proper settlement existed in the time of Moses that could correlate to the Kittim of the Table of Nations. The first clear reference to the name *Kty/Kt* comes late during the time of Phoenician settlement (5<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries B.C.) and it is possible that this name may be an abbreviation of the first part of its earlier attested name, Qarti-hadast. This may have been a necessary evolution to differentiate the Qarti-hadast of Cyprus from the more significant Qarti-hadast in North Africa (Carthage). Leaving Kition and Cyprus behind, it is time to explore a more credible option for Kittim.

### **Open Water - Macedonian Kittim, the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean**

The final credible theory of who or where Kittim is leads us to some surprising discoveries. While we are certainly not venturing into uncharted territories, the charts are very old and faded. We begin our journey with the Biblical story of Kittim in the Table of Nations:

"The sons of Javan: Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim. From these the coastland peoples spread in their lands, each with his own language, by their clans, in their nations." (Gen 10:4-5)

The Javan branch of the Japhetic family tree itself splits into these four nations or people-groups. At the time he wrote the book of Genesis, Moses could say that descendants of these families had settled throughout the coastal and island areas of the Mediterranean. The word for "coastland" is 'iy (יָי). This word is variously translated as isles or coastlands, but this doesn't give the complete picture. Apart from a few instances, this word usually appears in the plural. When used in the singular form, it applies to a specific, narrow coastal location or island, such as the shore of Philistia (Isaiah 10:6), the island of Tyre (Isaiah 23:2, 6) or the island of Caphtor (Jeremiah 47:4). The plural, by contrast, is used to indicate geographically wide coastal regions.

Javan is likely a cognate of Ion (Ἴων), the father of the Ionians and the Greeks. Elishah, as we have seen, almost certainly corresponds to the Cypriot kingdom of Alashiya. In Moses' day, Tarshish likely referred to the city of Tarsus in Cilicia, though it may have later included additional western territories. Dodanim has a textual variant in the parallel list in 1 Chronicles 1:7 where it appears as Rodanim. This group may be the same as the Dardanoi of

---

<sup>38</sup> Marjeta Vrbinc and Alenka Vrbinc, "Friends or Foes? Phraseological False Friends in English and Slovene," *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 39/1 (2014) 71. See also Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees-Miller, *The Handbook of Linguistics* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2008) 698.

<sup>39</sup> George Hill, *A History of Cyprus Vol. 1: To the Conquest by Richard Lion Heart* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1940), 97.

which Troy was the capital, and which later established the Balkan kingdom of Dardania.<sup>40</sup> While some of these identities are less clear than others, they do summarise the inhabitants of several north-eastern Mediterranean coastal locations at the time of Moses.

This brings us to the mystery of the Kittim. With Cyprus known as Alashiya and reasonably associated with Elishah and with no evidence of the name Kition as a Cypriot city or kingdom during the time of Moses, it is necessary to look for other possible cognates for this name. There are several place names of ancient attestation as far back as Mycenaean Linear B script with the consonants/sounds K-T or K-T-Y. In the Aegean there were locations such as the island of Kythira or the mountain range of Kithairon. This latter was important during Mycenaean times as part of the beacon network for transmitting news over long distances.<sup>41</sup>

One hypothesis that may be entertained, if wishing to maintain a Kition link, is that the Kittim could be the Mycenaeans whose artifacts are found at the earliest levels of settlement. The self-referential name for the Mycenaeans is not known as it isn't mentioned in the extant Linear B texts. The most common name used in the Homeric literature is the Achaeans (other names being Danaans, Argives and Hellenes) and this agrees with the Hittite name Ahhiyawa. It is also possible that these are the Ekwesh of the Sea Peoples mentioned in Egyptian sources. The Mycenaeans were also the founders of the city later known as Kition, though there is no evidence it was known as such during Mycenaean times. So, while a Mycenaean Kittim could account for the names of many of the K-T-Y locations, it doesn't have the force of a smoking gun, as there is an absence of evidence the Mycenaeans were known by anything resembling "Kittim".

There is another possible identity and general location for the Kittim which may fit even better. Homer mentions a group known as Keteians (Κήτριοι) as one of the allied peoples of the Mysian prince Eurypylos who aided the Trojans.<sup>42</sup> It is unclear whether Homer was saying that the Mysians themselves were known as Keteians or whether they were separate allies or mercenaries. The word Homer uses for allies is *hetairoi* (ἑταῖροι) and is somewhat ambiguous here though it is a word that is used in later history for the elite cavalry of the Macedonians. Could the Keteians be a people from Macedonia on the opposite side of the Bosphorus to Mysia? Following this lead, there are some indicators that might support such a conclusion.

Xenophon mentions a mountain named Kitios, inland of Macedonia that was known for its hunting game.<sup>43</sup> This can most likely be identified with Mount Chortiatis on the Chalcidice peninsula near modern day Thessaloniki.<sup>44</sup> There is also an ancient town in Macedonia of the same name as the later Cypriot city. The historian Livy, writing about the Third Macedonian War, wrote that Perseus marshalled his troops at a location called Citium.<sup>45</sup> Additionally, an alternative archaic form of the Macedonian ethnonym appears as Μακετία (Maketia).<sup>46</sup> This spelling appears on an epigraph from Smyrna.<sup>47</sup> Commenting on the language of the Macedonians, Nicholas Hammond wrote,

What language did these 'Macedones' speak? The name itself is Greek in root and in ethnic termination. It probably means 'highlanders', and it is comparable to Greek tribal names such as 'Orestai' and 'Oreitai', meaning 'mountain-men'. A reputedly earlier variant, 'Maketai', has the same root, which means 'high', as in the Greek adjective *makednos* or the noun *mekos*.<sup>48</sup>

Both the delta in Μακεδόνες and the tau in Μακέται are dental/alveolar stops. It wouldn't take much phonetic evolution for the unvoiced τ to morph into the voiced δ. López-Ruiz writes that "Experts in pre-Roman languages of

---

<sup>40</sup> Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003) 593.

<sup>41</sup> Titus Tienaa and Emmanuel Stefanakis, "Troy is ours – How on earth could Clytaemnestra know so fast?," in (Joaquín Huerta, Sven Schade & Carlos Granell, eds) *Connecting a Digital Europe through Location and Place: Selected Best Short Papers and Posters of the AGILE 2014 Conference 3-6 June 2014, Castellón, Spain*, (AGILE Digital Editions), 2014.

<sup>42</sup> Homer, *Odyssey*, 11.521.

<sup>43</sup> Xenophon, *On Hunting*, 11.1-4

<sup>44</sup> Christina Marangou and Dimitris Grammenos, "'Monumentality', Functionality, Animality: On an Unusual Prehistoric Clay Head from Central Macedonia, Greece, and Its Implications," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 100 (2005) 28.

<sup>45</sup> Titus Livius, *The History of Rome*, 42.51.2.

<sup>46</sup> Hesychius of Alexandria, *Lexicon*. Edited and translated by Friderico Ritschelio (Ienae: Typis Maukij, 1864) 1007. See also the Latin *Maketiae*.

<sup>47</sup> Georg Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berolini: Apud G. Reimer, 1878) 118. See also Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.28.

<sup>48</sup> Nicholas Geoffrey Lemprière Hammond, *The Macedonian State: The Origins, Institution and History*, (Oxford, UK: Calrendon Press, 1989) 12-13.



this area believe that these languages did not distinguish between voiced and voiceless stops, which would explain the variations between /t/ and /d/ in the Greco-Latin sources.”<sup>49</sup>

Thus, in the earlier form of the ethnic name we find the consonants/sounds K-T-Y. As to the ethnic origins of the Macedonians, they do appear as a branch of the Greek family, but not completely embraced by their kin in the Peloponnese. While they were accepted into the Olympics, there were times that the Macedonians were called “barbarians” by the other Greeks.<sup>50</sup> The foundation myth of the Macedonian nobility traced their lineage to Hercules through the Argives, but this isn’t necessarily true of the general populace. The legends of the founding of the Argead dynasty trace their genealogy through the Dorians who invaded the Peloponnese and defeated their Mycenaean kin. The Argead Macedonian dynasty began after Caranus left the crowded Peloponnese to found a northern kingdom, conquering the people already in that area. According to one account, Caranus conquered a pre-existing city named Edessa, a name of reportedly Phrygian origins.<sup>51</sup> This is significant when one considers that Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, wrote that Caranus led an army into the territory of the already established Macedonians.<sup>52</sup> All this would make sense of why the Greeks would have felt a complicated mix of kinship and aversion with the Macedonians. They were a distantly related people who had been conquered by members of the Heracleidae. It also explains why the Macedonians/Keteians might have sided with the Trojans, as they also shared kinship with these western Anatolians as the Dodanim. The Trojan war then becomes a war involving many of the offspring of Javan.

The earliest archaeological reference to the Kittim come from several ostraca found at Arad in Israel. Various inscriptions referring to the Kittim can be found on Ostraca 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 17, all of which were found at Stratum VII, have been dated to the late 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>53</sup> These inscriptions are thought to deal with the provision of stores to a group of mercenaries based in the Negev who were involved in defending against Edomite incursions during the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>54</sup> There is some debate about the identity of these Kittim with the main hypotheses being that they were Greek or Cypriot in origin.

The ‘Cypriot hypothesis’ for these Kittim relies chiefly on the alleged link between Kition and Kittim which as we have seen has no written record attesting to its validity earlier than Josephus. The only archaeological support that might be claimed for this identification is a small amount of Cypro-Phoenician pottery found at Tel Ira, 10 km southwest of Arad.

A Cypro-Phoenician juglet and Cypriot jug, as well as sherds of other Cypro-Phoenician vessels, appear in Stratum VII (late eighth century); a Cypriot amphora, sherds of coastal and Transjordanian cooking pots and handleless jars—usually attributed to Assyrian influence but common in the Transjordan, where they are known as Ammonite pottery—appear in Stratum VI (latter half of the seventh and early sixth centuries).<sup>55</sup>

The findings in Stratum VII at Tel Ira are too early to agree with Stratum VII at Arad, leaving only a single Cypriot amphora as a possible evidence of the Cypriot-Kittim hypothesis. Cypro-Phoenician juglets have been found at Arad itself, but these belong to Stratum IX (8<sup>th</sup> century B.C.), also too early for the timing of the Kittim presence.<sup>56</sup> Na’aman suggests from a reconstruction of Ostraca 3 that the Kittim may have been garrisoned in the city of Beersheba in the Beersheba valley, even though this ostraca doesn’t mention the Kittim. That the Kittim may have

---

<sup>49</sup> Carolina López-Ruiz, “Tarshish and Tartessos Revisited: Textual Problems and Historical Implications,” in Michael Dietler and Carolina López-Ruiz, *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia: Phoenician, Greek and Indigenous Relations* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009) 263.

<sup>50</sup> Eduard Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenica*, (Halle, 1909) 265.

<sup>51</sup> Phrygian had similarities to Mysian. Strabo stated that Mysian was “in a way, a mixture of the Lydian and Phrygian languages.” Strabo, *Geography*, 12.8.

<sup>52</sup> Eusebius, *Chronicle*, 227. In Andrew Smith (ed.), *Delphi Collected Works of Eusebius (Illustrated)* (Delphi Classics) 2019.

<sup>53</sup> Ze’ev Herzog, et. al., “The Israelite Fortress at Arad,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 254, (Spring, 1984) 4.

<sup>54</sup> Dana M. Pike, “Israelite Inscriptions from the Time of Jeremiah and Lehi”, in John W. Welch, et. al., ed., *Glimpses of Lehi’s Jerusalem*, (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2004): 222-223.

<sup>55</sup> Carly L. Crouch, *The Making of Israel: Cultural Diversity in the Southern Levant and the Formation of Ethnic Identity in Deuteronomy*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014) 68.

<sup>56</sup> Herzog, *Israelite Fortress at Arad*, 16.

been garrisoned nearby can be reasonably concluded from the fact that some of the ostraca involve instructions to send provisions to the Kittim.<sup>57</sup>

While evidence confirming a Cypriot link is either too early or too scarce (the single Cypriot amphora at Tel Ira), there is much more evidence for the Greek mercenary hypothesis. To begin with, there are Greek names among the Ostraca.<sup>58</sup> A coastal site in the Gaza, Meḏad Ḥashavyahu, has turned up a large quantity of pottery in a style known as East Greek including “cooking pots, lamps, kraters, drinking cups and amphorae” and constituting almost half of the discoveries at the site.<sup>59</sup> Fantalkin concludes that this site was a short-lived settlement in the late 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C. that was destroyed in 604 B.C. during Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign against nearby Ashkelon.<sup>60</sup> The timing for the East Greek wares found in this site fits the date of the stratum in which the Arad Ostraca have been found.

The East Greek pottery exposed at the site together with the ostrakon bearing the Phoenician name with the theophoric element of 'Ba'al' (Naveh 1962a:30-31; Lemaire 1977:268-269), and the ostraca bearing Yahwistic names indicate, in Na'aman's view, that the inhabitants of Meḏad Ḥashavyahu were of varied ethnic origins, such as Greek, Phoenician and Judean.<sup>61</sup>

An ethnic mix would fit with the reconstruction of Na'aman for Ostrakon 10 which reads, “[To Elia]shib: And now [give the Kittim]yim 3 bath-jars of wine [befo]re<sup>7</sup> the tu[ri]ng<sup>7</sup> of the day. And 1 (jar) oil [s]eal for the son of Obadiah, offi[cer?] of the Kittiyim.” Na'aman concludes, “Assuming that the restoration is correct, it indicates that a Judahite officer was in charge of the Kittiyim mercenary unit.”<sup>62</sup>

More evidence is found in the Beersheba valley itself. Just south of Arad is the site of Tel Malḥata where additional East Greek pottery has been found.<sup>63</sup> This includes a “Middle Wild Goat II East Greek oinochoe” dated “to the end of the 7th Century B.C.”<sup>64</sup> Due to this abundant evidence of Greek presence in close proximity to Arad dated at the same time as the ostraca mentioning the Kittim, it is little wonder that “Most scholars... still follow Aharoni’s initial hypothesis that the Kittim were Greek mercenaries.”<sup>65</sup>

The preceding evidence has given a strong historical basis for identifying the Kittim with the Macedonians or Greeks in general. However, this link between the Macedonians/Greeks and the Kittim becomes explicit during the intertestamental period. The first verse of the apocryphal book of 1 Maccabees states,

After Alexander son of Philip, the Macedonian, who came from the land of Kittim (Χεττιμ), had defeated King Darius of the Persians and the Medes, he succeeded him as king. (He had previously become king of Greece.)

A similar term is found in chapter 8:5 referring to Perseus as “king of the Kittim” (Κιτιέων). The Macedonians are also the likely identification of the Kittim mentioned in another intertestamental work at Jubilees 24:28. Jewish oral tradition preserved in the Talmud provides yet another witness as there Kittim is identified as Euboea, the second largest island in the Aegean.<sup>66</sup>

The Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran are divided in their application of Kittim. While the *Habakkuk Commentary*, 1QpHab, clearly holds the Kittim to be the Romans, there are other manuscripts that seem to indicate a Hellenistic Kittim. In a peshar on the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, 4Q247, Eshel concludes, “the king of the Kittim should be identified

<sup>57</sup> Nadav Na'aman, “Textual and Historical Notes on the Eliashib Archive from Arad,” *Tel Aviv: Journal of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University* 38, (2011): 83–93.

<sup>58</sup> Yohanan Aharoni, “Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple,” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 31/1 (February, 1968), 11.

<sup>59</sup> Peter James, (2015). “Meḏad Ḥashavyahu Reconsidered: Saite Strategy and Archaic Greek Chronology,” in Timothy P. Harrison, Edward B. Banning, and Stanley Klassen (ed.), *In Walls of the Prince: Egyptian Interactions with Southwest Asia in Antiquity*, (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015) 334.

<sup>60</sup> Alexander Fantalkin. “Meḏad Ḥashavyahu: Its Material Culture and Historical Background,” *Tel Aviv: Journal of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University* 28/1 (2001): 3–166.

<sup>61</sup> Fantalkin, *Ibid*, 8.

<sup>62</sup> Na'aman, *Textual and Historical Notes*, 86.

<sup>63</sup> Moshe Kochavi, *Notes and News, Israel Exploration Journal* 17/4, (1967), 273.

<sup>64</sup> Itzhaq Beit-Arieh and Liora Freud, *Tel Malḥata: A Central City in the Biblical Negev, Volume 1* (Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology 2015) 209.

<sup>65</sup> David Mark Mouritz, *East Greek Pottery and Graeco-Anatolian Mercenaries in the Southern Levant in Iron Age IIC (CA. 600 BCE)*, (PhD Thesis, Melbourne, Australia: University of Melbourne, 2018) 90. For an extended list of proponents of the Greek-Kittim hypothesis, see footnote 478 in Mouritz’ thesis.

<sup>66</sup> Talmud Yerushalmi, *Megillah*, 11.

as one of the hellenistic kings.”<sup>67</sup> The *War Scroll*, 1QM, contains many references to the Kittim, including a curious reference to the “Kittim of Asshur” (1:2). After ruling out earlier reconstructions of a similar “Kittim in Egypt”, Eshel concludes that “the Kittim mentioned in this scroll should be identified as the Seleucids”, one of the divisions of the Macedonian kingdom of Alexander (Daniel 7:6; 8:8; 11:4).<sup>68</sup>

Eshel argues that the reason for the different interpretations of the Kittim among the Dead Sea Scrolls is due to their chronological relationship to Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem, marking the transition from Greek to Roman rule over Palestine. He argues that after this time the Romans became the contextual reference for the Kittim. It is likely that the ‘Roman reading’ in the Septuagint and Targumim dates from after this period as well.

Modern scholars who accept the Roman identity for Kittim have a different reason than the Qumran community. The Qumran community changed their view in light of their apocalyptic expectations after their geopolitical situation changed. Modern scholarship which sees a Roman Kittim does so based on historical critical reasoning which considers Daniel to be a late composition. As such, it views the majority of the prophecy as centered on Antiochus Epiphanes, with the Kittim being the Romans that put a stop to his advance on the Ptolemaic kingdom. The evidence at Qumran shows that this community at least disagreed on this point. Josephus certainly never mentions it in his interpretation.

The shift in the meaning of Kittim from Greek to Roman still needs to make sense in the Jewish ethnographic worldview. What made this shift possible was likely their wider understanding of the Javan branch of the Table of Nations as settling the coastlands of the seas. There is also the history that was propagated at the time of the first century that the Romans were descended from the Greeks.<sup>69</sup>

Outside of the Mosaic literature and the repeated genealogy in Chronicles, Javan and his sons are not mentioned again until the prophets of the late monarchy, with the exception of Tarshish. Dodanim receives no further mention, which would make sense if the Dardanoi from the area around Troy migrated to the Balkans following their defeat. Elishah remained the designation of the Island of Cyprus as has been seen in the reference from Ezekiel. The two brothers that receive the most attention in the later Old Testament writings are Tarshish and Kittim. In fact, they are referenced as separate nations in both Isaiah and Ezekiel.

An examination of Tarshish might help us to better understand his brother. Setting our search for Kittim to the side, let us see if any clues may be forthcoming by a brief examination of the evidences regarding the possible locations for Tarshish. There is considerable debate over the location of Tarshish. Tarshish has frequently been linked to either Tarsus in Cilicia,<sup>70</sup> or a location on the island of Sardinia<sup>71</sup> or Tartessos in the western Mediterranean.<sup>72</sup> Some even claim that it is to be located outside of the Mediterranean altogether,<sup>73</sup> with proposals of locations in Britain, eastern Africa or India. The biggest challenge to identifying the Biblical Tarshish is summed up by Montenegro,

In general, we think that all these studies have a major weakness, which is evident in the fact that, since they rely heavily on the extra-biblical texts, they do not take into account all the information that is provided by the Bible. In particular the fact that the typical merchandise traded with Tarshish consisted not only of metals, especially silver, but other goods, including certain things not associated with the Mediterranean, such as ivory, monkeys and peacocks. Therefore we believe that while it is necessary to look for places associated with the metals in question, those places also have to be in the same area as other products mentioned in some of the biblical texts that relate to Tarshish. Hence all the sources should be treated equally in order to find one place, and the place identified as the site of Tarshish has to be one where all the products to which the biblical texts refer can be easily obtained.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Hanan Eschel, “Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim,” in David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2000) 32.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid*, 37

<sup>69</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Roman Antiquities*. Dionysius is believed to have written this as propaganda to persuade Greeks to accept Roman rule.

<sup>70</sup> Flavius Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, 1.127.

<sup>71</sup> William Foxwell Albright, “New light on the early history of Phoenician colonization”, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 83 (1941). The American Schools of Oriental Research. See also, Cross, *Interpretation of the Nora Stone*.

<sup>72</sup> See Carolina López-Ruiz, *Tarshish and Tartessos Revisited*.

<sup>73</sup> Arcadio del Castillo., “Tarshish in the Esarhaddon Inscription and the Book of Genesis,” *Biblia e Oriente* 46 (2004) 193-206.

<sup>74</sup> Julia Montenegro Valentín, “The Location of Tarshish: Critical Considerations.” *Revue Biblique* 123/2 (2016): 267-268.

Montenegro sums up the questions well, but doesn't arrive at solid answers. The truth is, some of the evidence credibly points to Tarsus while other evidence credibly points to the western Mediterranean. Evidence pointing to Tarsus in Cilicia includes reference to *Tarsisi* in the Esarhaddon inscription, *Tarzi* in earlier Assyrian texts as well as some of the Biblical evidence that indicates a nearer location for Tarshish. Evidence pointing to the western Mediterranean includes the Nora stone from Sardinia and most of the other late Biblical texts. These point to a location to the far west, such as Jonah's desired destination when he wanted to go in the opposite direction to Nineveh (also Isaiah 60:9).

The problem may lie with trying to pinpoint a single location for Tarshish. The later Biblical texts use the plural coastlands for Tarshish, indicating a wider region. Tarshish may therefore refer to both the immediate trading port in Cilicia which fits some of the evidence as well as referring to larger coastal region to the far west. Also, "ships of Tarshish" appears to be a term that evolved to evoke a class of vessel capable of long voyages.<sup>75</sup> Solomon had a fleet of this type of Tarshish-ship operating out of Ezion-Geber, that may have been used to trade with India, a known source of peacocks in the ancient world (1 Kings 9:26; 10:22; 22:4).<sup>76</sup>

This brief examination of Tarshish gives us a glimpse into how Kittim may have come to be understood in a more general sense, as a result of what Kooij calls "the widening of the geographical horizon."<sup>77</sup> In the oracle against Tyre in Isaiah 23, Kittim appears twice in a prophecy that also frequently mentions Tarshish. The first verse states, "Wail, O ships of Tarshish, for Tyre is laid waste, without house or harbor! From the land of [Kittim] it is revealed to them" (verse 1). Most modern translations insert Cyprus for Kittim showing dependence on Josephus and the assumptions regarding Kition, however there is nothing in the text to demand this rendering.

Though this passage refers to "ships of Tarshish" twice, it does so with other independent references to Tarshish, showing that it is connoting a region. The prophet calls on the various Mediterranean nations or regions with whom Tyre traded or held power, to lament over her, which included Tarshish, Kittim and Egypt. Tarshish in this passage is called "Daughter Tarshish" (verse 10). While some translations appear to refer to Tyre "Daughter of Tarshish" this does not make contextual sense.

The second reference to Kittim in this chapter would make sense as a distant place that the Phoenicians might flee to seek safety, rather than a location as close as Cyprus. In verse 12 the inhabitants of Tyre are told "arise, cross over to [Kittim], even there you will have no rest." If Kittim were a location in close proximity, such as Cyprus, it would not parallel with the earlier verse that says "Cross over to Tarshish" (verse 6). In both of these instances, Tyre would look for distant sanctuary, yet safety would not be available. The Phoenicians were known to trade with the Aegean, even having colonies in Crete and other islands of the Dodecanese, so this could easily refer to that region.<sup>78</sup> Pottery imports have been found especially in Tyre and the surrounding regions.<sup>79</sup> Therefore the use of both Tarshish and Kittim in this prophecy appear to indicate the idea that Tyre's downfall would impact the entire Mediterranean economy.

The next appearance of Kittim in Biblical texts is found in Jeremiah. This is only a passing reference in a passage where God is taking up the issue of the constant apostasy and idolatry of the Israelites.

For cross to the coasts of [Kittim] and see, or send to Kedar and examine with care; see if there has been such a thing. Has a nation changed its gods, even though they are no gods? But My people have changed their glory for that which does not profit. (Jeremiah 2:10-11)

Here Israel is being challenged to compare themselves with the fidelity the pagan nations have to their gods. It appears that Kittim and Kedar are used to create a double merism of geographical breadth. Kittim lay in the distant west, but if it is indeed the Aegean Sea and its surrounds, it appears to stand as representative of coastal and island people.

---

<sup>75</sup> G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament: Volume XV*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974) 792.

<sup>76</sup> Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel, Chapters 25-48*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997) 80.

<sup>77</sup> Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*, (Lieden, The Netherlands, Brill, 1998) 46.

<sup>78</sup> Ora Negbi, "Early Phoenician Presence in the Mediterranean Islands: A Reappraisal," *American Journal of Archaeology* 96/4 (1992): 599-615. For a more complete survey of Greek-ANE connections in antiquity, see Edwin M. Yamauchi, "The Greek words of Daniel in Light of Greek Influence in the Near East," in J. Barton Payne (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1970): 170-200.

<sup>79</sup> Claude Doumet-Serhal, et. al. (eds), *Decade. A Decade of Archaeology and History in the Lebanon (1995 – 2004)*. Beirut, 2004.

Meanwhile Kedar appears to represent nomadic people in the eastern desert. Thus this imagery invokes the vast expanse between west and east, encompassing both sea and land, a superlative figure of universality. Commenting on this verse, Eshel writes that “it seems that the name Kittim was used as a general epithet for western nations.”<sup>80</sup>

Ezekiel’s use of Kittim comes in a lament over what seems to be the fulfilment of the warning in Isaiah 23. The prophet describes Tyre as a metaphorical ship, created from materials sourced from surrounding nations.

Now you, son of man, raise a lamentation over Tyre, and say to Tyre, who dwells at the entrances to the sea, merchant of the peoples to many coastlands, thus says the Lord GOD: "O Tyre, you have said, 'I am perfect in beauty.' Your borders are in the heart of the seas; your builders made perfect your beauty. They made all your planks of fir trees from Senir; they took a cedar from Lebanon to make a mast for you. Of oaks of Bashan they made your oars; they made your deck of pines from the coasts of [Kittim], inlaid with ivory. Of fine embroidered linen from Egypt was your sail, serving as your banner; blue and purple from the coasts of Elishah was your awning. (Ezekiel 27:2-7)

In this prophecy, Elishah and Kittim do not appear in parallel to one another, but as two out of a list of many separate locations. The blue and purple dye from Elishah has already been discussed, but Kittim is said to be a source of “pines... inlaid with ivory”. Other translations have cypresses (NET, HCSB, LEB), boxwood (ASV), larch (CJB). These species of trees were found throughout the Mediterranean, so do not provide us with clues as to what was in mind as the location of Kittim. Ivory, however, does give some deeper insight. The Aegean was not a primary *source* of ivory, but there is evidence that the region possessed craftsmen who were skilled in the use of imported ivory.

The use of ivory and related materials for plain inlays has an exceptionally long history in the Aegean persisting with certain refinements for nearly one thousand years. The plain inlays are usually geometrical shapes or adaptations thereof, strips are especially common. The earliest seem to date from MM IA or a little before and so far are known only from north Cretan sites such as Mallia and Gournia. Those from Chrysolakkos are said to be bone and most others from proto-palatial Mallia have been published as bone or shell.<sup>81</sup>

This ivory was imported from various locations in Africa and the Levant and then crafted by Greek craftsmen before being exported throughout the Mediterranean. This evidence fits with the Kittim of Ezekiel being the coasts of the Aegean. Overall, the references in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel show an evolution of the term Kittim to embrace the Aegean, or even perhaps the whole eastern Mediterranean, by the time of the Babylonian exile.

Such an expanded regional view could emerge from the fact that the Kittim were closely affiliated with the main branch of the Javan/Ionian population in the Aegean. It explains why Josephus could say that Kittim was the name “given by the Hebrews to all the islands and to most maritime countries.” Further, it even accounts for how the Romans could come to be considered “Kittim” in the later interpretations after the transition of the Hellenistic to the Roman Empires. Had there not been such an increasingly broad usage of the term, probably as a result of the Hellenisation of the Eastern Mediterranean, it might have been much more difficult for the ‘Roman interpretation’ to gain traction. The weight of evidence clearly suggests that Kittim is anchored to the Macedonians and from there came to stand for a wider region as the Macedonian influence grew.

### Land Sighted - Kittim in the Oracles of Balaam

The first appearance of Kittim outside of the Table of Nations is in the final Balaamic oracle. This passage has been saved until now because of its profound significance for understanding the meaning of Kittim in Daniel 11:30. Though some count four oracles of Balaam in Numbers 23-24, there are in fact seven, each beginning with the similar introductory formula, “and he took up his oracle and said” (*wayyis̄sā mās̄ālōw wayyōmar* – וַיִּשָּׂא מִשְׁלוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר). Regarding these passages as a genre, Herbert summarises,

It is always a Parable expressed in brief pithy sentence, a vivid and striking speech, a rapidly drawn picture. Not only is it verbal: even a person, individual or corporate, e.g. Job or Israel may be a Parable. It has a clearly recognisable purpose: that of quickening an apprehension of the real as

<sup>80</sup> Eshel, *Kittim in the War Scroll*, 29.

<sup>81</sup> O. H. Krzyzkowska, “Ivory in the Aegean Bronze Age: Elephant Tusk or Hippopotamus Ivory?,” *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 83 (1988): 209-234.

distinct from the wished for, or complacently accepted; of compelling the hearer or reader to form a judgment on himself, his situation or his conduct. It is a recognized and accepted rhetorical or literary genre, as witness the use of a *masal* by the contemporaries of Ezekiel. But as used by the prophets, it is especially intended to awaken men to the supreme reality of God's present judgment with the intent that they may be saved. This usage persists in 4 Ezra and Enoch, and comes to its finest expression in the Parables of Jesus.<sup>82</sup>

As *māšāl* these are more than mere prophecies. They have an exhortative quality in the immediate setting, and they are intended to call the reader to continual reflection. There is a progression, not only to the text of these utterances, but to the impact they have on both Balaam and Balak. At the beginning, Balaam calls for elaborate rituals to be performed before each oracle. The first two oracles appear to come as a result of Balaam seeking “omens”, but the latter oracles come more spontaneously as a result of the Spirit of God coming upon Balaam. The remaining utterances come with little to no narrative interlude. For the first three oracles, Balak expresses increased consternation with Balaam who himself expresses increased surprise. Yet after the rapidity of the final four oracles, both men depart without any further debate, as though in contemplative silence.

Allen argues for the inherent linguistic unity of the passage based around the heavy feature of the number seven, saying “there are three times in which the narrator presents three sets of sevens within these chapters... it may be suggested that the number seven in our oracles argues strongly for the unity of the passage”.<sup>83</sup> The sets of sevens refer to the sacrificial rites carried out before the first three oracles: seven bulls and seven rams to be offered on seven altars (Numbers 23:1, 14, 29). Allen points to several internal linguistic features that point to an escalation in the first four oracles. The exordia build from addressing Balak in the third person in the first oracle, to using the second person in the second oracle, to not mentioning Balak in the third and fourth oracles. The exordia in these is identical apart from one additional line in the fourth, “and knows the knowledge of the Most High” (Numbers 24:16). This may indicate that the fourth oracle is the climax of the series.

Driving the entire narrative is Balak’s desire for Balaam to curse the Israelites. The same word for curse (ʿārar – אָרַר) is found throughout the early chapters of Genesis following the fall. The most thematically significant of these occurs in the Abrahamic blessing:

And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonors you I will **curse**, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed. (Genesis 12:2-3)

Discussing the connection, Allen writes, “Of course! This is the point of the Balaam-Balak escapade in a moment. It is a test case for the Abrahamic Covenant in its most elemental and fundamental level. Balaam was called by Balak to put Yahweh to the test, though neither of them knew the nature of the roles in which they found themselves.”<sup>84</sup> When viewed against the backdrop of the Abrahamic blessing, the Balaamic oracles provide a unique glimpse into the loyalty of God to His Covenant when it is challenged by outside forces.

Notice the way the first three oracles play out this theme. In the first – Numbers 23:7-10 – Balaam is unable to curse an Israel that has already been blessed by God. He sees a set apart Israel, “a people dwelling alone, and not counting itself among the nations!”. The words “who can count the dust of Jacob” uses the same imagery God used with Abraham at the first reiteration of the Covenant promise (Genesis 13:16). In a nod to the embracing inclusivity of the Covenant as seen above, Balaam ends this first oracle by voicing a desire to be included in the blessings of Israel, “Let me die the death of the upright, and let my end be like his!”.

The second oracle – Numbers 23:18-24 – builds on the theme of the first but with some major expansions. While the first oracle speaks of the futility of cursing what God has blessed, the second speaks of God as actively fighting *for* Israel. “God brings them out of Egypt and is for them like the horns of the wild ox.” While the first oracle mentioned Israel in contrast to the nations generally, this oracle mentions Egypt specifically in the context of the exodus. This

---

<sup>82</sup> Arthur Sumner Herbert, “The ‘Parable’ (MĀŠĀL) in the Old Testament,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 7/2 (1954) 196.

<sup>83</sup> Ronald Barclay Allen, *The Theology of the Balaam Oracles: A Pagan Diviner and the Word of God*, (PhD Dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1973) 249-250.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid*, 262

oracle ends with the declaration that Israel was a lion/lioness that would consume its enemies. Balak didn't miss the clear implications of this, responding, "Do not curse them at all, and do not bless them at all!" (verse 25)

The third oracle – Numbers 24:3-9 – rises yet higher in intensity and looks further into Israel's future. While the first two were more concerned about Israel's state in the present, this third oracle portrays the future abundance of Israel through natural images of trees and flowing water. An additional echo of the Abrahamic Covenant comes through as reference is made to a "seed". This, together with the reference to a future "king" hints at the Messianic fulfillment. In a nearer sense, it also points to the apex of Israel as a Kingdom under the reigns of David and Solomon.

This oracle repeats much of the previous oracle regarding God's fighting for Israel, bringing them out of Egypt, and also repeats the lion imagery, but again with escalation. This time it adds, "he shall eat up the nations, his adversaries, and shall break their bones in pieces and pierce them through with his arrows" (Numbers 24:8). This oracle includes an allusion to another nation – the Amalekites. Reference is made to the Israelite "king" being "higher than Agag". Agag was the name of the king of the Amalekites in the time of Saul (1 Samuel 15). This reference in Balaam's prophecy cannot be the same as the Agag from King Saul's time unless he lived for hundreds of years! Beegle concluded that "Agag is the traditional name for the king of the Amalekites, and it functions more like a title."<sup>85</sup> The theme of the Amalekites will be taken up again in the fifth oracle. This third oracle ends with a solemn pronouncement of blessing on those who bless Israel and cursing on those who curse her.

The fourth and climactic oracle, and the middle of the heptad – Numbers 24:15-19 – looks yet further into the future in Messianic anticipation. This oracle is the first to be given without any ritual preceding it and follows closely with the previous one. As prologue to this oracle, Balaam tells Balak, "Come, I will let you know what this people will do to your people in the latter days" (Numbers 24:14). This future focus continues with the words, "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near". Balaam's attention is drawn to the then-distant future as he beholds, "a Star shall come out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel". The Abrahamic Covenant is brought into view once more with this regal language. Abraham was promised that his descendants would include kings (Genesis 17:6, 16) and that his descendants would be like the stars in the heavens (Genesis 15:5; 22:17; 26:4). Here the focus is on a specific "Star" among Abraham's offspring. The imagery of the Scepter calls to mind the blessing of Jacob upon Judah (Genesis 49:10) and further narrows the intent. Two major interpretations have been proposed, Davidic and Messianic,

"The star and sceptre are in all likelihood both metonyms for a king or even for a coming messianic figure. Thus, this verse has been variously interpreted as a prophetic reference to King David or to the promised Messiah."<sup>86</sup>

That this oracle looks beyond the Davidic era is clear by what is ascribed to this future King. This future figure would totally crush Moab and Edom and dispossess them of their territory. Though David brought the Moabites into subjection to Israel, he did spare one third of them (2 Samuel 8:2). Though Edom was made a vassal state, they were not dispossessed of the land (2 Samuel 8:14). The ultimate act of this future Ruler would be to "exercise dominion and destroy the survivors of cities!" (Numbers 24:19). This certainly resonates with the prophecies of the Son of Man in Daniel 7. As with many Old Testament Messianic prophecies, the eschaton is not divided out into the two advents, but is seen as a whole unified event. The beginning of the eschaton occurs when the Star marches forth and the Scepter rises, hinting at the first advent, and is complete when full dominion is achieved.

The final three oracles come in rapid progression, expanding on the fate of successive nations. The focus remains in the future as seen from Balaam's day, and carries through to events at the beginning of the eschaton. The fifth oracle – Numbers 24:20 – concerns the fate of Amalek "the first of nations". Amalek was not the first nation in chronological origin, as it grew out of Esau's descendants (Genesis 36:12, 16). Rather it was the first nation to attack Israel after they left Egypt. This oracle ends with the grim warning that "its end is utter destruction." This was ultimately fulfilled in the time of Saul (1 Samuel 15).

---

<sup>85</sup> Dewey M. Beegle, *Moses, the Servant of Yahweh*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972) 325. In this way, "Agag" would be similar to other ancient regal titles such as "Pharaoh" of the Egyptians or "Kandake" of the Ethiopians.

<sup>86</sup> E. R. Wendland, "Two Dumb Donkeys Declare the Word of the Lord: A Literary-Structural Analysis of Numbers 22-24," *Journal for Semitics* 21/2 (2012) 187.

The sixth oracle – Numbers 24:21-22 – focuses on a little-known group called the Kenites. There are various possible groups this could refer to. There were Kenites in the land of Canaan at the time the Covenant was made with Abraham (Genesis 15:19), however the Kenites mentioned here are more likely referring to the branch of the Midianite family that Moses’ father-in-law belonged to (Judges 1:16). This would fit with the theme of Balaam’s oracles, which chiefly concern the extended Hebrew family. The Kenites dwelled with the Hebrews after accepting Moses’ offer to journey with them in their wilderness wanderings (Numbers 10:29-33). Curiously, this is the only group in the Balaamic oracles besides Israel to receive a blessing and not a curse.

The blessing was on the “dwelling place” of the Kenites and was said to be “enduring” or permanent. As they had entwined their destinies with Israel, the Kenites’ dwelling place was not geographic, but social. Because of this social integration, their share in the Assyrian and Babylonian deportations are found in the words, “nevertheless, Kain shall be burned when Asshur takes you away captive.” Greenstone comments on the difference in tone between this oracle and the ones concerning the Moabites, Edomites and Amalekites, saying,

In all the biblical records there is no mention of any hostility against Israel on the part of the Kenites. This brief prophecy is therefore couched not in the vengeful spirit of the prophecies against Moab, Edom and Amalek, but rather in a sympathetic form.<sup>87</sup>

This sympathy must embrace the shared destinies when Asshur comes. This segues into the seventh and final oracle – Numbers 24:23-24 – which begins with the question “Alas, who shall live when God does this?” This must be referring to the same event when Asshur was responsible for taking the Kenites away captive. The question implies that this taking away captive by Asshur is something that needs to be corrected, for it does not promote life. The remainder of the oracle deals with the judgement on Asshur, saying “But ships shall come from Kittim and shall afflict Asshur and Eber; and he too shall come to utter destruction.”

The identity of this Asshur and Eber is a matter over which there is almost as much divided opinion as that of Kittim. Regarding Asshur, one commentator has said “no one is happy about this reference.”<sup>88</sup> Critical scholars have proposed the reference to both Kittim and Asshur as evidence of late composition. Some have argued this refers to the Israelite tribe of Asher.<sup>89</sup> A more recent proposal identifies this fulfillment with the migration of the Sea Peoples. Pitkänen holds that rather than the ancient Assyrians, this could “refer to something else that is unknown... Ashur and Eber then should be close to the coastal regions, where the Sea Peoples settled, particularly in the twelfth century BCE.”<sup>90</sup> Gane is a little more specific on this theory, writing,

Some have identified this threat from the Mediterranean with the influx of “Sea People” during the thirteenth century B.C., but since the invasion stopped at the borders of Egypt, those who hold this view tend to identify Asshur with a north Arabian tribe (see Gen. 25:3 and south Arabian inscriptions) rather than with Assyria.<sup>91</sup>

On the surface, there are several problems with this interpretation. From a big picture perspective, it lacks the gravitas that would be expected as an event leading up to the coming of Messiah. As a potential fulfilment, it is absent from later Scripture. While the destruction of Amalek can clearly be seen in the events at the start of the monarchic period, in contrast there is no in-Scripture fulfilment for an obscure Arabian tribe taking inhabitants of Israel captive, or of this tribe later being destroyed by invaders from the sea.

This interpretation relies on the idea that the Kittim are the Sea Peoples (Philistines and others). We have seen that the Table of Nations holds the Philistines as being of Hamitic descent rather than Japhetic. Now this idea that the Philistines are the Kittim because they have attacked from the direction of Kition also fails, as we have seen that the connection between Kittim and Kition is a late false friendship attested no earlier than Josephus. There is also the

---

<sup>87</sup> Julius H. Greenstone, *The Holy Scriptures: Numbers, With Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948) 272.

<sup>88</sup> Norman Henry Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers*, (London: Nelson, 1967) 301.

<sup>89</sup> W. R. Wifall, “Asshur and Eber, or Asher and Heber? A Commentary on the Last Balaam Oracle, Num. 24: 21-24,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft LXMI* (1970), 110-4.

<sup>90</sup> Pekka Pitkänen, *A Commentary on Numbers: Narrative, Ritual, and Colonialism*, (Philadelphia, PA: Routledge) 2017.

<sup>91</sup> Roy Gane, *The NIV Application Commentary: Leviticus, Numbers*, (Zondervan, 2004), Kindle.



fact that in Scripture, the Philistines were already settled in the area of the Pentapolis before Balaam's prophecy was given!

An examination of the context and the names being used should settle the question. Kittim, Asshur and Eber are three names which only ever appear together in the genealogical Table of Nations (Genesis and Chronicles). Could it be that Asshur in Balaam's prophecy is referring to that major branch of the Semitic tree in the same way as Kittim is on the Japhetic tree. In Balaam's time, neither of these held the dominance they eventually would, and so this prophecy shows the far-reaching providence of God. It's no wonder that both Balaam and Balak appear to walk away from these final prophecies without saying another word!

Whereas the debate concerning this verse will continue, we prefer to take it as a magnificent panorama of history. The ships from Kittim speak of Western powers which will afflict Eastern powers (Assur and Eber). Then the Western powers too will finally be destroyed. If this is the correct interpretation of the verse, then there should be no surprise that it is a debated verse. For this would mean that Balaam was given a glimpse of the scope of history of the nations that is truly remarkable.<sup>92</sup>

The references to Kittim and Asshur create a sort of merismus, embracing west and east. Kittim cannot refer at this time to the city of Kition as it didn't then exist and its name is of much later provenance. The only known group from antiquity that this might embrace were the Keteians who Homer relates as being involved in the battle of Troy, and as we have seen, this is likely the group that later became known as the Macedonians. Asshur's destiny to the east is well known in the history of the Assyrian people.

So what then of Eber? Allen included Eber above as part of the "Eastern powers", however this is not necessarily the case. If we take a step back and look at the progression of these prophecies, we will notice that there is a fourth prominent name from the Table of Nations in this heptad of oracles – Mizraim. In both the second and third oracles, Mizraim is mentioned, translated as Egypt, from whom God had delivered Israel. Leaving out Eber for the moment, Mizraim, Asshur and Kittim provide representatives of each of the Noahic branches of humanity – Ham, Shem and Japheth respectively. All of the other tribal groups mentioned – Moab, Edom, Amalek, Kenites and Israel – belong to the Eberite branch of the Table of Nations! While Eber is technically of the Semitic line, he represents the chosen lineage, which sets Eber apart from the *goyim* (nations) surrounding him.

As Balaam's oracles have built to their climax, a cosmic conflict motif has become more and more explicit. The protection of God over Israel in keeping with His Covenant has become increasingly more apparent, to the point where the Messianic figure is spoken of as intervening personally in setting right the injustices of the nations. Mizraim (Egypt) had been mentioned in previous oracles as a place of Israel's captivity. In the distant future, Asshur and Kittim are used to represent future oppressors up until the time when the Messiah establishes His dominion. The three names represent the global enemies of God's Covenant people.

In between the past and the distant future, local politics would take place. The Amalekites were the first to battle against Israel after they left Egypt. Edom had refused the Israelites safe passage through their land into Canaan. And now the curses that Moab intended to place on Israel are prophesied to be placed back on Moab. Each of these nations face different fates. Amalek is destined for annihilation. Moab and Edom are to become subsumed under Israel's dominion. The Kenites, on the other hand, represent those who had chosen to identify with Israel. The "Eber" of the final oracle embraces the shared fate of the extended Abrahamic bloodlines when the more distant oppressors appear.

The last three oracles represent a chronological unfolding between Balaam's day and the coming of the Messiah. In that time, Eber – the extended Abrahamic family – would fight among themselves, before being caught up in the middle of a greater global conflict. First the neo-Assyrian empire, and then the succeeding neo-Babylonian empire carried away captive all the Eberites mentioned in this prophecy – Edomites, Moabites, Kenites and Israelites. Finally, a Western power would come to conquer this same territory. Though Assyria was displaced by Babylon, which was in turn conquered by the Medo-Persian Empire, a common feature among these eastern dynasties is that they retained the Akkadian royal titulary. Thus at the time the Kittim appeared, Persia stood in the place of Asshur.

The most natural candidate for the fulfillment of the "ships of Kittim" would be Macedonians under Alexander the Great, with specific reference to the conquest of the Achaemenid heirs to the territory and titulary of Assyria. The

---

<sup>92</sup> Allen, *Theology of the Balaam Oracles*, 330.

‘Sea Peoples hypothesis’ doesn’t fit because it requires the existence of a Kition during the period of their invasions/migrations, however the evidence is absent as the name *Kty* is only attested centuries after this period. Also frustrating this hypothesis is the fact that Assyria was not impacted by these marauding pirates, let alone defeated. Such a localized application would not satisfy the wide international scope that these final oracles build towards. Of Kittim, the prophecy ends with the words “he too shall come to destruction”. This finds its fulfillment in the fact that both the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires were extinct within a generation of the time that Jesus was born on this earth. By the time of Messiah, the Macedonian Kittim kingdoms were no more.

Two other names appear in these oracles may have additional cosmic conflict significance – Sheth and Kain. Both of these names appear in parallel bicolos. Sheth appears in the fourth oracle in parallel to Moab, and has been the subject of a lot of debate and speculation. One alternative was to translate  $\text{šēṭ} (\text{נשׁ})$  as “destruction” instead of a proper name, based on a contraction of  $\text{šēṭ} (\text{נשׁ})$ .<sup>93</sup> Another connection has been proposed by Albright to an ancient tribal group called the Sutu mentioned in Egyptian writings from the 20<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.<sup>94</sup> These conclusions are tenuous, however, given the parallel relationship between Edom and Seir in the following verse. Based on this parallelism, it would be natural for Sheth to be a place name in Moabite territory that has been lost to history. This is the most likely primary application. In the sixth oracle, Kain is found in parallel to the Kenites and appears as if it is the name of the progenitor of this branch of the Midianites. Alternatively, it also might be that it is a place name from a location the Kenites originated, also lost to memory.

Both Sheth and Kain are peculiar though for another reason. They are also the names of children of Adam and Eve (Commonly read as Cain and Seth). This has led some critical scholars, notably those who reject the concept of a global flood to conclude that these two men’s names were actually referring to two tribes that endured into Moses’ day.<sup>95</sup> A possible stylistic reason for referencing the obscure Kenites as subjects of the Assyrian deportation is that it allowed this reference to Kain as a juxtaposition to Sheth. Together, these names allude to the Genesis story when Cain and Seth essentially constituted the totality of humanity, and the conflict that would come between these two bloodlines. Seth, like Israel, was a divinely chosen lineage, while Cain and his descendants acted the part of a persecutors. This would create an additional layer of allusion and further bolster the conflict motif in these oracles.

There are two progressions in Balaam’s oracles. First there is a progression towards a thematic climax at the fourth oracle. This might be considered a vertical progression as it leads to the introduction of Messiah as the Deliverer of Israel. The other progression, which expands and enlarges the build-up to Messiah, is a more horizontal progression, eventually embracing all of humanity. This is not surprising in light of the Abrahamic Covenant backdrop of these oracles. The Abrahamic Covenant, together with the reference to the Kenites, speaks to the divinely intended inclusivity of Israel. The Kenites were an example of the Abrahamic blessing extending beyond the genealogy of Israel, grafted into the Covenant family.

Taken as a complete series, these oracles form the tapestry of an Apocalypse. Biblical apocalyptic follows a progression from the time of the prophet to an eschatological terminus. Paulien describe the difference between general and apocalyptic prophecy as, “While general prophecy describes the future in the context of the prophet’s local situation, apocalyptic prophecy portrays a comprehensive historical continuum that is under God’s control and leads in sequence from the prophet’s time to the End.”<sup>96</sup> With this literary designation, Balaam’s oracles would constitute the first Biblical apocalypse, reaching to the beginning of the eschaton with the first advent of Messiah. Heptadic progressions are common to the apocalyptic scenes in Revelation. These oracles even share the stylistic breakdown of four plus three. Macro-chiastic structures have also been identified for the entire Balaam portion of Numbers in line with other pieces of apocalyptic literature.<sup>97</sup> Within this apocalyptic outline, Macedonian Kittim is the final power to be destroyed prior to, or coinciding with, the appearance of the Messiah.

---

<sup>93</sup> Carl Friedrich Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament: The Pentateuch, Volume 3*, Translated by James Martin, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, n.d.) 193.

<sup>94</sup> Albright, “The Oracles of Balaam,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944), 220.

<sup>95</sup> See for example John Day, “Cain and the Kenites” in Gershon Galil, Mark Geller and Alan Millard (ed.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded*, (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2009): 335-346.

<sup>96</sup> Jon Paulien, “The End of Historicism? Reflections on the Adventist Approach to Biblical Apocalyptic,” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14/2 (Fall, 2003), 28.

<sup>97</sup> Junhee Lee, *Who is the True Seer Driven by God: Balak or Balaam? A Text Linguistic and Literary Study of Numbers 22–24*, (PhD Thesis, University of St Michaels), 2019.

## Seeking Safe Harbour – Kittim in Adventist Interpretation

Having plumbed the depths of what can be learned about Kittim in its ethnographical, historical and Biblical context, it is now possible to examine its usage in Daniel 11. We will begin with a survey of Historicist Adventist perspectives on the fulfillment of the “ships of Kittim” within this chapter.

The Millerites and early Adventists held to an essentially historical interpretation of Daniel 11 in general and this verse in particular. There is little exegesis or even theological discussion to be found in this period of Adventist exposition. While they held to largely the same view as to the fulfillment of this verse, there was some noticeable progression of thought. Miller wrote in 1833,

"For the ships of Chittim shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." About A. D. 447 Attila (called the scourge of God) ravaged the Roman empire and as I conceive it fulfilled this prophecy, his army being composed of Huns, from Hungary, which was by the Ancients called the land of Chittim.<sup>98</sup>

It's not precisely certain where Miller gets the idea to identify Kittim with the area of Hungary, but he repeated this at least up to 1842.<sup>99</sup> Litch, in his first exposition of Daniel 11 in 1838, repeated this claim, however he held Miller as his only source for the identification.<sup>100</sup> Three years later in 1841, Litch appeared less certain, writing only that, “The hordes of northern barbarians shall invade his dominions, and conquer the portion he has vacated by removing to Constantinople.”<sup>101</sup> The next year, Litch had departed from his former position to give the following interpretation,

What country is meant by Chittim, expositors are in doubt. The general explanation given, is, that Europe is meant; and some say all the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean are intended. Dr. A. Clarke, on Isa. xxiii. 1, -"From the land of Chittim it is revealed to them," -has the following remarks: 'The news of the destruction of Tyre, by Nebuchadnezzar, is said to be brought to them from Chittim, the islands and coast of the Mediterranean; 'for the Tyrians,' says Jerome, on verse 6, 'when they saw they had no other means of escaping, fled in their ships, and took refuge in CARTHAGE, and in the islands of the Ionian and Ægean seas.' So also, Jochri on the same place."<sup>102</sup>

While still holding the overall theme that the Barbarian invasions of Roman territory and Rome in particular were meant by the Kittim, Litch appears to have discarded Miller's “Hungary” identification of Kittim and looked more at the Mediterranean, settling on Carthage as the location of Kittim. Litch appears to conclude this simply because among the Barbarian tribes, the Vandals held naval dominance and attacked Rome from the sea. After discussing the history of Vandal admirals such as Alaric and Genseric, Litch summarises, “Thus the ships of Carthage or Chittim ruined Rome.”<sup>103</sup>

It is likely that Litch was unable to corroborate Miller's claim regarding an Eastern European Kittim. We did not explore that option in our earlier survey because it is without any evidence whatsoever and it is unknown what provenance there is to that claim. Litch's substitute of Carthage is a matter of convenience. While we have seen a late, wider-Mediterranean sense for Kittim, there is no reasonable grounds for viewing Carthage as a specific location. Even the appeal to Jerome is uncertain.

After the formation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, interpretation appears to rely entirely upon Litch's earlier hypothesis. Smith is especially slavish in his reliance on Litch, contributing little innovation:

---

<sup>98</sup> William Miller, *Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ About the Year A. D. 1843, and of His Personal Reign of 1000 Years*, (Brandon, VT: Vermont Telegraph Office, 1833) 25.

<sup>99</sup> William Miller, *Miller's Works. Volume 2. Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843*, (Boston, MD: JV Himes, 1842) 94.

<sup>100</sup> Josiah Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843 Shown by a Comparison of Prophecy with History, Up to the Present Time, and an Explanantion of Those Prophecies Which are Yet to be Fulfilled*, (Boston, MD: David H. Ela, 1838) 79.

<sup>101</sup> Josiah Litch, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy On the Near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth, As Indicated by the Word of God, the History of the World, and Signs of the Present Times*, (Boston, MD: JV Himes, 1841) 93.

<sup>102</sup> Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions Vol. 2 Or a Connected View of the Testimony of the Prophets Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Time of Its Establishment*, (Boston, MD: JV Himes, 1842) 66.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid*, 76.

The prophetic narrative still has reference to the power which has been the subject of the prophecy from the sixteenth verse; namely, Rome. What were the ships of Chittim that came against this power, and when was this movement made? What country or power is meant by Chittim? Dr. A. Clarke, on Isa.23:1, has this note: "From the land of Chittim it is revealed to them. The news of the destruction of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar is said to be brought to them from Chittim, the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean; for the Tyrians, says Jerome, on verse 6, when they saw they had no other means of escape, fled in their ships, and took refuge in Carthage, and in the islands of the Ionian and Aegean Seas. So also Jochri on the same place." Kitto gives the same locality to Chittim; namely, the coast and islands of the Mediterranean; and the mind is carried by the testimony of Jerome to a definite and celebrated city situated in that land; that is, Carthage.<sup>104</sup>

As can be seen, Smith spends more time focusing on a general Mediterranean view of Kittim. He adds little in the way of additional evidence, citing only Kitto for this. Rather than settle absolutely, Smith softens his language saying only that "the mind is carried by the testimony of Jerome to... Carthage". Covering similar history to Smith, Haskell tells the historical narrative with verse references in the margin, rather than give verse-by-verse commentary.<sup>105</sup> The only specific discussion of Kittim in the context of the Table of Nations in this early Adventist era was by A. T. Jones:

Kittim, or Chittim, the third of the sons of Javan, inhabited the islands of the Grecian archipelago, Cyprus, and even others of the Mediterranean Sea, and Corea at the southeast corner of Asia Minor. Isa. 23:1, 12 shows that Chittim was a resting-place for the ships of Tarshish; Jer. 2:10 and Eze. 27:6 speak of "the isles of Chittim;" and Dan. 11:30 speaks of "the ships of Chittim;" all showing that Chittim was in the isles of the Mediterranean Sea.<sup>106</sup>

Thus we may conclude that the Millerite and early Seventh-day Adventists appear to have held to a literal view of Kittim, seeking a precise geographic location from which to see a fulfillment of Kittim in Daniel's prophecy. Miller's original view of the Huns appears to have been abandoned, not only because it lacked any historical attestation, but because it did not allow for the naval imagery. Remaining tied to the literal Mediterranean, each of these interpreters seemed to view the Vandals as being representative of the Barbarian invasions that became the divided kingdoms of Europe.

The 20<sup>th</sup> century brought a wider diversity of views to this subject. George McCready Price followed the exposition of the earlier Adventists but was more explicit regarding the Vandals as representative of the other Barbarian tribes saying, "Here they are taken probably as symbolic or representative of the entire barbaric invaders of the Imperial City."<sup>107</sup> Louis Were passed over commenting on this verse, but it appears likely that he would have agreed with the earlier expositors as he summarises Daniel 11:16-30 as "Additional features given concerning pagan Rome."<sup>108</sup> Anderson advanced the traditional understanding without adding anything further.<sup>109</sup> The first departure from the historic understanding appears to have been Desmond Ford, who reverted to an Antiochus Epiphanes view of the text. While his views ultimately led him out of Adventism, he appears to be the first to grapple with additional evidence since the time of the early Adventists, such as the use of Kittim for the Romans in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>110</sup>

Maxwell was the first to forge new ground in his exposition of Daniel 11. Maxwell's interpretation is considered an outlier, as he proposed an early introduction of the Papacy into the prophecy as the "contemptible person" as well as

---

<sup>104</sup> Uriah Smith, *Daniel and The Revelation Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel and the Revelation: Being an Exposition, Text by Text, of These Important Portions of the Holy Scriptures* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1897) 280-1.

<sup>105</sup> Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald, 1901) 218-234

<sup>106</sup> Alonzo Trevier Jones, *The Empires of the Bible from the Confusion of Tongues to the Babylonian Captivity*, (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1904) 16.

<sup>107</sup> George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955) Ebook compiled by MaranathaMedia.

<sup>108</sup> Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered*, (Berrien Springs, MI: First Impressions) 1949.

<sup>109</sup> "The ships of Chittim shall come against him." Chittim ("Kittim" RSV) doubtless refers to the strong maritime power which began to develop in North Africa. Genseric, the clever admiral of the never-defeated navy of the Vandals, was for fifty years their hero. He was the terror of Constantinople and Rome. Carthage became a stronghold from whence he ventured forth with his ships to attack what he said were "the dwellings of men with whom God was angry." Twice Genseric destroyed the Roman fleet, once in the harbor of Cartagena, Spain, and another time off the coast of Carthage itself. Rome was eventually taken and sacked in A.D. 455. Roy Allen Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies*, (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1975, 148.

<sup>110</sup> Desmond Ford, *Daniel*, (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1978) 269.

on the timing of the abomination of desolation. In keeping with an earlier introduction of the Papacy, Maxwell understood verses 25-30 to “foreshadow the era of the crusades”.<sup>111</sup> In discussing the Kittim, he wrote,

During the crusades the Muslims hired Greek naval vessels to assist them in opposing the crusaders. Here are the "**ships from Kittim.**" Verse 30. ("From Kittim" signifies "from the west.") Although Roman Christianity ultimately lost the crusades, trade between Europe and the east was greatly stimulated by them; and Italian merchants in Venice and Genoa were especially enriched. Verse 28. Europeans learned to enjoy sugar, cotton, glass mirrors, diapers, and many other products of the east.<sup>112</sup>

Though novel in his introduction of the Papacy prior to the verse that speaks about the death of Christ, Maxwell may have left an impression on later expositors regarding the Crusades, though he doesn't get any more specific on the “ships of Kittim” than his outline above.

Hardy, in one of the first major structural examinations of Daniel 11, briefly touched on the topic of Kittim in a footnote, writing,

Dan 11:30 says, "Ships of the western coastlands will oppose him, and he will lose heart." The powers that opposed western Rome during the early Christian centuries, especially the fifth, were for the most part Germanic tribes that had become Arian Christians— "the Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, the Vandals in Africa, and the Ostrogoths in Italy" (H. M. Gwatkin and J. P. Whitney, eds., *The Cambridge Mediaeval History*, 3 vols. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947], vol. 1: *The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms*, p. 276). Rome was sacked by two of these groups (Visigoths, AD 410; Vandals, A.D. 455) and governed for a number of years by the third. All three may be said to have opposed Rome. But Dan 11:30 speaks particularly of a naval power, which makes it necessary for the historicist exegete to show some way in which Rome was opposed by the Vandals that it was not also opposed by the Visigoths and Ostrogoths. A distinction of this sort is indeed available, and it is of the highest interest. Visigoths, Vandals, and Ostrogoths alike opposed the Roman state, but only the Vandals opposed the Roman church. They mounted a vigorous persecution of Catholic (non-Arian) Christians under Huneric (A.D. 477-84).<sup>113</sup>

Hardy's comments here show a late support of, and interaction with, the traditional Adventist interpretation. While not contributing further to the specific identity of the Kittim, they do provide a reason of differentiation between the Vandals and other Barbarians, showing Hardy was placing significant importance on the literalness of the ships. At the same time, Hardy was advocating for a shift away from literal geography, a possible reason for his lack of interest in discussing the Kittim beyond translating the word as “western coastlands”,

In vv. 29-35 North is still Rome, but South is no longer geographical Egypt. Instead South, which receives very little attention in these verses, is the power that opposes North. Over the course of the prophecy geographical symbolism becomes more abstract and literal geography as such loses its significance. There is a reason for this. As God's people begin to be defined in spiritual rather than spatial terms during the early Christian centuries, the forces that threaten them are also defined in terms not related to geography.<sup>114</sup>

Shea's interpretation takes up the view that this portion of Daniel 11 relates to the Crusades but seeks a more specific application than Maxwell had provided. In attempting to find a fulfillment, Shea engaged in some questionable exegesis,

The first part of verse 30 is commonly translated as the "ships of Chittim" (KJV) going *against* the king of the north. But that is not the preposition used in the original Hebrew text. When the Hebrew wants to say that one army is going *against* another, it uses the preposition 'al. However the text here uses *be* or *beth*, which means "by," "in," "at," "with." Thus the ships of the Chittim, or western

---

<sup>111</sup> Emphasis original. C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares: The Message of Daniel For You and Your Family*, (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1981) 283.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 284

<sup>113</sup> Frank Wilton Hardy, *An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11*, (MA Thesis, Andrews University, 1983) 217

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 217-218

coastlands, did not come *against* the king of the north; they came "with" him; they were *his* ships. This is precisely the way the final Crusade attempted to invade Egypt. This Crusade was led by the devout French king Louis IX. He wintered at the end of 1248 on the island of Cyprus, but in the spring of 1249 he set sail for Egypt, invading it by the Damietta branch of the Nile. The major battle of the campaign was fought at Mansourah in the delta of Egypt in February of 1250. It was a major defeat for the crusader forces, and they had to retreat to Damietta where they surrendered to the Egyptians in April. Louis IX himself was taken prisoner and held for ransom. When he finally did leave Egypt, only 1,400 troops were left to go with him. He traveled first to Palestine, but eventually returned to France where he still devoutly supported the papacy in spite of his defeat (Daniel 11:30b).<sup>115</sup>

Doukhan has recently criticized Shea's exegesis here, saying he was "mistaken" in his proposal regarding the preposition *be*.<sup>116</sup> Shea's reading here is without support from any translations or commentaries and appears to be without merit. An apparently similar view regarding the origin of the ships of Kittim appears in Hayden's interpretation. Hayden holds a novel view of this passage that reverses much of who the pronouns are taken to refer to as a result of the ships of Kittim being on the side of the King of the North. Hayden's sole comment on the identity of Kittim comes from the Strong's concordance.<sup>117</sup> The same year, Swearingen defended the traditional Adventist viewpoint,

As a symbol of foreign oppression, the phrase "ships of Chittim" can symbolize "invaders and destroyers from any quarter," and, as we apply this phrase to Rome in the context of Daniel 11:30, it offers a perfect description of the "the barbarian hordes" that "invaded and broke up the western Roman Empire." History will clearly demonstrate that four tribal groups, the Visigoths, the Huns, the Vandals, and the Heruli, each made significant contributions to the final collapse of the political infrastructure of western Rome.<sup>118</sup>

Swearingen once again places significant emphasis in his treatment on the Vandals as important to fulfilling the naval requirement of "ships". Stefanovic provides a brief discussion of various understandings of Kittim without being committal as to an ultimate meaning,

"The western coastlands." The original text uses the name kittim, which may be a reference to the island of Cyprus. In Jeremiah 2:10, this place name is applied to "the westerners," or the people who lived throughout the Mediterranean basin. Josephus says that the Hebrew term kittim is used for all islands and maritime countries. At Qumran, this term is consistently applied to the Romans... Kittim is a term that was originally tied with the island of Cyprus but that later was applied in a much broader way to all the people who live in the Mediterranean basin, also referred to as "westerners" (Jer. 2:10).<sup>119</sup>

Stefanovic favours the interpretation of Shea and Maxwell without any innovation as to the precise fulfillment of the ships of Kittim.<sup>120</sup> A true innovation to the Crusade interpretation came with Tim Roosenberg's *Islam & Christianity in Prophecy*. Roosenberg takes Kittim to be Cyprus without additional comment on the identification, apparently depending on the NKJV. The verse is seen to be fulfilled in the naval battle at Lepanto in 1571,

Pope Pius V best represents the actions depicted here. During his time as pope, the Ottoman Turks had control of the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. Pius brought together the Holy League of 1571. The Fleet of the Holy League sailed towards Cyprus with the intent of fighting the Ottoman army there and driving it off the island. However, the fleet of the Holy League never got there!

---

<sup>115</sup> Italics original. William H. Shea, *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*, (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005) 257-258.

<sup>116</sup> Jacques Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded: An Exegetical, Historical, and Theological Study*, (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2019) 170.

<sup>117</sup> Timothy John Hayden, *The Vision by the Tigris: Daniel's Greatest Prophecy Unsealed*, (Ringgold, GA: Teach Services, 2006) 103.

<sup>118</sup> Marc Alden Swearingen, *Tidings Out of the Northeast: A General Historical Survey of Daniel 11*, (Coldwater, MI: Remnant Publications) 2006.

<sup>119</sup> Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel, Wisdom to the Wise: Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007) 407-408.

<sup>120</sup> "The expression the "ships of the western coastlands" (v. 30) stands for the Greek naval vessels that the Muslims hired to oppose the crusaders. Although the crusaders lost in the end, they returned home enriched, carrying sugar, cotton, glass mirrors, and other goods from the east (v. 28)." *Ibid*, 419.

The Ottoman fleet, which had embarked from Istanbul, took positions off the coast of Cyprus, where it landed an invasion force of at least 30,000 men and ultimately captured the entire island. Meanwhile, the Ottoman fleet sailed on to its western outpost at Lapanto (sic) and blocked the fleet of the Holy League. The Ottoman fleet was destroyed, but the Christians were unable to take advantage of this victory. The sacrifice of the Ottoman fleet stopped the fleet of the Holy League from going on to Cyprus, and the Ottomans held on to their prize.<sup>121</sup>

Roosenberg's position considers this fulfillment a solid historical anchor for his position. Gane, who follows Roosenberg's basic outline, wrote a paper in 2015 called *Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3*. While the title gives the appearance that it would simply outline a framework for working through the chapter, Gane presents his own interpretation throughout. Regarding verse 30, he writes,

There is a transition in v. 30 from military conflict with an outside power, the king of the south, to religious activities within the king's own northern domain, i.e., Christendom: "For ships of Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be afraid and withdraw, and shall turn back and be enraged and take action against the holy covenant. He shall turn back and pay attention to those who forsake the holy covenant." Here the church of Rome loses to the king of the south and gives up, a scenario that was fulfilled when the Crusaders ultimately failed to maintain control of the "Holy Land."<sup>122</sup>

As to the specific understanding of the ships of Kittim, Gane is noncommittal, saying that,

In this context, "ships of Kittim" in v. 30 are literal seagoing vessels. The fact that "Kittim" is an archaic reference to a place that was called "Kittim" in biblical times (probably Cyprus) does not make it symbolic for something other than a real geographical location.<sup>123</sup>

At the time of this article, Gane doesn't appear to grasp the importance that Roosenberg felt was invested in this term. In a paper presented at the Daniel 11 Conference in 2018, Roosenberg listed it as one of "the primary hermeneutical issues and areas of needed study".<sup>124</sup>

X. The research of Michael and Randy Younker indicate that the usage of the terms in Daniel's day meant only Cyprus and it was not until the Essenes and Josephus that the term was viewed symbolically. If taken literally, the ships from Cyprus match the Muslim ships that come from Cyprus and stop the Papal "Holy League" fleet from reaching Cyprus and Israel in the battle of Lepanto in 1571. This fits with the Islam as the KOS viewpoint.<sup>125</sup>

In personal conversations at the 2019 conference, when I asked what the key sticking point would be in disproving the "KoS=Islam" hypothesis, this was identified by Roosenberg, Gane and Michael Younker as one of, if not *the* key text supporting their exposition of 11:23-30. Younker considers the words "Kittim ships" to be "critical to an understanding of this verse,"<sup>126</sup> and counts it as one of the "four primary assumptions" on which his entire interpretation rests.<sup>127</sup> Younker's paper constitutes the strongest defence of this position from an exegetical and historical perspective, so it is worth considering some of the claims in light of our study thus far.

In discussing alternate views of Kittim, Younker claims that "a broader symbolic representation of Kittim has been favored lately by historical critics and others unconsciously following them".<sup>128</sup> He claims further that "Kittim refers to Cyprus, and not some vague 'western coastlands' location, as some commentators have recently claimed, based off of a long history of erroneous assumptions."<sup>129</sup> As we have seen in our survey, a wider interpretation of "western coastlands" is by no means recent. This has been an Adventist position at least since Litch. Moreover, Younker's

---

<sup>121</sup> Tim Roosenberg, *Islam & Christianity in Prophecy, Revised*, (Emmet, ID: Islam and Christianity in Prophecy Seminars) 2016.

<sup>122</sup> Roy E. Gane, "Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, 27/1-2 (2016), 321.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid*, 327. In a footnote, Gane further theorises that, "The expression "ships of Kittim" may refer to a kind of ship that is capable of a long voyage at sea, rather than ships that necessarily originate from Kittim."

<sup>124</sup> Tim Roosenberg, *Abstract-Daniel 11:2 to 12:3 Hermeneutical Issues and Path to Consensus* (Unpublished paper presented at the Daniel 12 Symposium in Berrien Springs, 2018), 1.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid*, 3-4

<sup>126</sup> Michael F. Younker, *A Literal-Historicist Proposal and Commentary*, (Unpublished Paper, Version 2.96: September 2, 2020) 75.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid*, 108

<sup>128</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*, 77

attempts to discredit a wider view of Kittim as being based on historical criticism neglect to mention that other historical critics favour the view he holds. The Cypriot identification of Kittim itself rests on higher critical underpinnings. The earliest attestation to the name Kition through the Phoenician *Kty* or *Kt* come from the fifth century B.C. As there is no earlier attestation to this name nor any link drawn between Kition and Kittim before Josephus, holding to this view requires one to ignore the earlier evidence from the Torah. The most common way this manifests is in denial of the historicity of the writings of Moses. It is no wonder that the Kition/Cyprus view is popular among proponents of the faulty Documentary Hypothesis for the Pentateuch which considers the writings of Moses to be compiled from several sources much later than the time period they claim to portray.

As a case in point, Younker quotes Robertson saying, “Kition probably never changed its name in antiquity and it was always known as such.”<sup>130</sup> Robertson can only say this, though, because he subscribes to the documentary hypothesis. He writes in the same paragraph,

In some Biblical texts the people of Kition, the Kittim, passed for being the Cypriotes, which incidentally indicates that the Kittim were the best known of the people from the island. The Biblical texts, however, are not very ancient. The Table of Nations of Genesis 10 in which the Kittim are listed belongs to the Priestly tradition and could not have been incorporated into the Biblical text before the fifth century, although the world picture presented by the text may fit the historical circumstances of the seventh century.<sup>131</sup>

Clearly Robertson does not believe in a fifteenth century B.C. Kittim in line with the time Moses wrote Genesis. In fact, Robertson doesn’t even believe Genesis was compiled until approximately 1000 years after the time Moses lived. So when he says that “Kition probably never changed its name in antiquity”, he is only speaking of the seventh century B.C. onwards. In this, Robertson appears to be acknowledging that the earliest references to the Cypriot city as Kition are from the fifth century B.C., but allows for this name to be in existence from the seventh century B.C.

Younker claims that “recent scholarship indicates that there may be some movement toward restoring the original meaning of Kittim as exclusively Cyprus” and that “Adventists have almost universally been unaware of the history behind this and its recent developments.”<sup>132</sup> This may be true in the sense of explicit knowledge, however the majority of modern Bible versions do use Cyprus in many of the instances where Kittim appears. This includes translations popular among Adventists such as NKJV. Cyprus has also been referenced as a possible identity for Kittim in the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* which is widely used within the denomination.<sup>133</sup> With the widespread circulation of the Bible Commentary series, the evidence used to support a Cyprus view has been available for many Adventist Bible students for some time.

Younker attempts to attribute some of the blame for the ‘broader understanding’ of Kittim on Josephus. Yet in this, Younker wants to have his cake and eat it too. He claims that those who hold the “western coastlands” view do so “as an overextended misapplication of the ancient historian Josephus’s understanding of the term.”<sup>134</sup> Younker rejects as irrelevant Josephus’ claim that “all islands, and the greatest part of the sea-coasts, are named Cethim by the Hebrews”, claiming that “[p]erhaps he added the phrase ‘all Islands’ to conceal the Jewish speculations concerning his current master Rome’s role in the prophecies of his people.”<sup>135</sup> While certainly an intriguing idea, there is no evidence to support this conjecture.

When it comes to Josephus’ claim that Kittim is to be identified with Kition, Younker accepts this without question, stating emphatically, “All extant archaeological evidence indicates that ‘Kition’ refers to Cyprus or the city by that name on Cyprus, and never some vague ‘western Mediterranean islands or coastlands.’”<sup>136</sup> Younker has pulled a clever bait-and-switch here. No one disputes that *Kition* was a name of the Cypriot city under discussion. No one has ever claimed that *Kition* had an extended meaning of “western Mediterranean islands or coastlands”. The correct question to ask is whether *Kittim* means these things. For all Younker’s discussion of the matter, the fact is that there

---

<sup>130</sup> Noel Robertson, *The Archaeology of Cyprus: Recent Developments* (Noyes Press, 1975), 126; in *loc. Cit.*

<sup>131</sup> Robertson, *loc cit.*

<sup>132</sup> Younker, *op. cit.*, 108.

<sup>133</sup> See references on Genesis 10:4, Numbers 24:24, Isaiah 23:1,12, Ezekiel 27:6 and Daniel 11:30. Francis D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary Series: 7 Volumes* (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1955).

<sup>134</sup> Younker, *op. cit.*, 108

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid*, 78.

<sup>136</sup> *Loc cit.*



is no archaeological evidence whatsoever to connect *Kittim* with Kition or Cyprus. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the city of Kition had yet been founded at the time when Moses wrote Genesis and Numbers, or even that the early name of the city was Kition. The earliest extant archaeological attestation to this name is from the Phoenician period, about 800 years after the time of Moses!

Yunker fails to ever actually establish the supposed Kittim-Kition connection. He merely states it as a fact in his commentary on Numbers 24:24,

There it is prophesied that *tzim* will come from *Kittim* (!) to afflict Asshur and Eber, before likewise being destroyed. This is precisely what happened when the “Sea Peoples” invaded northern Israel after spending some time, perhaps a century, on Cyprus... As Num 24:24 already makes clear, as a place name, Kittim refers to Cyprus...<sup>137</sup>

Given that Yunker rests his case upon the underlying verse in Numbers, it is surprising that he spends no time on the form and text of the Balaamic oracles. The view that the Kittim find their fulfillment in the Sea Peoples is circular reasoning *par excellence*. No sources prior to Josephus make the link that Kittim should be understood as referring to Cyprus. There is a complete dearth of evidence that the Sea Peoples ever attacked any nation or ethnic group called Asshur or Eber. It’s an argument wherein the premise is the conclusion!

Yunker briefly touches on the later prophets such as Isaiah and Jeremiah without examining the actual text of any of them. For example, he writes that, “Jer 2:10 refers to Kittim as just a short distance from Israel.”<sup>138</sup> This is not in the text of Jeremiah. Rather, as we have already seen, Jeremiah employs a merism of east and west by referring to a nomadic Arab tribe to the east and Kittim to the west. As a literary device, merisms imply the whole by referring to two polar extremes.<sup>139</sup> The rhetorical thrust of the verse is that if a person were to travel far and wide in either direction, they would find greater loyalty among pagans towards their gods than Israel manifested towards YHWH.

The same appeal is made regarding the mentions in Isaiah, “reference is made again to Kittim or Cyprus as a place seemingly not far from Sidon; and in fact they are quite close.” Once again, Yunker fails to examine the force of the passage. We saw that this passage was a prophecy against Tyre which saw a lament being carried out across the entire Mediterranean. It is not conclusive in terms of establishing the location of Kittim, but a more distant location would make sense as a perceived refuge from destruction.

Yunker spends some space speaking about the type of ship mentioned in Daniel 11:30, a *šiy* (שֵׁי). This is identified as referring to “a large war-galley that contains an adjustable sail and a deck or bulwark for the archers on top to shoot their arrows, beneath or behind which the oarsmen could row while protected (sometimes later called a *trireme*).”<sup>140</sup> For Yunker, this is important to determine the “‘life-span’ of usage in history”. Though there are leaps made in interpreting the evidence, it is fair to conclude, based on the context of both Numbers 24 and Daniel 11, that these vessels were battle-oriented naval ships as opposed to the primarily cargo-oriented trading or transport ships frequently represented by the Hebrew word *‘oniyāh* (אֲנִיָּהּ).

As seen above, Yunker makes several claims about the Sea Peoples as the fulfillment of Numbers 24. Such a fulfillment has multiple flaws that have already been discussed in previous sections of this paper. It assumes Kittim is Kition. The proposed fulfillment would occur centuries before the name *Kty* is ever attested for the Cypriot city. It places heavy emphasis on the Philistines who were already settled in Gaza at the time the prophecy was given. The fulfillment is so obscure it doesn’t even feature in the pages of Scripture. And significantly, it ignores the Covenant themes and apocalyptic pace of the Balaamic oracles. Yunker merely repeats the unfounded assertions of earlier commentators without providing the necessary evidence to demonstrate their veracity.

Yunker’s largest failure in the present version of his manuscript is that he omits all reference to the Arad ostraca. He claims that,

In no instance either extra-biblically or in Scripture itself does *kittim* or *kitti’im* refer unequivocally to an ethnos or ethnic group... It always refers to a polity or geographic location, that is, a geopolity—

---

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid*, 77.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid*, 79.

<sup>139</sup> Leyland Ryken, *A Complete Handbook of Literary Forms in the Bible*, (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2014) 124.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid*, 74-75

which in extra-biblical literature may be the Greeks or Romans, as peoples of the sea (and controllers of Cyprus!) in the eyes of the Jews, but it is not an ethnic designation alone.

This is patently inaccurate. The Kittim mercenaries in the Arad inscriptions make the most sense as an ethnic designation. These were first published in the 1960s and are referenced in several of Younker's sources. There is also a very strong case, Biblically, for an ethnic designation for Kittim based on its genre of the Table of Nations alone. Overall, in spite of the passion with which Younker approaches Daniel 11, his commentary on Kittim appears to be a conclusion in search of justification, rather than an objective investigation. In both Genesis and 1 Chronicles, the focus is on genealogy, not geopolity. While in the later prophets there is a focus on locale, this derives from the genealogical idea of the human family build upon the Table of Nations.

There has been relatively low engagement so far with the 'Islamic King of the South' hypothesis of Roosenberg, Gane and Younker. In a paper in 2015 released by the Biblical Research Institute, Rodríguez cautioned,

the identification of the king of the South in verse 40 as Islam is dependent on a previous interpretation of the king of the South as Islam in Daniel 11:25–30 (the Crusades). Let it be clear that finding the Crusades in Daniel 11 is far from certain and Adventist interpreters of Daniel 11 are still debating the matter. Therefore determining the identity of the king of the South in verse 40 on the basis of this particular interpretation of 11:25–30 should be, to say the least, an extremely tentative suggestion.<sup>141</sup>

While not discussing the meaning of Kittim, Rodríguez shows skepticism at the idea that the Crusades are the subject of this section of the prophecy. Doukhan rightly points to the importance of Balaam's prophecy, saying:

The phrase "against him" refers to the King of the North, who is still the subject of this passage (see 11:28). The particular expression "ships from Cyprus" alludes to Balaam's prophecy, which uses the same language to describe an eschatological conflict between God and the enemy nations: "Who shall live when God does this?... Ships shall come from the coasts of Cyprus, and they shall afflict Ashur and afflict Eber" (Num. 24:24). In Balaam's prophecy, Cyprus (in Hebrew *kittim*) designates a distant power from the western isles (cf. Jer 2:10; Ezek. 27:6) that will be raised by God to crush the far eastern enemies of Israel and His Messiah (Num. 24:17). In this prophecy (Num. 24:24), these enemies are specifically identified as Assyria and Eber, which refers to Mesopotamia (the word 'eber is the shortened form of *'eber nahar*, "the other side of the river," the designation for Mesopotamia; cf. Josh. 24:2). Daniel takes Balaam's oracle in the sense of his own prophecy: Greece will crush Persia.<sup>142</sup>

Though Doukhan quotes from the NKJV which reads "Cyprus", he is not limited to this one translation, preferring "western isles". In discussing the view of Shea, Doukhan offers the criticism that he "doesn't recognize the spiritual allusion to Balaam's prophecy."<sup>143</sup> This criticism could be applied to almost all of the Adventist interpreters that we have surveyed. Only Younker and Doukhan have considered this prophecy in relation to the identity of Kittim, and neither have explored the structure, themes and theology of the Balaamic oracles in a wider sense.

One last interpretation that didn't fit within the earlier discussion is a novel outlier proposed by Núñez. Regarding Kittim, Núñez reflects many of the basic findings of this paper,

The Hebrew word "kittîm" appears eight times in the Hebrew Bible. This word may refer to people or location: (1) people, "sons of yawan" (= Greeks; Gen 10:4; 1Chr 1:7); (2) location, "Greek island regions" (Num 24:24; Je 2:10; Isa 23:1, 12; Ezek. 27:6). "Kittîm" seems to be in apposition to the word "ships" in Daniel 11:30 or rather it makes the function of an adjective (Greek ships).<sup>144</sup>

What makes Núñez' approach unique is that he applies this verse to the Punic Wars,

---

<sup>141</sup> Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, *Daniel 11 and the Islamic Interpretation*, (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 2015) 30.

<sup>142</sup> Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 167-168.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid*, 170

<sup>144</sup> Samuel Núñez, *The Referent of 'The King of the South' and 'The King of the North' in Daniel 11:40: A Text-Linguistics Approach*, (Unpublished paper presented at the Daniel 12 Symposium in Berrien Springs, 2018) 12.

the description of the wars of Daniel 11:25-30b between a non-literal "king of the north" (Rome) and a non-literal "king of the south" (Carthage) takes into account the historical reality of both entities. It also corresponds with the verbal system of Biblical Hebrew in Daniel 11.<sup>145</sup>

This survey of Adventist commentators highlights the various currents of interpretation for this verse. The longest standing view within Adventism sees the ships of Kittim fulfilled by the Barbarian invasions and the fall of the Roman Empire. The view that has begun rising in prominence sees the events of the battle of Lepanto in 1571 A.D. as the latest installment of the 'Crusades' hypothesis. Outliers that have yet to gain traction include the Punic Wars hypothesis and the proposal of the naval battle towards the end of the wars of the tetrarchy. As can be seen, these are widely different approaches, some requiring flash-forwards and others requiring flashbacks in the chronological unfolding of the text of Daniel 11.

Having done our own thorough examination of references to Kittim through Biblical and extant historical sources, we now have an anchor to hold us securely in position as we look at the actual passage in question and seek the most viable fulfillment.

### Going Ashore - Ships of Kittim in Daniel 11:30

This paper does not intend to present a complete understanding of Daniel 11:23-31. Agreeing with Roosenberg and Younker that the specificity of the reference to the "ships of Kittim" presents a key to unlocking this portion of the text, we will focus on the situation around that text and allow for further work in future papers.

If Daniel 11:30 was referring to a specific, literal geographic location, the only identification that would fit the context of the chapter based on the research presented would be the Greek/Macedonian hypothesis. Greece is mentioned explicitly within the context in Daniel 10:20 and 11:2, and almost the entire first half of the chapter concerns the history of the Greek Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms. An expanded meaning of Kittim, i.e. western isles or wider Mediterranean, would not fit either, because Kittim modifies the ships as an adjective, indicating origin. The most expanded sense that the text would seem to indicate would be the Aegean as this is where the Macedonians originate. In this, only Tim Hayden presents a plausible naval battle occurring in this region. However, his proposal reverses the grammatical subject and object, and is thus disqualified. To gain our bearings on what the ships of Kittim is referring to in Daniel 11, let us work through the three key issues surrounding this text.

#### *Chronological progression or anachronistic?*

Our first question is whether the prophecy engages in chronological displacement. Two of the proposed understandings of this pericope involve anachronistic interpretations. Núñez' reverts centuries into the past after verse 22 to see the Punic Wars in Daniel 11:30. Shea, Roosenberg, Gane and Younker leap from the Cross in verse 22 to the Crusades by verse 25, only to revert back to the beginnings of the Papacy in verse 31. Does the text warrant such temporal hermeneutic gymnastics?

Gane, in his paper on the first half of Daniel 11, identified a key "hermeneutical framework" from "the first few verses" of the chapter,

There are gaps in the succession of kings (as in the Akkadian "Dynastic Prophecy"). Most significantly for us, Persian history includes a number of kings after Xerxes, but once Grecia is mentioned, the focus of attention goes to that power. Shea points out "a basic principle for interpreting Daniel's apocalyptic prophecy. That principle is this: it is only necessary to continue with one kingdom, or line of kings, until the new one of importance is introduced on the scene of action."<sup>146</sup>

Just as Daniel 11 skips the remaining Medo-Persian rulers after Xerxes and goes immediately to Hellenistic Alexander the Great and his successors, so the chapter skips the remaining Seleucid kings after Antiochus III and goes immediately to Rome in verses 20 and following.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Ibid, 13.

<sup>146</sup> Gane, *The Un-Manifestation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Daniel 11:1-22*, (Unpublished paper presented at the Adventist Theological Society symposium on eschatology in 2007), 4. Quoting William Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation* (Daniel and Revelation Committee 1; ed. F. Holbrook; Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 41

<sup>147</sup> Gane, *op. cit.*, 21.

The temporal interpretations of Roosenberg, Younker and even Gane himself abandon this framework in the latter half of the chapter to fast-forward to the Crusades by verse 25. Reaching the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 A.D. in verse 30 they then rewind back to 508 A.D. in verse 31 for the beginnings of the Papacy. In place of a hermeneutic framework, Younker appeals to the subjectivity of discourse analysis.

The phrase which begins the verse, *ūzārō ‘im mimmennū ya ‘āmōdū*, “and/but by means of arms/forces he will stand,” is a *waw* disjunctive, likely indicative of a ‘camera’ shift, which would correspond with the thematic transition of this verse and the following verses, which focus explicitly on God’s true people.<sup>148</sup>

In an accompanying footnote, Younker explains,

When a disjunctive *waw* functions in an introductory manner, it may begin a new narrative or introduce a new idea or theme within a narrative, or provide anterior justification for prior developments. When introducing a new theme within a narrative, a temporal shift backwards is possible. That is, “the disjunctive clause frequently functions to provide simultaneous information. Nothing about the form of the disjunctive clause differentiates its use as a discourse marker establishing a setting and its use in providing simultaneous information. These uses are distinguished by the context,” Bouchoc, *An Analysis of Disjunctive Waw Verbal Clauses in the Biblical Hebrew Narrative of the Pentateuch*, 266; and Osborne, “Anteriority and Justification: Pragmatic Functions of the Wex-qatal Form in Direct Speech in Genesis,” 376-379.<sup>149</sup>

In the text, Younker claims that a ‘camera’ shift is “likely” due to a *waw* disjunctive. In the footnote, he lists several viable functions for this type of discourse marker. According to the footnote, “a temporal shift backwards is *possible*”. This is a different matter to “likely”. Whether “possible” or “likely”, in drawing this conclusion Younker has abandoned his own advice earlier in his paper where he states that,

absent any textual transition clues that can be meaningfully agreed upon in this single, continuously flowing prophecy, one should at least consider a continuous literal hermeneutic and interpretation using the given geographical locations first (of which Kittim is one key word, see verse 30), and see if it harmonizes, or at least is compatible, with other eschatological portions of Scripture before jettisoning the idea altogether as unsound.<sup>150</sup>

Younker is chiefly talking about a hermeneutic shift from ‘literal’ to ‘spiritual’, but the same principle can apply to temporal transitions. There are over forty *waw* disjunctive clauses in Daniel 11.<sup>151</sup> Arguing for temporal reversion in this one clause is a case of eisegesis and special pleading, not of sound exegesis and hermeneutics. A ‘camera’ shift would be reasonable, but what is being proposed is rewinding the tape and recording over the top of what has already been filmed! The burden of proof rests upon those that are promoting such temporal shifts to demonstrate precisely why a *waw* disjunctive should be considered to function in that way, besides the fact their interpretation requires it to be. In addition, they need to demonstrate that there is a special reason for this particular introductory *waw* disjunctive to function in this sense apart from all the other *waw* disjunctives in the chapter. Exegesis ought to come before the interpretation, not the other way around. So without any compelling reason beyond what may be *one of many possible outcomes* from a text-linguistics approach, the preferred reading should honour an overall continuous forward chronological progression with *waw* disjunctives functioning in their usual manner as either leading into a description or explanation or denoting contemporaneous information.

#### *Typical or Atypical Fulfillment*

As we surveyed the SDA landscape on this question, a common theme was present in all the positive hypotheses regarding the historical fulfillment of the ships of Kittim – each posit a specific, literal, naval battle or war in the Mediterranean in which Rome is a key participant. The traditional Adventist view looks specifically at the Vandals

---

<sup>148</sup> Younker, *op. cit.*, 87.

<sup>149</sup> *Loc Cit.*

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid*, 4

<sup>151</sup> Table compiled by Samuel Núñez, December 31, 2019. In private correspondence Dr. Núñez explained that “the verbal forms weqatal and weyiqtol indicate temporal succession or continuity and the x-yiqtol, nominal clause, infinitive clause are none sequential, but give explanations or some additional detail or information.”

who sacked Rome during the Barbarian invasions, necessitating the identification of Kittim as Carthage. The ‘Islamic view’ requires that Kittim be identified as Cyprus in order to support its conclusion regarding the Battle of Lepanto. These differences of locating Kittim aside, both views agree on the need for a literal naval engagement. Younker writes regarding his hermeneutic,

Essentially, it is widely agreed upon by both historical-critical and evangelical scholars that there is no clear textual hint within the prophecy that any significant “hermeneutical transitions” occur that might justify a shift from a literal account of the history of God’s people to one focusing on a vaguely defined symbolic ‘spiritual’ Israel—note, the problem is not that the emphasis is on ‘spiritual’ Israel (i.e., Christians) after Christ’s potential appearance in the prophecy. Rather, the problem is with the use of symbolic meanings with literal language. Indeed, it may not be that a literal view of the prophecy as a whole is necessarily or exclusively “Israel-centric,” in contrast to what one might suppose, as will be explored below.<sup>152</sup>

Younker is correct that in the text of Daniel 11 alone there is no “clear textual hint” of hermeneutic transitions. In my paper presented at the 2019 Daniel 11 Conference, this idea of hermeneutic transitions was covered in depth.<sup>153</sup> It is only when the angelic discourse of Daniel 11 is overlaid upon the previous prophecies, especially that of chapter 9, that the transition comes into focus. Daniel 9 is actually a portion of the greater Daniel 8 prophecy, cropped to focus narrowly on the probationary period for national Israel. The corresponding synchronism for the close of national Israel’s probation in chapter 11 is found in verse 22, where the Messiah-Prince of the Covenant is broken. Despite this brief mention of the Prince, it is the people of the Covenant that continue to be the subject of the prophecy beyond this point.

Through this overlay, a powerful hermeneutic tool is revealed that enables us to accurately obtain a ‘fix’ on our location, a waypoint from which type pivots to antitype throughout the remainder of the prophecy. National Israel transitions to antitypical Israel in line with the development of the New Testament theology. Geographical directions such as “North” and “South” become transcendent, and the powers that were located to the north and south of Israel before the transition verse become filled by representative antitypical figures in the second half of the chapter. Examples of the type-antitype hermeneutical switch were presented from Old and New Testament prophecies. It was shown that Revelation builds on the platform of this hermeneutic shift with the eschatological enemy of Israel being called “Babylon”. The paper concluded by saying,

The onus of proof was initially admitted to rest upon the side of those who would argue for a representative-spiritual “king of the north” and “king of the south” after verse 22. Having established this to a high standard, the obligation must now rest with any alternate proposal to bring additional evidence and principles that might be claimed to have been neglected by this investigation. It must also account for the hermeneutical considerations brought to bear in this paper to create an even bigger picture than this study which has fully embraced the intersection between Hermeneutics, Christology, Eschatology and Ecclesiology. These multiple lines of convergence confirm the hypothesis that there is a self-consistent reason for moving from a geographical fulfillment in the first half of the chapter to a global fulfillment beginning midway through Daniel 11. The type-antitype reading of Daniel 11 is neither arbitrary nor unprecedented, but shows clear signs of divine intentionality and congruity with the pattern of prophecy and how the Scriptures interpret themselves. The first advent of Jesus Christ becomes the event upon which history and prophecy hinges as it pivots from local to universal, from transient to transcendent, from type to antitype.<sup>154</sup>

Our investigation of the ships of Kittim presents a fresh opportunity to test this proposed type-antitype pivot. If geography has been transcended in the latter half of Daniel 11, then there should be some clear indicators pointing to an antitypical fulfillment of the ships of Kittim. That these words are an allusion to the earlier prophecy of Balaam provides strong grounds for exploring such a hypothesis. If Daniel 11 does indeed deal with an antitype, one would

---

<sup>152</sup> Younker, *op. cit.*, 4

<sup>153</sup> Brendan Valiant, *The Broken Messiah-Prince of the Covenant: Hermeneutic Doorway between Type and Antitype in Prophetic History*, (Unpublished paper presented at the Daniel 12 Symposium in Berrien Springs, 2019).

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

expect there to be macro and micro indicators within the context of both mentions of the “ships of Kittim” in Daniel 11:30 and Numbers 24:24.

Before moving forward, it is important to refresh our understanding of what typology is. Davidson defines typology in the following way,

Typology as a hermeneutical endeavor on the part of the biblical writers may be viewed as the study of certain OT salvation-historical realities (persons, events, or institutions) which God has specifically designed to correspond to, and be prospective/predictive prefigurations of, their ineluctable (*devoir-être*) and absolutely escalated eschatological fulfillment aspects (Christological/ecclesiological/apocalyptic) in NT salvation history.<sup>155</sup>

In my paper last year I developed upon this theme noting the Christological pivot for type and antitype.

The Biblical catalyst for type-antitype transition is the revelation of Jesus Christ. At this point, types meet their complete reality. In typology, the type does not necessarily cease, or become irrelevant, but undergoes a *Steigerung* or intensification in the antitype.

On the macro-level, Daniel 11-12 resonates thematically with the prophecies of Balaam. The seven oracles of Balaam, when viewed as a whole, contain many elements of an apocalyptic outline prophecy. Core to the two prophecies is the build up towards a Messianic climax. Daniel 11-12 has two such apexes (verse 22 and 12:1), while Balaam’s final three oracles repeat and enlarge the history up to the time of the Messiah, first revealed in the fourth oracle. Each prophecy follows the story of the Covenant people of God caught in a conflict with increasingly larger and more hostile enemies reigning over the glorious land.

There are even similarities in the situational context. The unfolding of Balaam’s prophecy begins soon after the exodus from Egypt, while the events in Daniel’s prophecy occur after the return of the Jews from exile in Babylon. Daniel receives the prophecy of Daniel 11 after a vision of Christ-Michael while Balaam’s oracles come after an encounter with the “Angel of YHWH” (Numbers 22). The cosmic conflict is in the background of each. In Numbers, Balak was seeking to prevent Israel from entering the promised land, whereas in Daniel 10, Gabriel reveals that he had been contending with the “Prince of Persia”. The key concern of Daniel was the return of God’s people to the promised land with Cyrus the key to securing this.

These strong parallels suggest that Daniel 11 contains a kind of antitypical echo of Balaam’s final oracle. When seeking antitypical fulfillment, it is important to focus on the characteristics present in the original situation. In Numbers 24:24, Kittim represents the final power in focus immediately before Messiah establishes His dominion and destroys all the enemies of Israel (see Numbers 24:17-19). The power that fulfilled this in the type was Macedonian Greece, which was conquered by Rome in the same generation as Christ’s first advent. In looking for an antitypical fulfillment, one would consider the prophetic power in existence right up to the time of Christ’s second advent. This power is outlined within the earlier prophecies of Daniel.

Nebuchadnezzar’s mixed-material statue culminates with feet and toes of iron mixed with clay (Daniel 2). This is the last power in the succession before the stone kingdom is set up. The penultimate power in Daniel 7 is exhibited by the horn kingdoms growing out of the terrible beast. Daniel 8 chiefly focuses on the characteristics of the Little Horn, but we already know from the earlier vision that seven of the other horns continue to the end. If Kittim, identified as Macedonian Greece, constitutes the type, being the final power extending up to the time of Messiah’s first advent, then the divided kingdoms represented on the statue as the feet and toes of iron and clay, and as the horns of the terrible beast, would fill the shoes as the antitype.

In Balaam’s oracle, Asshur and Eber are not destroyed by Kittim-ships, they are merely afflicted (*’ānāh* – ענה). This fits with the King of the North only being grieved (*kā’āh* – כאב) by the actions of the Kittim-ships. Words relating to these roots are used in parallel in Psalm 69:29 showing their semantic overlap. This affliction in Balaam’s oracle is in contrast to the outcome for Amalek and the final kingdoms, which face utter destruction (*’ōbēd* – אבד). The

---

<sup>155</sup> Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical ΤΥΠΟΣ Structures* (Andrews University Press: Berrien Springs, MI, 1981) 405-6.

Aramaic form of this word for destruction is used in Daniel when the penultimate kingdoms are also destroyed at the coming of the Messiah (Daniel 7:26).

In light of these considerations, it is clear that the historical event that most appropriately satisfies the antitypical fulfillment of the ships of Kittim is the period of the Barbarian incursions and settlement into the territory of the Roman Empire during the 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D. These military migrations resulted in the establishing of the divided kingdoms that came to comprise modern Europe, and through colonialism could be expanded to now embrace the entire world. This event makes sense as the antitypical fulfillment, not only with regard to the actions that are described but also as to the timing in relation to the other events outlined in the prophecy. Moreover, the divided nations stand as the final world power prior to the second coming of Messiah in the same way as Kittim was the final long-standing power prior to Jesus' first advent.

What about the ships? As we noted, Younker looked at the exact type of ship that might be denoted by the word *šiy*. While the information he compiled was excellent in identifying this type of naval vessel as a fast, military-capable ship, there are a few reasons to think that the text doesn't require a literal interpretation here. The first point is that we are dealing with an allusion to an already fulfilled prophecy. While the wording in Daniel isn't a direct quotation from Numbers, the two principal words are present – ships (*šyîm*) and Kittim. In Daniel 11:30 the phrase appears as *šyîm kittîm* (צִיִּים כְּתִים), literally “ships-Kittim” or “Kittim-ships”. This is slightly different to the phrase in Numbers 24:24 which reads *wāšîm mîyad kittîm* (וְצִיִּים מִיַּד כְּתִים) which means “ships from the coast of Kittim”. The omission of *min* (“from”) and *yād* (“coast”) removes both the directional and topographical elements from the phraseological unit in Daniel 11.

Since the literal fulfillment occurred during the Macedonian conquests, it is unnecessary for the antitype to occur in the same, literal way. In Daniel 11:40, in a verse which is recognised to be after the “Time of the End”, chariots are mentioned, even though these have not been in use for a long time. The idea isn't so much the literalness of the chariots, but that which the chariots imply, much the same as these Kittim-ships.<sup>156</sup> The character of that engagement and of the ships themselves will give impetus to the antitype. In the original, Alexander's conquest was rapid and brutal. This points to the only major naval battle during Alexander's conquest – the siege of Tyre. This ostensibly impregnable city was taken by brute force after being surrounded and cut off. In the antitype, the Barbarian attacks on the Roman Empire achieved a similar effect. The Barbarian tribes systematically took over the territory of Rome, surrounding it on all sides, and even sacking and occupying the city of Rome itself on several occasions. So it is that by every metric, this overthrow of Pagan Rome and transition to the divided nations of Europe answers to the historical type when Macedonian Greece overthrew the Persians as heirs to the Assyrian territory and titles.

#### *What is the “Former” and “Latter”?*

The final question to be explored involves the way in which the “ships of Kittim” verse is introduced. How does this interpretation fit within the unfolding narrative of the angelic discourse? The verse immediately before reads,

At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter. (Daniel 11:29 – KJV)

Younker's comments are helpful for understanding this verse:

Several popular contemporary translations of verse 29 do not accurately reflect the Hebrew text. The Hebrew *kāri šōnāh wəkā'ahārōnāh*, literally translated, would be “like the first and/or like the last.” That is, it appears that this time “it will not be” as two other times, one earlier, and one later...

In fact, the phrase in Dan 11:29 is unique in the OT. Nowhere else are *ri šōnāh* and *'ahārōnāh* both used with the comparative *ka*. That is, 11:29 demonstrates them as paired—*ka* (as/like) *ha* (the) *rishon* (first/former) *waw* (and) *ka* (as/like) *ha* (the) *acharon* (last/latter). Literally rendered, it would be “like the first/former and/or like the last/latter.” Thus, it appears to be a double comparative and

---

<sup>156</sup> This is commented on in Gane, *Methodology for Interpretation*, 329, “The words “with chariots and horsemen, and with many ships” (v. 40) are not symbolic; they are simply archaic expressions for rapidly conveyed ground troops and naval forces (cf. v. 30—“ships of Kittim”). Thus, the expression rendered “like a whirlwind” (*hithpael* of *š-’r*; v. 40) is descriptive of a military force storming/rushing out against the enemy. The predicted events clearly involve literal warfare, not merely some kind of ideological conflict, although ideology often drives physical warfare.”

contrast. The verb *tihyeh* provides the “it” creating three events to make the double contrast logical. Indeed, it seems this is the only occurrence of *kā’ahārōn*—no where else is it used as a comparative in the OT, and even *karishon* only appears one other time. Beyond even with the comparative *ka*, even in other instances, without the comparative, there are clearly three events referenced with a pairing of *rishon* and *acharon*. For example, see Neh 8:18, where “day by day, from the first day unto the last day, he read in the book of the law of God.” That is, the first (*hāri’šōwn*) day and the last (*hā’ahārōwn*) day are separate from a middle time, the days inbetween.<sup>157</sup>

Several proposals have been presented as to what the “former” or “latter” refer to. Most conclude that the “latter” refers to the conflict that occurs at the close of the chapter in verses 40-45. This makes sense as that is the next passage that takes up the North-South conflict. The “former” is usually taken to refer to the nearest antecedent North-South narrative in verses 25-28. As Younker summarises, “Narratively, the obvious interpretation is that the encounter in verses 29-30 will have a different result than the encounters in verses 25-28 and 40-43, the immediately prior encounter and the only following encounter between two warring kings.”<sup>158</sup>

Younker’s point does appear to have weight on the surface, though it fails to embrace the panorama of prophecy and history. If we zoom out to a wider view of the angelic discourse, we can see that there are actually three broader North-South conflict narratives in the chapter. Each one of these conflict narratives reaches its climax with a different outcome.

1. Verses 5-19 – Culminates in King of the North victorious over the South (partial).
2. Verses 25-30 – Culminates in King of the North thwarted by Ships of Kittim
3. Verses 40-45 – Culminates in King of the North victorious over South (complete).

The conflict in the first and third narrative blocks reaches a terminus when the King of the North emerges triumphant over the King of the South, and then turns his attention to other locations. Since verse 29 introduces the final event in the middle conflict narrative block, from a structural point of view, the former and the latter would therefore forecast that the outcome of this period of conflict will not have the same victorious outcome for the King of the North as is seen in the others.

As Younker points out, the grammar creates a functional equivalence between the former (*rišōn*) and latter (*’ahārōn*). Since the “latter” of the three conflict narrative blocks is widely understood to be the final conflict at the end of the chapter, the “former” would be expected to present with a similar narrative progression and climax. On examination of verses 25-28, however, we find that this is not the case, as these verses are located within, and as part of, a larger conflict narrative block.

The King of the North’s dominance in verse 25 is not as a result of his own superior actions, but due to sabotage within the ranks of the King of the South, who it is foretold “shall not stand, for plots shall be devised against him. Even those who eat his food shall break him. His army shall be swept away, and many shall fall down slain.” This victory stands in contrast to the later victory outlined in verses 40-43, as this one is unmistakably due to the superior force of the King of the North. This insight provides strong evidence against the interpretation of verses 25-28 as encompassing the “former”.

On the other hand, the first conflict narrative block (verses 5-19) parallels the last conflict narrative block (verses 40-45) in a marked manner, as can be seen in the following table:<sup>159</sup>

<b>Antiochus III the Great (11:11-19)</b>	<b>Latter King of the North (vs 11:40-45)</b>
The king of the south, moved with rage, shall come out and fight against the king of the north.	At the time of the end, the king of the south shall attack him.
The king of the north shall again raise a multitude, greater than the first... a great army and abundant supplies.	But the king of the north shall rush upon him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen and with many ships.
he shall stand in the glorious land	...he shall come into the glorious land.
...destruction in his hand...	...tens of thousands shall fall...

<sup>157</sup> Younker, *Ibid*, 74-75. See also Frank Hardy, “Historical Overview of Dan 11:29-35,” unpublished paper, 2005 (revised 2015), 15.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid*, 75

<sup>159</sup> From Valiant, *op. cit.*, 25.



...afterward he shall turn his face to the coastlands and shall capture many.	...he shall stretch out his hand against the countries, the land of Egypt shall not escape.
...a commander shall put an end to his insolence.	...news from the east and the north shall alarm him.
...he shall turn his face back toward the fortresses of his own land.	...he shall pitch his palatial tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain.
...he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found.	...he shall come to his end, with none to help him.

When viewed from this macrostructural lens, the events in verse 29 at the close of the middle conflict block appear narratively distinct from the conflict narrative blocks both before and after. The remarkable symmetry between the “former” and the “latter” satisfies the functional equivalence that is drawn in verse 28 by the words *rišōn* and *’ahārōn*. The middle conflict narrative block does not see the King of the North emerge triumphant in its struggles with the King of the South. Instead, his conquest is thwarted by the Kittim-ships resulting in affliction and grief in the place of triumph and victory. In fulfilling this prophecy, the Barbarian invasions put an end to the might of Imperial Rome, thus creating a vacuum ultimately resulting in the transition to Rome’s Papal phase.

### **Burn the Ships – The Next Adventure Starts Here!**

This paper has by no means resolved all the issues surrounding the problematic verses in Daniel 11:23-31. It has, however, taken up the challenge of resolving some of the key questions concerning the identity of Biblical Kittim and its place within Daniel 11. On a personal note, this study has been richly rewarding. Never could I have imagined that doing a deep dive on a single Biblical expression would recover such a valuable trove of sunken treasure.

Our survey of the proposed identities for the ships of Kittim led us first to exclude the more obscure hypotheses. References to Rome or to the Italic peninsula occur too late (1<sup>st</sup> century AD) to be of value to Biblical interpretation. The Hittite hypothesis and any reference to the Philistines or wider Sea Peoples violates the genealogical origins of the Table of Nations, as well as other Biblical statements from the time of Moses.

The proposal that Kittim refers to the city-state of Kition or the island of Cyprus seemed plausible on the surface, but upon deeper investigation lacked any historical substance or corroborating evidence.<sup>160</sup> The earliest attestation to the Phoenician name *Kty* for the Cypriot city occurs very late in history, and its earlier Mycenaean name is apparently lost to the ravages of time. The island itself has a long history of being known as Alashiya after Kittim’s brother Elishah, with this name persisting until Hellenistic times. While Cyprus was also known as Kuprios to the Mycenaeans and Iadanna to the later Assyrians, no evidence has yet been adduced to show that the island was ever known as Kittim or that the city-state of Kition ever held dominance over the island. Ultimately, the alleged connection between Kittim and Kition is found no earlier than Josephus, in the first century A.D., who was known to localise and contextualise some of the more obscure figures in the Table of Nations. The absence of additional evidence to confirm this claim leads to the conclusion that his linkage of Kittim to Kition is most likely a linguistic case of false friends.

Turning to the primary evidence, a greater examination of the Aegean/Eastern Mediterranean world of antiquity was conducted which was warranted due to the Javan heritage of Kittim. The only ethnonym from antiquity that shares phonetic similarity to Kittim is a group mentioned by Homer as fighting in the Trojan war called the Keteians. This group was allied to Mysia, a region in north-western Anatolia bordering the Bosphorus. An exploration of the northern Aegean revealed ancient place names reflecting the common phonemes *kty* such as a mountain named Kitios near Thessaloniki and a city called Kition in Macedonia. The archaic form of *Makedon* was noted as being *Maketai* and these were considered to be counted among the Greeks, but not always considered by them to be equals.

Archaeological evidence from the Negev was presented of Greek mercenaries in the late seventh century B.C. known as Kittim. The balance of evidence, including Greek names reportedly among them and East Greek pottery discovered in the region from the same period, favours the conclusion that Kittim was an ethnonym for peoples from the Aegean.

<sup>160</sup> On a personal note, I did begin this quest with the same assumption in mind and was led to examine the Mycenaean founding of the town later known as Kition in my initial research. The lack of evidence that it was in existence during the time of Moses and the late attestation to the name *Kty* led me to ultimately look elsewhere.

Biblical and extracanonical evidence was examined showing both a narrow and wider meaning for Kittim that embraced the Aegean region, with specific identifications of the Kittim in the Maccabean texts as being Macedonian.

Numbers 24:24 was identified as being of central importance to understanding Daniel 11:30, and thus an in-depth examination of the Balaamic prophecies was engaged. These oracles are set against an expansive Covenantal and Cosmic Conflict backdrop. We noted a progression throughout the seven oracles of Balaam to a Messianic climax in the middle or fourth oracle. The final three oracles presented some progressive historical judgements on Semitic nations in the lead up to the coming of the Messiah, the last of which sees Eber, the progenitor of Abraham, caught between Kittim and Asshur. As a unity, this heptad stands as perhaps the earliest example of Biblical apocalyptic.

A survey of the history of Adventist interpretation on the ships of Kittim showed a widespread lack of attention to the connection of Daniel 11:31 with Numbers 24:24. Of the various proposals, those with the greatest traction in our history have viewed the Ships of Kittim as either the Barbarian invasion of Rome, or more recently as referring to the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 A.D. in the struggles between Christendom and Islam. In interacting with this last position, it became clear that this idea rests on the tenuous connection between Kition/Cyprus and Kittim. A thorough examination of the claims of this proposal has revealed that there are insurmountable deficiencies with that line of reasoning leaving us no option but to cast it overboard.

Moving to the text of Daniel 11, we saw that if any literal fulfillment were to be pursued, it should be sought in the region of the Aegean, as that was where the evidence points.<sup>161</sup> A careful examination of the proposals that involve elements of chronological reversion within the passage showed that these were predicated upon subjective interpretations of Hebrew discourse markers. In the absence of any stronger evidence than a *waw* disjunctive these types of approaches amount to nothing more than clever eisegetical special pleading. Comparing Daniel 11 with the Balaamic oracles, we noted multiple macro-thematic and micro-linguistic parallels. These indicate that the fulfillment of Daniel 11:30 would be an antitype to the fulfillment of Numbers 24:24. Daniel 11:29 was examined as the introduction to the ships of Kittim reference in verse 31. There we saw that as the climax to the middle North-South conflict narrative (11:25-30), this would not turn out like the former (11:5-19) or latter (11:40-45).

It might be tempting to consider the findings of this study as simply confirming the traditional Adventist proposal due to the fact that there are similar conclusions regarding the Barbarian invasions, however doing so would be reductionistic. While we arrive at a similar historical synchrony between the Barbarian invasions and the ships of Kittim, there are significant hermeneutical differences in how we have arrived at this conclusion. While they have arrived at the same section of the coast, the weakness of the traditional expositions have been that they have run aground in shallow waters of literal interpretation, failing to properly navigate the type-antitype currents. This has led to untenable claims that Carthage was the identity of Kittim. The significance of the Barbarian invasions as the fulfillment of the ships of Kittim is not due to a geographical point of origin or ethnic background. Instead, these migrating people which formed the divided nations of Europe satisfy the antitypical characteristics of Kittim in Numbers 24:24 as being the last power prior to the second coming of Messiah.

This paper has begun a fresh work of deeply examining the most difficult section of Daniel chapter 11 in light of the type-antitype pivot. Future work undertaken on this middle conflict narrative block within the chapter should build out from this solid temporal and narrative synchronism, embracing linguistic and literary considerations. While any extraordinary proposals should always be looked upon with a healthy degree of scepticism, future study should recognise the contributions of discourse analysis where patterns can be firmly established.

This paper has confirmed and clarified a number of points that were raised at the 2019 Daniel 11 Conference. As a test-case in the Messianic type-antitype pivot, it provides strong confirmation and corroboration of that hermeneutic. As a predictive evaluation, further confirmation of the Messianic type-antitype pivot would be expected through examining additional allusions identified within the text. This is especially important for allusions to other ethnonyms/toponyms (see for example Moab, Edom and Ammon in 11:41; cf. Isaiah 11:14). Further questions yet

---

<sup>161</sup> On a personal note, prior to engaging this study, I had personally leaned towards Hayden's historical overlay. This has been abandoned due to problems with his proposed referents for some of the verses in this pericope, however it did agree with what I had preliminarily concluded regarding the Kittim-Aegean connections. I've been personally challenged by the direction this research has taken and it has helped shape my view of this complex chapter.

to be addressed in the scope of 11:23-31 include the nature of the alliance in 11:23, the purpose of the repeated “time” references (11:24, 27, 29, 35, 40), the nature of the initial portion of the North-South conflict in 11:25-28, and how this conflict narrative ultimately relates to the hattamid-abomination transition in verse 31. Working through these and other neglected issues will contribute to a hermeneutically self-consistent and defensible interpretation of this important chapter that can be embraced broadly among historicist scholars.