

STUDIES ON DANIEL

Table of Contents

	<u>Page #</u>
1. Notable Dates and Events Related to Daniel	3
2. Daniel's Central Theme	7
3. Daniels Little Book	19
4. Notes on Revelation 10	27
5. The Historical Chapters of Daniel	37
6. Notes on Daniel 1	45
7. Notes on Daniel 2	53
8. Notes on Daniel 3	63
9. Notes on Daniel 4	81
10. Notes on Daniel 5	91
11. Daniel 5 as the Background to Revelation 16 and 17	101
12. Notes on Daniel 6	111
13. Notes on Daniel 7	117
14. The Jewish View of Tradition	209
15. A Case Study: Mark 7:1-13	217
16. Jesus and Theological Conflict	225
17. The Roman Catholic View of Tradition - Part 1	233
18. The Roman Catholic View of Tradition - Part 2	243
19. Sabbath Controversies and Tradition	253
20. Dies Domini The Horn that Attempted to Change God's Law	263
21. Notes on Daniel 8	293
22. Notes on Daniel 9	327
23. Notes on Daniel 10	367
24. Ellen White's View of Daniel 11	379
25. Notes on Daniel 11 (a work in progress)	387
Contact Secrets Unsealed	459

LESSON #1 – NOTABLE DATES AND EVENTS RELATED TO DANIEL

- **1445 BC:** Israel enters a covenant relationship with God at Mt. Sinai (**Exodus 19:5, 6**).
- **1405 BC:** Israel begins the conquest of the Promised Land after 40 years in the wilderness (the book of Joshua).
- **1000 BC:** Beginning of the Hebrew Monarchy with Saul and David.
- **953 BC:** Temple built by Solomon is dedicated (**2 Chronicles chapters 6 and 7**).
- **931 BC:** Jeroboam causes the split of the tribes of the south (Judah) from the tribes of the north (Israel).
- **723 BC:** Destruction of Samaria by the Assyrians leads to the dispersion of the Ten Tribes of the north. The remnants of the Ten Tribes are the Samaritans of Christ's day.
- **626 BC:** The call of Jeremiah (**Jeremiah 25:3**) begins his ministry that lasts for about 40 years.
- **623 BC:** Birth of Daniel (**2 Chronicles 35:18; in Testimonies for the Church, Volume 4 p. 470** Ellen White affirms that Daniel was 18 when he was taken captive in 605 BC).
- **621 BC:** Josiah's reformation (**2 Chronicles 35:18; Testimonies for the Church, Volume 4 p. 570**) Huldah the prophetess leads Israel in a great reformation when the book of the law is discovered in the temple (**2 Kings 22:14-20**). Daniel grew up during this reformation.
- **612 BC:** Babylon conquers Nineveh, the capital of the waning Assyrian Empire (predicted by the prophecy of Nahum).
- **605 BC:** Daniel and his friends are taken captive to Babylon by King Nebuchadnezzar (**Daniel 1**).
- **605-536 BC:** Jeremiah's prophecy of the 70 year captivity begins and ends (**Jeremiah 25:11, 12**). The book of Lamentations was sung by the Hebrew captives on the way to Babylon and **Psalms 137** was sung by them while in Babylon.
- **597 BC (March 15):** After Judah rebelled and sided with Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem for a second time and Ezekiel was taken captive to Babylon.

- **588-586 BC:** Jerusalem was besieged and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (described in **2 Chronicles 36:15-21**).
- **539 BC:** The fall of Babylon (prophesied in **Jeremiah 50 and 51** and **Isaiah 47** and described in **Daniel 5**).
- **536 BC:** Cyrus issues the decree to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. The Seventy year captivity comes to an end (**605-536 BC**).
- **535-520 BC:** Rebuilding of the temple is suspended due to opposition by the Samaritans.
- **520-515 BC:** The temple rebuilt and finished (described in the books of **Haggai** and **Zechariah**).
- **483 BC:** The story of **Esther**.
- **457 BC:** The decree of King Artaxerxes Longanimus marks the beginning of the seventy weeks and allows the Jews to reestablish its civil and religious institutions.
- **408 BC:** The walls of Jerusalem rebuilt and finished by Nehemiah in troublous times (the book of **Nehemiah**).
- **425 BC:** **Malachi** was the last prophet of the Old Testament but the promise of Elijah to come closes the Old Testament period with a note of hope (**Malachi 4:4, 5**).
- **331 BC:** The kingdom of Persia falls and the kingdom of Greece takes its place in history.
- **168 BC:** The kingdom of Greece falls and the Iron Empire of Rome begins its rule.
- **27 AD (spring and fall):** John the Baptist prepares the way in the spring for the Messiah's anointing in the fall.
- **31 AD:** Messiah is crucified on the 14th day of Nissan at 3 o'clock in the afternoon as the Passover Lamb (**Exodus 12:5, 6; Leviticus 23:5; 1 Corinthians 5:7, 8**).
- **31 AD:** Messiah rests in the tomb on the 15th of Nissan (on the Seventh-day Sabbath as the Unleavened Bread and the Manna; **Leviticus 23:6-8; Acts 2:25-32**).
- **31 AD:** Messiah resurrects on the 16th of Nissan and presents Himself as the first-fruits to His Father at 9 o'clock in the morning (**Leviticus 23:9-14; 1 Corinthians 15:23; Acts 2:15**).
- **31 AD:** (forty days after the resurrection): Jesus ascends to heaven (**Acts 1:9-11**).
- **31 AD: (ten days before Pentecost)** Jesus is invested as High Priest and receives the promise of the Spirit to pour out upon His disciples. Meanwhile the disciples prepare to receive the Spirit in the Upper Room (**Acts 1; Revelation 4; Leviticus 8; Psalm 133**).
- **34 AD:** The stoning of Stephen marks the close of probation for the Jewish theocracy (**Acts 7**).
- **70 AD:** Jerusalem destroyed by the Roman Armies under General Titus (**Daniel 9:26, 27; Luke 19:41-44; Matthew 24:15; Matthew 22:7**).
- **476 AD:** The final fall of the Roman Empire and the beginning of 'divided Rome' (**Daniel 2:41-43**).

- **508 AD:** Clovis King of the Franks lends the help of the civil power to the papacy for the first time. Beginning of the 1290 and 1335 days/years (**Daniel 12:11, 12; 11:31**).
- **538 AD:** The beginning of the 1260 days/years and the dominion of papal Rome (**Daniel 7:25; Revelation 12:14; 13:5**).
- **1798 AD:** The end of the 1260 and the 1290 years marks the conclusion of the first stage of papal dominion.
- **1843 AD:** The end of the 1335 days/years (**Daniel 12:12**).
- **1844 AD:** The beginning of the investigative judgment in heaven in fulfillment of the prophecy of the 2300 days of **Daniel 8:14**.
- **Date Unknown:** Close of human probation (**Daniel 12:1**).

LESSON #2 – DANIEL’S CENTRAL THEME

Ellen White on the Central Theme of Daniel

*“In the annals of human history the growth of nations, the rise and fall of empires, **appear** as dependent on the will and prowess of man. The shaping of events **seems**, to a great degree, to be determined by **his** power, ambition, or caprice. But in the word of God the **curtain is drawn aside**, and we behold, **behind, above, and through all** the play and counterplay of human interests and power and passions, the agencies of the all-merciful One, silently, patiently working out the **counsels of His own will.**” *Education*, p. 173*

Three Key Phrases

Dan 2:20-21: Three key phrases reveal the central theme of the book of Daniel:

*“Daniel answered and said: “Blessed be the name of God forever and ever, for wisdom and might are His. And He [1] **changes the times and the seasons**; He [2] **removes kings and raises up kings**; He [3] **gives wisdom to the wise** and knowledge to those who have understanding.”*

The idea of the ‘change’ of times is found in some very interesting places in the book of Daniel. The word basically means that God is in charge of the historical events of nations and individual persons. In **Daniel 3:28** we are told that the three young Hebrews changed the king’s word (actually God did). In **Daniel 6:8, 17** we are told that the law of the Medes and Persians could not be changed but God changed and overturned it. In **Daniel 4**, when the king was looking forward to many years of prosperity, God changed his plans and made seven times pass over him before he recovered his sanity. **Daniel 7:25** uses the same word to describe the little horn thinking that it could control times. On an individual level the Psalmist exclaimed to God: “My times are in your hand” (**Psalm 31:15**).

Central Theme in Daniel 1

Daniel 1:1, 2: The two sides in the conflict are introduced

- **Two kings:** Jehoiakim versus Nebuchadnezzar
- **Two gods:** Yahweh versus Marduk
- **Two cities:** Babylon versus Jerusalem
- **Two temples:** the temple of God versus the temple of Marduk

- **Two peoples:** The Hebrews versus the Babylonians
- On the surface, Nebuchadnezzar appeared to have the upper hand. He and his god appeared to be more powerful than Jehoiakim and His God. But **Daniel 1:1, 2** removes the veil and shows that Nebuchadnezzar prevailed only because **God allowed it**. It was necessary that Daniel end up in Babylon because God had a very important work for him there:

***Daniel 1:1,2:** “In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came to Jerusalem and besieged it ² And **the Lord gave** Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with some of the articles of the **house of God**, which he carried into the land of Shinar to the **house of his god**; and he brought the articles into the treasure **house of his god**.”*

Change of Diet

Daniel 1:5: The king appoints the diet

The king appeared to have control by **appointing the diet** of Daniel and his friends. This diet differed radically from the original diet that God had appointed in Eden:

Daniel 1:5: “And **the king appointed** for them a daily provision of the king's **delicacies** and of the **wine** which he drank, and three years of training for them, so that at the end of that time they might serve before the king.”

The king attempted to control the diet of Daniel and his friends in this way exhibiting his sovereignty over them. But then Daniel and his friends **refused to eat** his rich food and drink his wine. This refusal on the part of Daniel and his friends reveals that Nebuchadnezzar was **not in full control**.

Daniel 1:8: “But Daniel **purposed in his heart** that he would not **defile himself** with the portion of the king's delicacies, nor with the wine which he drank.”

Change of Names

Daniel 1:7: The king **changed the names** of the Hebrew worthies. In the Bible the name is a revelation of the person's character:

Daniel 1:7: “To them the chief of the eunuchs **gave names**; he gave Daniel the name *Beltshazzar*; to Hananiah, *Shadrach*; to Mishael, *Meshach*; and to Azariah, *Abed-Nego*.”

The king appeared to be in control because he **changed the names** of Daniel and his friends. That the change had an intentional purpose is seen in **Daniel 4:8** where Nebuchadnezzar brags that he changed Daniel's name to Beltshazzar to honor his gods rather than the God of Daniel.

Daniel 5:12 Although the eunuch changed the names he did so because the king instructed him to do so:

Daniel 5:12: *“Inasmuch as an excellent spirit, knowledge, understanding, interpreting dreams, solving riddles, and explaining enigmas were found in this Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar, now let Daniel be called, and he will give the interpretation.”*

Daniel 4:8: *“But at last Daniel came before me (his name is Belteshazzar according to the name of my god).”*

Nebuchadnezzar’s desire to control is revealed in the rest of the book by the fact that the king always refers to the Hebrew worthies by their Babylonian names. But God and the Hebrew worthies employ their Hebrew names.

Change of Education

The king’s desire to exhibit his control is also revealed by the fact that he had the Hebrew worthies enrolled in the educational system of Babylon. He wanted to change their religion and world view by putting them into the school of Babylon with the wise men; but the young men were not buying! Daniel and his friends never used the divination methods of the wise men. In fact, they were hated by the wise men because of their religious principles.

Daniel and his friends made up their minds that they would be faithful to the God of their fathers and God rewarded them by giving them true wisdom from heaven.

Daniel 1:17: *“As for these four young men, God gave them knowledge and skill in all literature and wisdom; and Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams.”*

The result of their faithfulness was apparent: Daniel and his friends were ten times better than all the wise men which ate Babylon’s food and studied in the Babylon’s school. Because of their faithfulness God brought them to prominence in the kingdom.

Central Theme in Daniel 2

God’s control of history is revealed in several details in the story of **Daniel 2**.

First of all, according to **Daniel 2:29**, God was able to read the king’s thoughts when he went to bed:

Daniel 2:29: *“Thoughts came to your mind while on your bed about what would come to pass after this.”*

Because God knew what the king was thinking, He gave him a dream to reveal what he wanted to know.

God then gave the king amnesia. The purpose of the amnesia was to unmask the wise men and reveal before the world that the religion of Babylon was bankrupt and that the religion of Daniel was superior. Daniel did not use the forbidden methods of the wise men. His only method was prayer to God. He did not practice what he was taught in the school of Babylon.

Now that Satan's instruments had been unmasked, Satan took advantage of the situation by acting upon the king's mind to destroy all the wise men and among these were Daniel and his friends. Obviously Satan had seen in these young men a **potential future problem** and he was going to nip the problem in the bud.

God showed that He was in control by **revealing the dream to Daniel** that He had veiled from the king's memory. **God gave** Daniel wisdom to know the dream and its meaning.

As Daniel went before the king to tell him the dream and its meaning, he clearly told the king that the course of **history is controlled by God**:

Daniel 2:37-38: *"You, O king, are a king of kings. For the **God of heaven has given you a kingdom, power, strength, and glory**³⁸ and wherever the children of men dwell, or the beasts of the field and the birds of the heaven, **He has given them into your hand, and has made you ruler over them all** — you are this head of gold."*

According to Daniel's explanation, Nebuchadnezzar did not come to the kingdom because of his superior intelligence or mightier weapons. He became king because **God determined it that way**.

God then showed His sovereignty over human history by revealing how it would flow from Daniel's day until the end of time. Only the One who **knows the future** in advance can mold the course of history to fulfill his plan. Daniel clearly showed the king that **God will have the last word**.

Satan intended to have Daniel and his friends killed along with the wise men but instead, **God brought them** to prominence in the kingdom where they could be in close contact with the king.

The Central Theme in Daniel 3

God had **delineated** in **Daniel 2** the **sequence** of kingdoms that would arise between the days of Nebuchadnezzar and the second coming of Jesus. Nebuchadnezzar did not like the scenario that God had presented and he attempted to **change God's prophetic** scenario—the times. The king was saying: 'History will unfold according to **my scenario. I am in control.**'

There are several links between **Daniel 2 and 3**:

- The word "**gold**" in **Daniel 2 and 3** links the chapters.
- The word "**image**" is identical in both chapters.
- The expression "I have **set up**" is repeatedly used in the chapter (verses **1, 2, 3** [2 times], **5, 7, 12, 14, 15, 18**).
- Remember that in **Daniel 2** God had stated that He was going to "**set up**" his eternal and **indestructible** kingdom (**3:1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 14, 15 and 18**) so the king **set up** an image to announce that his kingdom would be eternal and indestructible.

All the power and control appear to be in the king's hand as the story in **Daniel 3** unfolds. The king **raises the image** in defiance of God's perspective of history. **He commands** everyone to worship the image. All nations, tongues and peoples bow to the king's command. **He utters** a death decree against anyone who fails to recognize his authority. **He heats** the furnace seven times hotter than ever before. **He** has the young men thrown into the furnace.

But the story clearly shows that the power and control of the king are limited. While the whole world follows the order of the king, there is a small remnant of three who contested his supremacy—they were the allies of the God of heaven. The king's power and authority was not absolute. In fact, it is limited because he could not force the young men to worship his image. They refused to recognize the king's perspective of human history. They were loyal to the God of heaven.

The king defiantly claimed to be greater than the God of the Hebrews when he said to them:

Daniel 3:15 (NIV): *"...**What God** shall be able to deliver you from **my** hand?"*

The three young men answered the king:

Daniel 3:16, 17: *"...O Nebuchadnezzar, we have no need to answer you in this matter. ¹⁷ If that is the case, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and **He will deliver us** from your hand, O king."*

Nebuchadnezzar then **exercised his power and control** by heating the furnace seven times hotter and throwing the three young men into the furnace. But God spoke the last word. Christ Himself **interrupted and overturned** the king's power and authority by coming personally into the furnace to deliver His remnant. A key word that appears at critical junctures in the chapter is the word '**deliver**'. In fact we will discover that this word is found only in **Daniel 3, 6 and 11-12**. God is the one who **changes the evil decrees of human kings** and delivers his people from certain death.

At the end of the chapter the king is forced to admit that the **God of Daniel is above all gods**. He is not yet a believer in the one and only God but he is well on his way to becoming a humble child of the heavenly king.

The Central theme in Daniel 4

At the beginning of **chapter 4** King Nebuchadnezzar publicly proclaimed that God is in control of human affairs (**Daniel 4:3**). But at this point the king perceived God as a great wonder worker, not as a personal God who cares about individuals in the flow of history.

Daniel 4:2-3: *"I thought it good to declare the signs and wonders that the Most High God hath wrought for me. ³How great are his signs and how mighty his wonders! **His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom** and his **dominion is from generation to generation.**"*

God gave the king the dream of the tree. As a result the king was disturbed and wished to know the meaning. Amazingly, the king called the same charlatans who had failed him in **chapter 2**

(4:4 7) and whose scheme against the three Hebrew worthies had been brought to nought in chapter 3. This indicates that the king had not yet totally shed his pagan view of God.

According to **Daniel 4:13-17** God had given the kingdom to Nebuchadnezzar and He could take it away from him whenever He pleased:

Daniel 4:13-17: *"I saw in the visions of my head while on my bed, and there was a watcher, a holy one, coming down from heaven. ¹⁴ He cried aloud and said thus: 'Chop down the tree and cut off its branches, strip off its leaves and scatter its fruit. Let the beasts get out from under it, and the birds from its branches. ¹⁵ Nevertheless leave the stump and roots in the earth, bound with a band of iron and bronze, in the tender grass of the field. Let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let him graze with the beasts on the grass of the earth. ¹⁶ Let his heart be changed from that of a man, let him be given the heart of a beast, and let seven times pass over him. ¹⁷ 'This decision is by the decree of the watchers, and the sentence by the word of the holy ones, in order that the living may know that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, gives it to whomever He will, and sets over it the lowest of men.'"*

The king then admitted that the Spirit of the holy God was in Daniel and that God had revealed dreams to Daniel. (**Daniel 4:18**)

When Daniel provided the interpretation to the dream in verses **24-27**, he explained that the watchers would remove him from the throne and after his repentance they would restore him to it:

Daniel 4:24---27: *" . . . this is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the Most High, which has come upon my lord the king: ²⁵ They shall drive you from men, your dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make you eat grass like oxen. They shall wet you with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over you, till you know that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomever He chooses. ²⁶ "And inasmuch as they gave the command to leave the stump and roots of the tree, your kingdom shall be assured to you, after you come to know that Heaven rules. ²⁷ Therefore, O king, let my advice be acceptable to you; break off your sins by being righteous, and your iniquities by showing mercy to the poor. Perhaps there may be a lengthening of your prosperity."*

About a year after his dream, the king looked upon the greatness of Babylon and came to the conclusion that it was built because of his greatness and power and for the honor of his majesty.

Daniel 4:29, 30: *"At the end of the twelve months he was walking about the royal palace of Babylon. ³⁰ The king spoke, saying, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for a royal dwelling by my mighty power and for the honor of my majesty?"*

Daniel 4:31-33: God is doing this through the instrumentality of the watchers who are His messengers. In **Daniel 4:31-33** we find a consistent use of passive verbs. The king's insanity is due to what God through the watchers does to him. While the king thought that he was in full

control of his destiny and looked forward to many years of prosperity, the God who controls the times withdrew his reasoning powers for seven years.

Daniel 4:31-33: *"While the word was still in the king's mouth, a **voice fell from heaven**: "King Nebuchadnezzar, to you **it is spoken**: the kingdom **has departed** from you! ³² And **they** shall drive you from men, and your dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field. **They** shall make you eat grass like oxen; and seven times shall pass over you, **until you know** that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to **whomever He chooses**." ³³ That very hour the **word was fulfilled** concerning Nebuchadnezzar; he **was driven** from men and ate grass like oxen; his body was wet with the dew of heaven till his hair had grown like eagles' feathers and his nails like birds' claws."*

Ellen White comments:

*"The jewel of the **mind**, that which **elevates man above the beasts**, he no longer retained. The scepter is no longer held in the hand of a proud and powerful monarch. The mighty ruler is a **maniac**. He now herds with the cattle to eat as they eat. He is a companion of the beasts of the field. The brow that once wore a coronet is disfigured by the **absence of reason and intellect**."*
Testimonies for the Church, Volume 8 p. 127

It is nothing short of miraculous that the king survived in this condition for seven years. In antiquity, whenever a king showed the least weakness there were always those who wanted to knock him off and usurp the throne. But God preserved it secure for him while he was 'out of it'. Thus, **God placed him** on the throne, God **removed him** from the throne and **God restored** him to it once more.

Daniel 4:34-37 reveals that the king learned the lesson that God wished to teach him. When he looked **at himself** he lost his sanity but when he looked **up to God in heaven** he regained it:

Daniel 4:34-37: *"And at the end of the time I, Nebuchadnezzar, **lifted my eyes to heaven**, and my **understanding returned** to me; and I **blessed** the Most High and **praised** and **honored Him** who lives forever: For His **dominion** is an everlasting dominion, and **His kingdom** is from generation to generation. ³⁵ All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; He does **according to His will** in the **army of heaven** and among the **inhabitants of the earth**. No one can restrain His hand or say to Him: "What have You done?" ³⁶ At the same time my **reason returned** to me, and for the glory of my kingdom, my honor and splendor **returned to me**. My counselors and nobles resorted to me, I **was restored** to my kingdom, and excellent majesty **was added** to me. ³⁷ Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, all of whose works are truth, and His ways justice. And those who walk in pride **He is able** to abase."*

The Central Theme in Daniel 5

Daniel 5 describes a great banquet that King Belshazzar organized for all his nobles. Why was King Belshazzar having a party when he knew that the Medes and Persians had the city surrounded at that very moment? The reason is that he was certain that the city was invincible. He was sure that Babylon, with its massive walls and protecting river would never fall!!

Daniel 5:5: God, through a watcher wrote on the wall decreeing the close of probation for Babylon. God sets up kingdoms and God decrees their fall when they fail to fulfill His purpose:

Daniel 5:5: *"In the same hour the fingers of a man's hand appeared and wrote opposite the lampstand on the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote."*

The watchers are heavenly angels through whom God fulfills His purpose on earth. Ellen White explains that they watch and write down the actions of human beings (**Christ's Object Lessons, p. 175**), they watch heaven's gates (**Christ's Object Lessons, p. 373**), they see the earth filled with corruption and violence (**Christian Service, p. 53**) they shield the righteous from the power of the wicked one (**The Great Controversy, p. 512, 513**), our prayers find access to the Father in heaven through the watchers (**In Heavenly Places, p. 84**) and guardian angels are called watchers (**My Life Today, p. 302**).

Daniel 5:7-8: The wise men could not understand the meaning of the writing on the wall. They could read the words (see my notes on **Daniel 5**) but they did not understand what they meant. Only the God who had written on the wall could reveal what the words meant and Daniel was needed to interpret the writing:

Daniel 5:7, 8: *"The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers. The king spoke, saying to the wise men of Babylon, "Whoever reads this writing, and tells me its interpretation shall be clothed with purple and have a chain of gold around his neck; and he shall be the third ruler in the kingdom."⁸ Now all the king's wise men came, but they could not read the writing, or make known to the king its interpretation."*

Daniel 5:12: According to the queen mother what the wise men could not do, Daniel could because God had given him wisdom:

Daniel 5:12: *"Inasmuch as an excellent spirit, knowledge, understanding, interpreting dreams, solving riddles, and explaining enigmas were found in this Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar, now let Daniel be called, and he will give the interpretation."*

Daniel made it clear to the king that the God of heaven had given him the kingdom:

Daniel 5:18: *"O king, the Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar your father a kingdom and majesty, glory and honor"*

In **Daniel 5:19-21** we once more encounter a series of passive verbs that reveal that historical events are being guided and determined by an invisible hand:

Daniel 5:19-21: *"And because of the majesty that He gave him, all peoples, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him. Whomever he wished, he executed; whomever he wished, he kept alive; whomever he wished, he set up; and whomever he wished, he put down.²⁰ But when his heart was lifted up, and his spirit was hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him.²¹ Then he was driven from the sons of men, his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild donkeys. They fed him*

with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till he knew that the **Most High God rules** in the kingdom of men, and appoints over it **whomever He chooses**.”

In **Daniel 5:23**, the prophet informed the king that **God was the source** of his very breath and that **He owned** all his ways:

Daniel 5:23: “. . . and the God who **holds your breath in His hand** and **owns all your ways**, you have not glorified.”

Daniel 5:24: The words written on the wall by a heavenly Watcher pronounced the doom of Babylon. Notice that God’s hand did not write on the wall. **God sent** the hand to write on the wall:

Daniel 5:24: “Then the fingers of the hand **were sent from Him**, and this writing was written.”

Daniel 5:26-28: **God took away** Belshazzar’s kingdom and gave it to the Medes and Persians. Once again one is struck by use of the **passive verbs**. There is someone **behind the scenes** who is choreographing history.

Daniel 5:26-28: “This is the interpretation of each word. Mene: **God has numbered** your kingdom, and finished it; ²⁷ Tekel: You **have been weighed** in the balances, and found wanting; ²⁸ Peres: Your kingdom **has been divided, and given** to the Medes and Persians.”

Daniel 5:30-31: God’s decree was fulfilled on that very night. **God removed** the king from the throne and gave the kingdom to the Medes and Persians:

Daniel 5:30-31: “**That very night** Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, was slain. ³¹ And Darius the Mede received the kingdom, being about sixty-two years old. “

The Central Theme in Daniel 6

In this chapter we find a group of evil princes who are envious of Daniel and wish to have him killed. The **princes believed** that they were in control because the decrees of the Medes and Persians could not be changed. The king exhibited **his power and authority** by issuing a decree. But after giving the decree he was bound by it and could not deliver Daniel. It was seen that the king’s power and authority were limited because he was bound by his own law (**Daniel 6:7, 8**). His power was not absolute. The irrevocable decree that was supposed to reveal the power of the king actually bound him and made him a slave of circumstances.

All the power seemed to be in the hands of Daniel’s enemies. By all appearances, the prophet would become cat food. But Daniel prayed to his God because he knew that He was in control. He was not afraid of the lions because he knew that God created them and therefore He could deliver him from them (**Daniel 6:10**).

The king who had **exercised his power** in giving the law was now **powerless** to deliver Daniel. The king realized that he was not in control at all. If Daniel was going to be delivered a **king greater than he** would have to do it. The king did all in his power to deliver Daniel but was not

able to do it **Daniel 6:14**). The wise men reminded the king that his decree **could not be changed Daniel 6:15**). When the king lost all hope of helping Daniel he said to the prophet: *“Your God, whom you serve continually, He will deliver you.” (Daniel 6:16)* The word ‘changed’ in verses 14-17 is significant. This is the same word that is used in **Daniel 3:28** where Nebuchadnezzar confessed that the God of heaven changed his plans. It is the same word that is used in **Daniel 7:25** where the little horn attempted to take control of the times and the seasons. It is the same word that is found in **Daniel 2:21** where we are told that God is in control of the times and the seasons (see also **Acts 1:7**). The king’s counselors boasted that the decree could not be changed but the God of Daniel changed their evil plans and delivered his prophet. God then closed the mouths of the lions that He had created. All night the lions behaved as little kitty cats! (**Daniel 6:18-22**) while the king worried and fretted.

Early in the morning the king came to the lion’s den and cried out: *‘Has the **God whom you serve** continually been able to deliver you?’* the answer was immediate: *‘Yes, God has delivered me because I was found innocent before him and I have done you no wrong.’*

God then **removed His control** over the lions and they devoured the princes who had planned the evil plot. (**Daniel 6:24**).

At the conclusion of chapter 6 we find a beautiful confession of the king extolling the God of Daniel:

Daniel 6:26-27: *“I make a decree that in every dominion of my kingdom men must tremble and fear before the God of Daniel. For **He is** the living God, and steadfast forever; **His kingdom** is the one which shall not be destroyed, and **His dominion** shall endure to the end. ²⁷ **He delivers** and rescues, and **He works signs and wonders** in heaven and on earth, who has delivered Daniel from the power of the lions.”*

The Central Theme in Daniel 7

This chapter follows the same sequence as **Daniel 2**. God is in control of history because He can reveal how it will transpire: Basically God is saying: “This is the way that history will unfold.”

Daniel 7 is full of **passive verbs** that reveal that there is a power behind the curtain of history that is guiding human affairs:

Daniel 7:4: The lion

*“The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings. I watched till its wings **were** plucked off; and it **was** lifted up from the earth and **made** to stand on two feet like a man, and a man's heart **was given** to it.”*

Daniel 7:5: The bear

*“And suddenly another beast, a second, like a bear. It was raised up on one side, and had three ribs in its mouth between its teeth. And **they** [presumably the watchers] **said** thus to it: 'Arise, devour much flesh!’*

Daniel 7:6: The leopard

*"After this I looked, and there was another, like a leopard, which had on its back four wings of a bird. The beast also had four heads, and dominion **was given** to it."*

Daniel 7:7: The dragon beast

"After this I saw in the night visions, and behold, a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, exceedingly strong. It had huge iron teeth; it was devouring, breaking in pieces, and trampling the residue with its feet. It was different from all the beasts that were before it, and it had ten horns."

Daniel 7:25: The little horn

*"He shall speak pompous words against the Most High, shall persecute the saints of the Most High, and shall intend to change times and law. Then the saints **shall be given** into his hand for a time and times and half a time."*

The little horn appeared to be in control. It thought it could change the times and the law, it blasphemed God, it persecuted the saints and things seemed to go well for it because we are told that **it prospered**. This is the reason why the martyrs cry out for justice in **Revelation 6:9-11**. But God puts a time limit on the work of the little horn. God decrees that it will only be able to exercise control for a time, and times and the dividing of time.

Three times in **Daniel 7** we are told that after the little horn does its work, the court will sit in heaven and **God will take dominion away** from the little horn and give it to the saints of the Most High (**Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14; Daniel 7:21, 22; Daniel 7:25-27**). Thus the evil work of the little horn on earth will be judged in the heavenly court after which the little horn will be destroyed and the kingdom will be given to the saints.

Notice the passive voice of the verbs: Jesus **was brought** by the angels before the Ancient of Days and then the kingdom **was given** to Jesus (**Daniel 7:14**), "*judgment **was made in favor** of the saints*" (**Daniel 7:22**). The **watchers took away** the little horn's dominion and then the kingdom **shall be given** to the saints of the Most High.

LESSON #3 – DANIEL'S LITTLE BOOK

Two Books in one

A careful examination of the book of Daniel reveals that it is composed of **two books** within one book. One is **Daniel 1-7** and the other is **Daniel 8-12**.

Briefly review the **chiastic structure** of **Daniel 1-7**.

Review **Daniel 7** with the emphasis on the **succession of powers**:

- Babylon
- Medo-Persia
- Greece
- Roman Empire
- Roman Empire divided
- Ecclesiastical Rome (**538-1798**)

Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14: After all of these powers have ruled, the **next event** in the sequence is a judgment that takes place **in heaven**. The idea that the judgment would take place in **two stages** (**investigative** in heaven and **executive** on earth) was **not understood** before **the time of the end**.

Daniel 7:9, 10, 13, 14: "I watched till thrones were **put in place** and the **Ancient of Days was seated**; His garment was white as snow and the hair of His head was like pure wool. His **throne was a fiery flame, its wheels a burning fire**; ¹⁰ A **fiery stream issued [the angelic hosts]** and came forth from before Him. A thousand thousands ministered to Him; ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him. The **court was seated** and the **books were opened**... ¹³ "I was watching in the night visions and behold, One like the Son of Man, **coming with the clouds of heaven**! He came **to the Ancient of Days** and **they [the angels]** brought Him near before Him. ¹⁴ **Then** to Him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve Him. His dominion is an **everlasting dominion**, which shall not pass away and His kingdom the one which shall not be destroyed."

Daniel 7 clearly reveals that the judgment is composed of **two stages**: **Investigative** in heaven and **executive** on earth.

The Book that was sealed

Daniel 12:4:

"But you, Daniel, **shut up** the words and **seal** the **book until** [there is a time limit to its being sealed] the time of the end; [but at the time of the end] many shall **run to and fro**, and **knowledge** [of the contents of the book that was sealed] shall increase."

The book which was sealed and could not be understood until the time of the end (**Daniel 12:4, 9**) is **not the ENTIRE** book of Daniel but rather the **portion** that has to do with the **2300 day prophecy** and the **judgment hour** message.

Six Reasons why the Little Book is Daniel 8-12

Reason #1:

The introduction to the book of Daniel is in **Hebrew**. But beginning in chapter 2 and until the end of chapter 7 the language shifts to **Aramaic**. Then in chapters 8-12 the language shifts again to **Hebrew**. Thus, the first half of Daniel is in one language and the other half is in another language. This indicates that the book of Daniel is divided into two parts.

Reason #2:

There is evidence that Daniel, chapters 1-7, **was almost entirely understood long before** the "time of the end", Notice the words of the church father **Hippolytus** who wrote in the **third century** A. D.

*"In speaking of a 'lioness from the sea', he [Daniel] meant the rising of the kingdom of **Babylon** and that this was the 'golden head of the image' . . . Then after the lioness he sees a second beast, 'like a bear', which signified the **Persians**. For after the Babylonians the Persians obtain the power. And in saying that 'it had three ribs in its mouth', he pointed to the three nations, Persians, Medes, and Babylonians, which were expressed in the image by the silver after the gold. Then comes the third beast, 'a leopard', which means the **Greeks**; for after the Persians,*

*Alexander of Macedon had the power, when Darius was overthrown, which was also indicated by the brass in the image. And in saying that the beast 'had four wings of a fowl, and four heads', he showed most clearly how the **kingdom of Alexander was parted into four divisions**. For in speaking of four heads, he meant the four kings that arose out of it. For Alexander, when dying, divided his kingdom into four parts. Then he says, 'the fourth beast (was) dreadful and terrible: it had iron teeth, and claws of brass'. Who, then, are meant by this but the **Romans**, whose kingdom, the kingdom that still stands, is expressed by the iron? 'For', says he, 'its legs are of iron.'" L. E. Froom, **The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers**, volume 1, p. 272*

He also has something to say about the identity of the little horn and the judgment:

*"Let us look at what is before us more carefully, and scan it, as it were, with open eye. The '**golden head** of the image' is identical with the '**lioness**', by which the **Babylonians** were*

represented. 'The golden shoulders and arms of silver' are the same with the 'bear', by which the Persians and Medes are meant. 'The belly and thighs of brass' are the 'leopard', by which the Greeks who ruled from Alexander onwards are intended. The 'legs of iron' are the 'dreadful and terrible beast', by which the Romans who hold the empire now are meant. The 'toes of clay and iron' are the 'ten horns' which are to be. The 'one other little horn springing up in their midst is the 'antichrist'. The stone that 'smites the image and breaks it in pieces', and that filled the whole earth, is Christ, who comes from heaven and brings judgment on the world.'" L. E. Froom, The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, volume 1, p. 272

It will be noticed that Hippolytus understood everything about **Daniel 7** except the investigative pre-Advent judgment. For him the judgment would take place when Jesus came from heaven to earth to establish His everlasting kingdom.

Notably, even some portions of **Daniel 8-12** that were fulfilled before the time of the end could be understood before that time.

Certainly the meaning of the Ram and the he-goat of **Daniel 8** were understood before the time of the end as was the prophecy of the seventy weeks. Much of the earlier portions of **Daniel 11** could be understood before the time of the end. In fact, the pagan philosopher, Porphry argued against the early church fathers that the first half of **Daniel 11** described so precisely Greek and Roman history that it had to have been written *ex-eventu* in the second century but panned off as the work of the prophet Daniel in the sixth century.

But there is one aspect of **Daniel 8-12** that could not be understood by anyone until the time of the end. The message concerning the 2300 days and the judgment were sealed until the time of the end.

Reason #3:

Ellen White explicitly states more than once that the book which was sealed until the time of the end was not the entirety of the book of Daniel but rather the PORTION or PART of the book (the portion which is in Hebrew) that has to do with the judgment as depicted in the 2300 day prophecy.

"In the Revelation all the books of the Bible meet and end. Here is the complement of the book of Daniel. One is a prophecy; the other a revelation. The book that was sealed is not the Revelation, but that portion of the prophecy of Daniel relating to the last days. The angel commanded, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end." Daniel 12:4." Acts of the Apostles, p. 585

"The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message [the first angel's message] is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment had come. The prophecies present a succession of events leading down to the opening of the judgment. This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But that part of his prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal "to the time of the end." Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on the fulfillment of these prophecies. But at the time of the

end, says the prophet, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." **Daniel 12:4.**" **The Great Controversy**, p. 355

"The words of the angel to Daniel relating to the **last days** were to be understood in the **time of the end**. At that time, "many shall run to and fro, and **knowledge shall be increased**."...¹⁰ "The wicked shall do wickedly: and **none of the wicked shall understand**; but the **wise shall understand**." **Daniel 12:4, 10 The Desire of Ages**, p. 234

"The unsealing of the little book was the **message in relation to time**." **Manuscript Releases**, volume 1, p. 99

"Honored by men with the responsibilities of state and with the secrets of kingdoms bearing universal sway, Daniel was honored by God as His ambassador, and was given many revelations of the mysteries of ages to come. His wonderful prophecies, as recorded by him in **chapters 7 to 12** of the book bearing his name, **were not fully understood even by the prophet himself**; but before his life labors closed, he was given the blessed assurance that "**at the end of the days**"-- in the **closing period of this world's history**--he would again be permitted to stand in his lot and place. **It was not given him to understand all that God had revealed of the divine purpose**. ...**Daniel 12:4**: "Shut up the words, and seal the book," he was directed concerning his prophetic writings; these were to be sealed...⁴ "**even to the time of the end**."...⁹ "Go thy way, Daniel," the angel once more directed the faithful messenger of Jehovah; "for the words are closed up and sealed till **the time of the end**". . .¹³ "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot **at the end of the days**." **Daniel 12:4, 9, 13 Prophets and Kings**, p. 547

Reason #4:

The **internal evidence** that is found in **Daniel 8-12** proves beyond any doubt that this is the little book that was sealed until the time of the end. Let's take these chapters, **one by one** to see how their content is closely linked with the **2300 days** and the **judgment**:

Daniel 8:

In this chapter the historical framework of the 2300 day prophecy is **introduced**:

- The **Ram** with **two horns**: Begins in the time of the kingdom of **Medo-Persia**.
- The **He-goat** with a **notable horn**: Represents the kingdom of **Greece** and its first king, **Alexander** the Great.
- The **Four horns**: Represent the **four divisions** of **Alexander's Empire** after his death.
- The **Little horn** (first stage): **Pagan Rome** first extends **horizontally** on earth to the south, the east and the glorious land.
- The **Little horn** (second stage): **Papal Rome** extends **vertically** to heaven and interferes with Christ's work in the **heavenly sanctuary**.
- This **vision** [*chazon*] will extend over a period of **2300** days/years and **then** the process of **cleansing** the sanctuary **will begin**.

Four Differences

Although the prophecy of **Daniel 8** is parallel to the ones in **Daniel 2 and 7**, there are **four differences**:

- First, while in **Daniel 2** and **Daniel 7** the prophetic series **begins** with the **kingdom of Babylon** (the gold and the lion) in **Daniel 8** (although it is dated to the reign of Belshazzar) there is **no symbol for the kingdom of Babylon**. The **traditional argument** given for this difference is that the kingdom of Babylon was **about to pass away**. But the **date given** for this chapter (**550 BC**) indicates that the kingdom of Babylon would not pass away for another **twelve years**.
- Second, in contrast to **Daniel 7**, the beasts that are used in **Daniel 8** are **domestic sanctuary animals**. The **ram** was used in the **daily service** while the **he-goat** was used in the **yearly service**. This strongly hints that the **central theme** of **Daniel 8** is the **daily** and **yearly** services of the sanctuary.
- Third, there is only **one symbol** in **Daniel 8** for both **pagan** and **papal** Rome, a little horn. The horn first spreads out **horizontally** [east, south, glorious land] and then **vertically** to heaven. In other words, it first extends politically and then religiously. It is rather clear that the **introduction of another beast** into **Daniel 8** to represent pagan Rome would have **spoiled** the **symmetry of the chapter** which emphasizes the two beasts of the sanctuary service. By using only one horn for the two stages of Rome God wants us to understand that Rome would morph from a mere political kingdom into a political/religious one. This idea is brought out in **Daniel 11:31** where ‘forces’ stand up to aid in the taking away of the daily and the setting up of the ‘abomination of desolation’.
- Fourth, there is **no reference** in **Daniel 8** to the establishment of **Christ’s everlasting kingdom**. This is due to the fact that Daniel **got sick** before Gabriel was able to explain the **meaning** of the cleansing of the sanctuary (**Daniel 8:26, 27**). This is the reason why **Gabriel came back** in **Daniel 9-12** to explain the things that had **remained unexplained** in chapter 8.

Daniel 9: Is related to the 2300 day prophecy by providing its starting point.

Daniel 8 mentions the 2300 day prophecy but does not provide a **starting point**. But in **chapter 9** the **starting point** for the 2300 days is given. They will begin with the ...**Daniel 9:25**: ‘going forth of the command to restore and build Jerusalem.’ This decree was given in the year 457 BC by the Persian King Artaxerxes. The seventy weeks constitute the **first 490 years** of the 2300 day prophecy and those years **begin** during the kingdom of **Persia**. This is the real reason why the kingdom of **Babylon is not mentioned** in **Daniel 8** because the 2300 days do not begin during the kingdom of Babylon but during the kingdom of Persia.

Daniel 10:

In order for the prophecy of the 2300 days **to begin its fulfillment** it was necessary for the **kings of Persia** to give **certain decrees** for Israel to go back to their land and rebuild their **temple, city, walls and to restore** a functioning **Hebrew theocracy**.

Satan (who is described as the prince of Persia) **knew this** and therefore he worked on the **minds of the Persian kings** to try and **prevent them** from allowing Israel to return to their land.

- If Israel **did not return**. . .
- The temple, the city and the walls would **not be rebuilt**.
- A **functioning theocracy** would not be reestablished.
- The Seventy Week prophecy would not begin.
- The prophecy of the **2300 days** could not begin to be fulfilled.
- God's timeline would be frustrated.
- But in the end, **Michael** came to **help Gabriel** and the decrees were given **right in time** for the **seventy week prophecy** and the **2300 days** to begin right on schedule.

When the events of **Daniel 10** transpired, Cyrus had just given the decree for the Jews to return to the land to rebuild the temple. However, there were storm clouds on the horizon. Opposition from the Samaritans soon led King Cambyses to revoke the decree that Cyrus had given and as a result, the work of building the temple was suspended. Later on (in the year 520 BC, Darius I had to reaffirm the original decree by Cyrus and as a result the Jews were able to finish the temple.

Daniel 11:1-12:3:

- Now that which was begun and not finished in **Daniel 8** will be **completed in chapter 11**.
- It is important to note that the last vision in the book of Daniel was the one in chapter 8. Beginning with chapter 9 we have only additional explanations to the vision of Daniel 8. **Daniel 11** does not contain a new vision but rather a further explanation of the vision of **Daniel 8**.
- As in **Daniel 8**, the explanation of **Daniel 11** begins during the kingdom of **Persia** (not Babylon).
- The explanation continues with **Greece**, its **first king** and the **four divisions** after Alexander's death.
- The explanation continues with **pagan** Rome, the power that **broke the Prince** of the Covenant.
- The description then moves on to **papal Rome** during the 1260 years, a power that spoke **great words against God**, **slew the saints**, took away the **daily** and set up the **abomination of desolation**.

- The chapter next takes us to the period (verses 40-45) when the **King of the North** (the little horn or beast) **recovers its power** after being **wounded** (in 1798 AD). The resurrected power overwhelms the world and puts the very **existence of the remnant** in jeopardy.
- **Daniel 8** took us from the time of the kingdom of Persia **to the end of the 2300 days in 1844** when the **judgment began**, but **Daniel 11** takes us all the way from Persia to the **end of that judgment** and the **close of probation** (**Daniel 12:1**: the standing up of Michael).
- Finally, **Daniel 12:2, 3** takes us to the time when God's people will resurrect and inherit the **everlasting kingdom** and the righteous will **shine as stars** forever and ever.

Daniel 12:4

The book about the **2300 days and the judgment** is then **sealed** until the time of the end.

Daniel 12:5-13: This section of Daniel does **not begin a new vision** but is rather to be understood as the **epilogue** of the book. These verses provide a summary review and **further explanation** of the **key time periods** that were mentioned in **Daniel 7-12**.

Reason #5: The key word that links **Daniel 8-12** is 'understand'

- **8:16**: An order to Gabriel to help Daniel understand.
- **8:17**: Gabriel instructs Daniel to understand.
- **8:27**: Daniel did not understand.
- **9:1, 2**: Daniel understood the 70 year prophecy.
- **9:23**: Gabriel tells Daniel to understand the vision.
- **10:1**: Daniel understood the thing.
- **10:11, 12** and **13**: Gabriel comes to help Daniel understand.
- **12:12**: The wise shall understand.

Reason #6

- The opening of the little book in **Revelation 10** is a clear reference to the moment when the little book of **Daniel 8-12** was **unsealed and opened**. Notably, the little book of **Revelation 10** is opened at the beginning of the **sixth trumpet** toward the very end of history immediately before **Jesus takes over the kingdom** at the time of the seventh trumpet (**Revelation 11:15-18**). The angel who came from heaven announced that time would be no longer because the prophecy of the 2300 days had reached its fulfillment (**Revelation 10:6**) and prophetic times had come to an end.
- Concerning the unsealing of the little book, Ellen White remarks:
- *"It was the Lion of the tribe of Judah who **unsealed the book** and **gave to John the revelation of what should be in these last days**. Daniel stood in his lot to bear his testimony, which was sealed until the time of the end, when the **first angel's message** should be proclaimed to our world. These matters are of infinite importance in these last*

days, but while "many shall be purified, and made white, and tried," "the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand." . . . The book of Daniel is unsealed in the revelation to John, and carries us forward to the last scenes of this earth's history.
Manuscript Releases, volume 18, p. 15

- We shall find in our next study that no chapter in the Bible explains in a clearer way the **origin, message, mission** and **destiny** of God's end-time remnant people.
- It is no coincidence that the **central message** of the Millerites who preached at the **beginning of the time of the end** was drawn from **Daniel 8:14** and **Revelation 14:6, 7**.
- The **eating of the little book** in **Revelation 10** clearly describes the **judgment hour study and preaching** of the Millerite movement and its subsequent **disappointment**. After the disappointment John was told to **prophecy again** and then he was commanded to **measure the temple**. In other words, after the disappointment God's people were called upon to **present another message** from the little book of Daniel and that message had to do with the **measuring of the heavenly temple** which is the investigative judgment (see the notes on **Revelation 10** that follow. For a fuller exposition of the relationship between the little book of Daniel and the open book of **Revelation 10** see the notes that follow.

LESSON #4 – NOTES ON REVELATION 10 (Related to Daniel 12:4)

Introduction

There is no passage in Scripture that better portrays the **origin, message** and **mission** of the Seventh-day Adventist Church than **Revelation 10**. Let's read the passage highlighting certain important words and expressions:

*Revelation 10:1-11, 11:1: "I saw still another **mighty angel** coming down from heaven, clothed with a **cloud**. And a **rainbow** was on his head; his face was like the **sun**, and his feet like **pillars of fire**.² He had a **little book open** [having been opened] in his hand. And he set his **right foot** on the sea and his **left foot** on the land,³ and cried with a loud voice, as when a **lion roars**. When he cried out, **seven thunders** uttered their voices.⁴ Now when the seven thunders uttered their voices, I was **about to write**; but I heard a voice from heaven saying to me, "**Seal up** the things which the seven thunders uttered, and do not write them."⁵ The angel whom I saw standing on the sea and on the land raised up his hand to heaven⁶ and **swore** by Him who lives forever and ever, who created heaven and the things that are in it, the earth and the things that are in it, and the sea and the things that are in it, that there should be **delay no longer**,⁷ **but** in the days of the sounding of the seventh angel, when he is **about to sound**, the **mystery of God** would be **finished**, as He declared to His servants the prophets.⁸ Then the voice which I heard from heaven spoke to me again and said, "Go, take the little book which is open in the hand of the angel who stands on the sea and on the earth."⁹ So I went to the angel and said to him, "Give me the little book." And he said to me: "**Take and eat it**; and it will make your stomach bitter, but it will be as sweet as honey in your mouth."¹⁰ Then I took the little book out of the angel's hand and ate it, and it was as sweet as honey in my mouth. But when I had eaten it, my stomach became bitter.¹¹ And he said to me, "You must **prophesy again** about many peoples, nations, tongues, and kings." Then I was given a reed like a **measuring rod**. And the angel stood, saying: "Rise and **measure the temple of God**, the altar, and those who worship there."*

Summary of the little book episode

At the **very center** of the chapter is the **mighty angel**:

- He **comes down** from heaven to the earth (**verse 1**).
- His **physical characteristics** are described (**verse 1**).
- He brings an **open scroll** in his hand (**verse 2**).

- He places one **foot** on dry land and the other on the sea (**verse 2**).
- He speaks with the **roar of the lion** which echoes like seven **thunders** (**verses 3-4**).
- He swears the **oath** to the Creator (**verses 5-7**).
- He **gives the book** to John with instructions (**verses 8-10**).
- He instructs John to **prophecy again** (**verse 11**).
- He commands John to **measure the temple** (**11:1**).

Who is this Angel Messenger?

Jesus Himself is the Messenger of **Revelation 10** therefore the message must be **extremely important**.

- This is not just any angel, He is a **mighty angel**.
- His **Face** like the sun [**Revelation. 1:16**].
- He is surrounded by a **cloud**.
- His feet are like **pillars** of fire.
- He roars like a **lion**.
- He has a **Rainbow** over His head.

*“As the bow in the cloud results from the union of sunshine and shower, so the bow above God’s throne represents the **union of His mercy and His justice**. To the sinful but repentant soul God says: Live thou; “I have found a ransom.” **Job 33:24**. Education, p. 115*

“The mighty angel who instructed John was no less a personage than Jesus Christ.” Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Vol 9, p. 971

“The instruction to be communicated to John was so important that Christ came from heaven to give it to His servant, telling him to send it to the churches.” Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Vol. 7 pp. 953, 954

The identity of the Book

Only **one book** was ever **sealed** in the Old Testament to be **opened** at the time of the end:

Daniel 12:4: *“But you, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book **until the time of the end**; many [eyes] shall run to and fro, and knowledge [of the book] shall increase.”*

Revelation 10:2 describes the opening of the book of Daniel 12:4. The translations do not really capture the perfect tense of the verb. The Greek literally reads: “the book, the one **having been opened**.” This clearly indicates that the book was **closed** and then it was **opened immediately before** the angel came down from heaven to the earth and **swore the oath** that time would be no longer.

The unsealing of the little book is the explanation of the **prophetic message** of **Daniel 8-12**, especially relating to the **2300 days**:

*"The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment had come. The prophecies present a succession of events leading down to the opening of the judgment. This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But **that part of his prophecy** which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal "to the time of the end." Not till we reach this time could a message **concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on the fulfillment of these prophecies**. But at the time of the end, says the prophet, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." **Daniel 12:4. The Great Controversy, p. 356***

When was the Book Unsealed?

The book was opened for people to study and proclaim when the sixth angel blew his trumpet. The book will be sealed once again when the seventh angel is **about to blow** his trumpet and the mystery of God is finished. At that time probation will have closed and a message from the book would no longer do any good because all cases have been decided in the judgment for life or for death (see **Revelation 22:10-12**). When the seventh angel blows his trumpet, Jesus takes over the kingdoms of the world. Thus the book is opened when the sixth trumpet begins to sound and will be closed when the seventh is about to sound.

Thus we have the following sequence:

- **Daniel 12:4**: From Daniel's day till 1798: The judgment hour message in the little book was sealed and closed (could not be understood).
- **Revelation 10; 22:10**: In 1798 when the sixth angel began to blow his trumpet, the book was opened and the judgment hour message was understood and proclaimed.
- **Revelation 22:11**: When the seventh angel is about to blow his trumpet, the Mystery of God is finished and probation closes: The book is closed once more because all cases have been decided and a message from the book would do no good.
- **Revelation 11:15-17; 22:12**: The seventh angel then blows his trumpet: Jesus comes to take over the kingdom.

Global Extension

The **global extension** of the message from the little book is represented **symbolically** at the beginning of the chapter (feet on the sea and on the land) and **literally** at the **end of the chapter** (prophesying again to every nation, tongue and kings).

*"The message of **Revelation 14**, proclaiming that the hour of God's judgment is come, is given in the time of the end; and the angel of **Revelation 10** is represented as having **one foot on the sea** and **one foot on the land**, showing that the message will be carried to distant lands, the ocean will be crossed, and the islands of the sea will hear the proclamation of the last message of warning to our world." **Selected Messages, Vol 2, pp. 107, 108***

The message of judgment would be proclaimed to the **old world** and the **new world**. The act of planting the feet means staking claim to the land (see **Joshua 1:3**).

The Seven Thunders

John 12:27 - 29: Thunder is identified as God delivering a message. The **peals of thunder** are simply the **echo of God's voice**:

*"Now My soul is troubled, and what shall I say? 'Father, save Me from this hour'? But for this purpose I came to this hour. ²⁸ Father, glorify Your name." Then a voice came from heaven, saying, "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again." ²⁹ Therefore the people who stood by and heard it said that it had **thundered**. Others said, "An **angel** has spoken to Him."*

The seven thunders utter their voice **immediately preceding the oath** so they must have something to do with events **leading up to the time** when the angel swears the oath. If the oath is sworn in 1844 then the thunders must have something to do with events leading up to 1844. In fact, the seven thunders announced events that transpired between 1842 and 1844. They uttered that there would be a disappointment leading up to 1844.

John **understood** what the voice of God uttered but he was **forbidden** from writing it. In other words, the message delivered by this angel was **given to John**, he understood it and was about to write it out but the angel commanded him to seal it. Ellen White has some perceptive remarks about the sealing of the seven thunders:

*"I saw the people of God joyful in expectation, looking for their Lord. But God designed to prove them. **His hand covered a mistake in the reckoning of the prophetic periods [this is the same as the sealing of the seven thunders. If John had written down what the thunders said the people would not have been disappointed]**. Those who were looking for their Lord did not discover this mistake and the most learned men who opposed the time also **failed to see it**. God designed that His people should meet with a disappointment. The time passed, and those who had looked with joyful expectation for their Savior were sad and disheartened, while those who had not loved the appearing of Jesus, but embraced the message through fear, were pleased that He did not come at the time of expectation. Their profession had not affected the heart and purified the life. The passing of the time was well calculated to reveal such hearts. They were the first to turn and ridicule the sorrowful, disappointed ones who really loved the appearing of their Savior. I saw the wisdom of God in proving His people and giving them a searching test to discover those who would shrink and turn back in the hour of trial. **Early Writings**, pp. 235, 236*

*"The special light given to John which was expressed in the seven thunders was a delineation of events which would transpire under the **first and second angels' messages**. It was not best for the people to know these things, for their faith must necessarily be tested." **Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, Vol. 7, p. 971*

The Oath

After the seven thunders utter their message the mighty angel swears an **oath** that **time will be no longer**. What time is here referred to?

*“This time, which the angel declares with a solemn oath, is **not the end** of this world's history, neither of **probationary time**, but of **prophetic time**, which should precede the advent of our Lord. That is, the people will **not have another message upon definite time**. After this period of time, reaching from 1842 to 1844, there can be **no definite tracing** of the prophetic time. The longest reckoning reaches to the autumn of 1844.” **Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, Vol. 7, p. 971*

There are two biblical reasons why the time referred to in this verse cannot mean the **end of human history**:

1. This announcement is made during the period of the **sixth trumpet** and Jesus does not come to take over his **kingdom** until the **seventh trumpet (Revelation 11:15-19)**.
2. After the announcement was made that *“time will be no longer,”* John was instructed to **prophesy again (Revelation 10:11)**. How could he do this if the world had come to an end?

The translation *“there should no longer be any delay”* in many modern versions is incorrect. In the book of **Revelation** the word **chronos** is used **three other times** and in none of them can the word be translated in such a way (**Revelation 2:21; 6:11; 20:3**) In fact this word is translated **“time”** in over **30 places** in the New Testament and it is not translated ‘delay’ by modern versions except in this verse. The New Testament had a way to express a delay and that is the word **chronizo** that is used in **Matthew 24:48** where the servant states: *“my master is **delayed**.”*

It is obvious that the declaration: *“time will be no longer”* cannot have been made by the angel **before** the 42 months (**Revelation 11:2; 13:5**), 1260 days (**Revelation 11:3; 12:6**), 3 ½ times (**Revelation 12:14; Daniel 7:25**), 3 ½ days (**Revelation 11:9, 11**) and 2300 days (**Daniel 8:14**) were fulfilled.

As part of the oath the mighty angel swears in the name of the Creator and actually alludes to the language of the Fourth Commandment. When John is given the command by the mighty angel to prophesy again he is referring to the first angel’s message of **Revelation 14:6, 7**.

The Mystery of God

Revelation 10:7 begins with a **strong adversative ‘but’**. This ‘but’ clearly marks a **time separation** between when the announcement is made that **‘time will be no longer’** and the moment when the **sounding of the seventh** trumpet begins.

What the text is saying is that the declaration that *“time will be no longer”* is made during the **period of the sixth trumpet** but the mystery of God will not be finished until the seventh

trumpet is **about to begin to sound**. This clearly shows that the **end of prophetic time** comes during the sixth trumpet and before the seventh. The sequence is like this:

- Sixth trumpet **begins** to sound: The mighty angel opens the book and swears the oath that prophetic time will be no longer.
- Seventh trumpet **about** to sound: Mystery of God is finished.
- Seventh trumpet **sounds**: Jesus takes over the kingdoms of the world.

What is the mystery of God?

Romans 16:25-27:

*"Now to Him who is able to establish you according to my **gospel** and the **preaching of Jesus Christ**, according to the revelation of the **mystery** kept secret since the world began ²⁶ but **now made manifest**, and by the **prophetic Scriptures** made known to all nations, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, for obedience to the faith ²⁷ to God, alone wise, be glory through Jesus Christ forever. Amen."*

*"The incarnation of Christ is a **mystery**. The union of divinity with humanity is a **mystery** indeed, hidden with God, "even the **mystery** which hath been hid from ages." It was **kept in eternal silence** by Jehovah, and was first revealed in Eden, by the prophecy that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and that he should bruise his heel. To present to the world this mystery that God kept in silence for eternal ages before the world was created, before man was created, was the part that Christ was to act in the work he entered upon when he came to this earth. And **this wonderful mystery**, the incarnation of Christ and the atonement that he made, **must be declared to every son and daughter of Adam, whether Jew or Gentile.**" Signs of the Times, March 25, 1897*

The mystery of God is finished (probation closes) when the **seventh trumpet** is **about** to sound. When the seventh trumpet sounds **Jesus takes over the kingdom**. When the mystery of God is finished, Jesus will take off His **priestly robes** and change into his garments of vengeance. This is parallel to **Daniel 12:1** where the expression 'to stand up' means 'to begin to rule' (Daniel 11:2, 3).

Revelation 22:10-12 has the sequence:

"And he said to me, "Do not seal the words of the prophecy of this book [in other words, a message that can be understood is still coming from the book of Revelation which decodes the book of Daniel], for the time is at hand [for the book to be closed—the close of probation].¹¹ He who is unjust, let him be unjust still; he who is filthy, let him be filthy still; he who is righteous, let him be righteous still; he who is holy, let him be holy still. ¹² "And behold, I am coming quickly, and My reward is with Me, to give to everyone according to his work" [Jesus takes over the kingdom along with His people].

The Bittersweet Experience

The contents of the unsealed book cause a bittersweet experience: Sweet at first but then bitter in the aftermath. The judgment hour message must have caused a mixed experience.

That eating the scroll means to **assimilate the message to then share it** with God's people. This is corroborated by the closest Biblical parallel in **Ezekiel 3:1-4** where the prophet is told to **eat the scroll** and then he is told to **go share** the message with Israel.

Notice the **chiastic structure** of **Revelation 10:9-11**:

- A. The angel tells John to take the scroll and eat it (**verse 9a**).
- B. It will be bitter in your stomach (**verse 9b**).
- C. In your mouth it will be sweet as honey (**9c**).

- C. It tasted as sweet as honey in my mouth (**verse 10a**).
- B. It was bitter in my stomach (**verse 10b**).
- A. You must prophesy again (**verse 11**).

This chiastic structure is important because it shows that John's **eating the scroll in verse 9a** is the same as uttering a **prophecy from it in verse 11**. Thus when John ate the scroll a message came out from it the first time. But afterward it became necessary for the message to be **preached again** from the **same scroll**.

It is very clear that the episode that deals with the eating of the book **precedes Revelation 10:7** in time. How do we know that? The reason is obvious. After John eats the little book and it is sweet in his mouth and bitter in his stomach he is **told to prophecy again** and to **measure the temple**. If the **mystery of God** (the preaching of the gospel) had already been finished and **probation had closed**, what good would it do to prophesy again about the contents of the book and to talk about the investigative judgment? Clearly **verses 8-11** take us back to events that occurred **between verses 6 and 7**.

The Disappointment

Ellen White:

"The comprehension of truth, the glad reception of the message, is represented in the eating of the little book. The truth in regard to the time of the advent of our Lord was a precious message to our souls." (Manuscript 59, 1900) Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Volume 7 p. 971

Hiram Edson:

". . . we confidently expected to see Jesus Christ and all the holy angels with him; and that his voice would call up Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the ancient worthies, and dear friends which had been torn from us by death, and that our trials and sufferings, with our earthly pilgrimage would close, and we should be caught up to meet our coming Lord to be forever with

him, to inhabit bright golden mansions in the golden home city prepared for the redeemed. Our expectations were raised high, and thus we looked for our coming Lord until the clock tolled 12, at midnight. The day had then passed and our disappointment became a certainty. Our fondest hopes and expectations were blasted, and such a spirit of weeping came over us as I never experienced before. It seemed that the loss of all earthly friends could have been no comparison. We wept, and wept, till the day dawn. I mused in my own heart, saying, My advent experience has been the richest and brightest of all my Christian experience. If this had proved a failure, what was the rest of my Christian experience worth? Has the Bible proved a failure? Is there no God, no heaven, no golden home city, no paradise? Is all this but a cunningly devised fable? Is there no reality to our fondest hope and expectation of these things? And thus we had something to grieve and weep over, if all our fond hopes were lost. And as I said, we wept till the day dawn." Hiram Edson, manuscript fragment on his "**Life and Experience**," no date, pp. 4-5, Ellen G. White Research Center, James White Library, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.

Washington Morse:

"The passing of the time was a bitter disappointment. True believers had given up all for Christ, and had shared His presence as never before. The love of Jesus filled every soul; and with inexpressible desire they prayed, 'Come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly;' but He did not come. And now, to turn again to the cares, perplexities, and dangers of life, in full view of jeering and reviling unbelievers who scoffed as never before, was a terrible trial of faith and patience. When elder Himes visited Waterbury, Vermont, a short time after the passing of the time, and stated that the brethren should prepare for another cold winter, my feelings were almost uncontrollable. I left the place of meeting and wept like a child." Washington Morse, "**Remembrance of Former Days**," **The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald**, May 7, 1901

William Miller:

"It passed. And the next day it seemed as though all the demons from the bottomless pit were let loose upon us. The same ones and many more who were crying for mercy two days before, were not mixed with the rabble and mocking, scoffing, and threatening in a most blasphemous manner." **Words of William Miller in a letter to I. O. Orr, M. D. dated December 13, 1844**

The experience of the Millerites is very similar to what happened to the disciples. They had never experienced anything **sweeter** than the triumphal entry of **Jesus into Jerusalem** on a donkey. They were sure that He was going to **establish His kingdom** on earth. Jesus was even going to fulfill the prophecy of the **Seventy Weeks**. But they were **bitterly disappointed** in their expectations. After the bitter disappointment Jesus caught up to **two of his followers** on the road to Emmaus and **explained the prophecies** that they had misunderstood. Jesus then entered the **holy place** in heaven to begin His ministry there and he gave the apostles power to **preach again** but with the **added understanding** of what Jesus was doing. (**Matthew 28:18-20**).

The Millerites also had a **sweet experience**. They were sure that Jesus was going to **establish His kingdom** on earth in 1844. He even was fulfilling a **specific Bible prophecy**, the 2300 days (of which the 70 weeks are the smaller portion). But their expectations **were dashed because they misunderstood** prophecy. Jesus then **explained the prophecies** that they had

misunderstood and they realized that Jesus had moved into the **most holy place** to measure the temple. They were told to **prophesy again** but with the **added understanding** of what Jesus was doing. That message is found in **Revelation 14:6-12**

Prophesying Again

After the bittersweet experience **another message** is to come from the little book and that message has to do with the **measuring of the heavenly temple**. You cannot prophesy **again** unless you have done it once. **Prophesy again** but **no time element involved!!**

Why are the kings mentioned as one of those to whom John is to bear witness? Because **Revelation 17:10, 12** tells us that the kings will **fornicate with the harlot** and they **must be warned** about the judgment to come. This is why they are added to the list instead of tribes.

It is no coincidence that God raised up the Seventh-day Adventist church shortly after 1844 to fulfill the task of prophesying again to the world about the measuring of the heavenly temple. It is no coincidence that God raised up a people to proclaim that message.

LESSON #5 – THE HISTORICAL CHAPTERS OF DANIEL

Introduction

The books of Daniel and Revelation are saturated with symbolic terminology. A metallic man, savage beasts, domestic sanctuary animals, mysterious horns that speak, strange actions (such as eating a book that is sweet in the mouth and the bitter in the stomach) and mystical numbers fill their pages. In order to understand this exotic language it is necessary to decipher or decode this symbolic language.

In contrast to these apocalyptic chapters in Daniel, we have the simple, down to earth stories that are found in the first half of the book.

These stories are straightforward and easy to understand and they seem to need no decoding. What child has not been inspired by the story of the three young men who were delivered from the fiery furnace? And who can ever forget the story of Daniel's deliverance from the mouths of the lions? No doubt these stories were written to encourage God's people at all times and in all places.

A Deeper Dimension

However, the stories in the first half of Daniel (**Daniel 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6**) have a deeper dimension than appears on the surface. The stories of Daniel are not mere stories that happened 'once upon a time.' These stories actually illustrate, in narrative form the symbolic language of the book. Stated another way, the stories actually decode the symbols and help us understand in simple matter-of-fact language the meaning of these symbols in the apocalyptic portions of the book. These stories are local and literal types that illustrate world-wide and spiritual events in the time of the end.

Once we understand the reasons for the conflict in the historical sections of Daniel we can then comprehend the nature of the conflict in the apocalyptic sections. Let's take a look at some details in the historical chapters to see how they point us to the time of the end.

Daniel 1: The two sides in the conflict introduced

- **Two kings:** Jehoiakim versus Nebuchadnezzar.
- **Two gods:** Yahweh versus Marduk.

- **Two cities:** Babylon versus Jerusalem.
- **Two temples:** God's temple versus Marduk's temple.
- **Two peoples:** The Hebrews versus the Babylonians.

In the introduction to the book we find a **contrast** between **Babylon** and **God's people** in the time of the end. The king attempted to **change the mindset and conduct** of the Daniel and his friends in four significant ways:

First, he attempted to do it by having them enrolled in the **University of Babylon** and determining their **curriculum**. He felt that by teaching them the **culture**, the **philosophy** the **language** and the **religion** of Babylon their **way of thinking** would be changed. The king hoped that this would cause a **shift in their world view**. Yet the Hebrew worthies **never used the divination methods** that they learned in the University. **Prayer** was their means of communing with their God. When push came to shove they were faithful to God.

Secondly, the king attempted to change their allegiance by continually **rubbing it in their face** that the god of Babylon was **superior** to their God. After all, if **their God was greater** than Marduk, why were they captive in Babylon? It is obvious that the King was **not able to convince** or **compel** them because they proved themselves **loyal only** to the true God even in the face of death!

Third, the king attempted to change their thinking and conduct by **appointing their food and their drink**. But they **refused to eat** the Babylonian food and drink its wine and instead they partook of a Hebrew diet.

Fourth the king attempted to change their allegiance by **changing their names** from **Hebrew** names that honored their God to Babylonian names that honored the **Babylonian gods** (see **Daniel 4:8**). Yet in the book we never find Daniel and his three friends using their Babylonian names. Whenever they or **God referred to them** or they referred to themselves they always used their **Hebrew names**.

God's loyal servants were a **people of principle**. Daniel **purposed in his heart** (made a decision of the will) that he would **not defile** himself. This **decision of the will** was **exhibited in their conduct**.

Daniel and his friends were faithful in the **small tests** and therefore proved faithful in the **large tests**.

Counsels on Health, p. 66:

*"What if Daniel and his companions had made a compromise with those heathen officers, and had yielded to the pressure of the occasion by eating and drinking as was customary with the Babylonians? That **single instance** of departure from principle would have **weakened their sense of right** and their **abhorrence of wrong**. Indulgence of appetite would have involved the sacrifice of **physical vigor**, **clearness of intellect**, and **spiritual power**. **One** wrong step would*

probably have led to others, until, their connection with heaven being severed, they would have been swept away by temptation.”

A further study of **Daniel 3 and 6** will reveal that Daniel and his friends foreshadow the character that the final generation of God’s people will have. Their **[1] world view** will not be changed by the vain philosophies of Babylon, they will not receive the **[2] name** of the beast, they will not **[3]** drink Babylon’s wine and they will not be **[4]** intimidated by the idea that they are an insignificant minority.

Daniel 3

This story prefigures the symbolic story of **Revelation 13:11-18**. The two passages have many common details.

- In both there is a conflict between the religion of Babylon and the religion of God’s faithful remnant.
- The King did not like the perspective of history that God had revealed in **Daniel 2** so the Chaldeans suggested that he make an image like the one he had seen in his dream but entirely of gold. In this way he would be making an in-your-face statement to God that he was in control of history and his kingdom would be eternal.
- In both **Daniel** and **Revelation** we find reference to a beast.
- In both books we find image of the beast.
- In both books we have a record of numbers that bear a relationship with the sun.
- In both books people from every nation, tongue and people are commanded to worship the image.
- In both books there is a death decree against those who fail to obey the order to worship the image of the beast.
- In both books there is a faithful and insignificant remnant whose life is governed by principle. They would rather die than worship the image of the beast.
- There was a shaking in the Valley of Dura.
- In both books the conflict is over worship and obedience to the commandments of God—particularly the first table of the law.
- In both books, the religious leaders accuse the people of God before the civil power.
- The wrath of the King prefigures the wrath of the dragon against the final remnant that keep the commandments of God.
- Ellen White makes some interesting remarks about the King’s body language when he spoke the words of **Daniel 3:15**. He spoke these words “with hand stretched upward in defiance” (Signs of the Times, May 6, 1897).

- She also saw his face: *“Satanic attributes made his countenance appear as the countenance of a demon.”* (**Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, Volume 4 p. 1169)
- **Daniel 3** is a vivid illustration of what happens when the religious power influences the **civil power** to **establish** religious observances. This chapter shows what will happen when the **government** will violate the **establishment clause** of the First amendment to the Constitution.
- The three young men went through a **terrible time of trouble** where their faith was **severely tested**. The furnace was **heated seven times** hotter than ever before. Yet the young men stood with **great courage** before the king and refused to worship the image to the beast. They **preferred to die than to sin**. They went through the fire but are **not consumed**! Speaking about God’s end time remnant, Ellen White states:

“Their affliction is great, the flames of the furnace seem about to consume them; but the Refiner will bring them forth as gold tried in the fire. God's love for His children during the period of their severest trial is as strong and tender as in the days of their sunniest prosperity; but it is needful for them to be placed in the furnace of fire; their earthliness must be consumed, that the image of Christ may be perfectly reflected.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 621

- In both chapters Jesus **Christ is the hero**. At the **critical moment** Jesus stood up to defend and deliver His faithful remnant from certain death!
- In **Daniel 3** the Aramaic word ‘**deliver**’ is found **four times** (**Daniel 3:15, 17 [2x], 28**). As we shall see in a few minutes, this same word is used **five times in chapter 6** (**Daniel 6:14, 16, 20, 27 [2x]**). The equivalent Hebrew word is used also in **Daniel 11:41 and 12:1** to describe the final deliverance of God’s people from the King of the north who will go out with great fury to destroy them.
- These are the **only places** in the book of Daniel where the word ‘deliver’ is used so there must be a link between these chapters.
- As we study the stories of **Daniel 3 and 6** we can know for certain that the **issues in the final conflict** will not be over the **oil** of the Middle East or of the **Palestinians** against the Jews or the **Muslims** against the Jews. The final conflict will be over worship and the commandments of God versus the commandments of men.

Those who are in a **personal covenant relationship** with the Lord will be **delivered**, every one whose name is written in the book.

- As a loving **Husband**, Jesus will protect His covenant wife.
- As a **faithful Shepherd**, Jesus will protect His covenant sheep.

- As a **Sovereign King**, Jesus will protect His covenant subjects.
- As the **Head**, Jesus will protect His covenant body.
- God will **keep His covenant** with those who serve him.

A very important principle

Literal Israel was **literally captive** in **literal Babylon**, the **literal king** behaved like a **literal beast**, set up a **literal image** in a **literal valley**, commanding everyone to **literally bow and worship** the **literal image**. A remnant of **literal Jews** refused to **literally bow** before the **literal image** and therefore they were thrown into a **literal fiery furnace** and were delivered from the **literal flames** by Christ who **literally** came into the **literal furnace**.

The story of **Daniel 3 foreshadows** the final conflict over Sabbath/Sunday:

*“An **idol sabbath** has been set up, **as the golden image** was set up in the plains of Dura. And as Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, issued a decree that all who would not bow down and worship this image should be killed, so a proclamation will be made that all who will **not reverence the Sunday** institution will be punished with **imprisonment and death**.” **Manuscript Releases**, volume 14, p. 91*

Daniel 5

- This chapter is **foundational** to understand the prophecy of **Revelation 16 and 17**.
- In both chapters the city of **Babylon is seated** upon the many waters of the **River Euphrates**.
- Babylon **feels secure** because she is **protected by her river**—multitudes, nations, tongues and peoples.
- The leader of Babylon gives her **literal wine** to the nations and this does not allow them to **distinguish** between what is **holy** and what is **common** (the story of **Nadab and Abihu** illustrates a similar Truth).
- In both chapters the inability to distinguish between the holy and the common leads to **false worship** and **idolatry**.
- In both chapters **probation closes before** the fall of Babylon by a **divine decree** (Revelation 22:11).
- In both chapters the deliverance of God’s people comes from the **north and the east**.
- In both chapters the **drying up of the Euphrates** leads to the fall of Babylon.
- In both chapters God’s **people are delivered** from Babylon so that they can return to their lost homeland in **Jerusalem**.

Summary of Daniel 5

On **literal Babylon’s** final night, the **literal king** was drinking **literal wine** in **literal cups**, was worshipping **literal idols** when a **literal hand** began to write a **literal message** on a **literal wall** in the **literal palace** which announced the **literal fall** of **literal Babylon**. Cyrus, the deliverer came from the **literal east**, dried up the **literal river** Euphrates and in this way the **literal city** of

Babylon to deliver literal Israel from literal bondage so that they could return and build the literal city of Jerusalem. All of this has symbolic value in the book of Revelation and is fulfilled globally and spiritually!

Daniel 6

- Daniel was full of the Holy Spirit.
- Daniel had a profound relationship with God as is revealed in his life of prayer. His relationship with God was more important than life itself. He would rather die than sin.
- Daniel had a passion to comprehend the prophecy of the 2300 days. Actually, as we shall see in our last study today, this prophecy is at the core of Daniel 8-12.
- Daniel was faithful in the secular affairs of everyday life. His enemies could find no fault in his service to the King. He was obedient to the second table of the law. He was also faithful to the first table of the law as can be seen in Daniel 6:4:

“So the governors and satraps sought to find some charge against Daniel concerning the kingdom; but they could find no charge or fault, because he was faithful; nor was there any error or fault found in him.”

- His enemies had to find fault with Daniel’s religious convictions and practices—the first table of the law. Notice Daniel 6:5:

“Then these men said, “We shall not find any charge against this Daniel unless we find it against him concerning the law of his God.”

- So the issue in the conflict was the law of God (primarily the first table) versus the laws of men.
- The civil power gave a religious decree. This was a violation of the second clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution—the free exercise of religion.
- There was a faithful remnant which had a deep covenant relationship with the Lord and refused to obey the religious law that was given by the civil power.
- The religious law was written and signed by the King with a death decree in it against those who disobeyed.
- Daniel faced death for disobeying this religious law that was imposed by the state.
- The idea for this law did not come from the King. The civil power was not inimical to Daniel. The king’s counselors were behind the plot.
- God allowed Daniel to go through the tribulation so that his trust in God could be revealed before all of those who were present. In this way God was glorified in his servant, Daniel. Does this have anything to say about the character that will be possessed by the end time generation?
- The word deliver is used 5 times in Daniel 6 (verses 14 {2 x’s}, 16, 20, 27). It is the key word in the entire story.

- Daniel was delivered because he **trusted** in his God. The word “trusted” in the **LXX** is the same word that is translated ‘faith’ in the New Testament.
- Those who **prepared the plot** died with their own weapons.

Daniel 11:40-12:1

Daniel 3 and 6 are the foundation to understand **Daniel 11:40-12:1**. At the very end, the king of the north (spiritual Babylon, little horn, man of sin, beast, harlot, abomination of desolation) will go out with the intention of annihilating God’s people. Why will the king of the north want to do this?

Daniel 3 and 6 reveal that it will have to do with the religious convictions of God’s people. The issue will be worship and obedience to God’ Commandments. But at the critical moment, when God’s people are about to be destroyed, Michael will stand up. God’s people will go through the time of trouble such as has never been seen but they will be delivered (the key word), everyone that is found written in the book. Then God’s people will shine as stars throughout eternity.

LESSON #6 – NOTES ON DANIEL 1

Historical Background to Daniel 1

In God's providence, Daniel grew up under the influence of Josiah's reform which began in **621 BC**. At this time Daniel was just an infant. Daniel undoubtedly was home schooled so his education was of optimum quality. His early training helped him remain faithful to God when he was taken captive to Babylon. Daniel was 18 years old when he was taken captive (Testimonies for the Church, Volume 4, p. 570)

How could God allow a righteous person like Daniel to be taken captive to Babylon along with the unrighteous?

- Though Daniel's captivity appeared to be a curse, it was actually a blessing in disguise as was Joseph's ordeal in Egypt.
- Daniel brought the knowledge of the true God to the greatest empire and king the world has ever seen.
- The book of Daniel was given while Daniel was captive in Babylon.
- Through the ministry of Daniel Nebuchadnezzar was converted to the Lord.
- God used Daniel to lead His people out of captivity at the end of the 70 years.
- **Romans 8:28** was certainly fulfilled in the lives of both Daniel and Joseph.

The Great Controversy Theme in Daniel

Daniel 1 contains the seeds of the rest of the book as well as of the book of Revelation. In **Daniel 1** the battle lines are clearly drawn between the two sides in the great controversy:

- **Two kings:** Jehoiakim and Nebuchadnezzar.
- **Two Gods:** Jehovah and Marduk.
- **Two Cities:** Babylon and Jerusalem.
- **Two temples:** God's temple and Marduk's temple.
- **Two peoples:** The Hebrews and the Babylonians.

By all appearances Nebuchadnezzar, Marduk, Babylon, Marduk's temple and the Babylonians prevailed over Jehoiakim, Jehovah, Jerusalem, God's temple and the Hebrews.

As we have seen, the central theme of Daniel is: Who is in control of world history? The book of Daniel answers this question by making it unmistakably clear that Jehovah sits on the throne of the universe. He sets up kings and removes kings. He gives wisdom to the wise. He changes the times and the seasons. It is the God of the Hebrews who guides history to its intended end in spite of all the obstacles that human kings put in the way. **Daniel 1** makes it crystal clear that Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem only because the God of heaven gave it into his hand. This theme reappears in each and every chapter of the book.

Enrolled in the University of Babylon

In several ways, Nebuchadnezzar attempted to show that he was in control of historical events. In **Daniel 1:4** we are told that the king had Daniel and his friends enrolled in the University of Babylon. It was his intention to brainwash the Hebrew worthies with Babylon's world view.

The Chaldeans (*Kasolim*) were a priestly caste of astrologers who felt that they could discern the future in the stars (see **Daniel 2:2, 4, 5, 10**). They were the official spokesmen for the religion of Babylon. **Isaiah 47:13** describes the Babylonian methods of divination which God abhorred. The king wanted to brainwash Daniel and his friends by having them study the Babylonian religion, culture, philosophy and language. It was the intention of the king to cause a paradigm shift in the thinking of the Hebrews.

Regarding this Ellen White remarks:

*"The great men of Babylon were willing to be benefited by the instruction that God gave through Daniel, to help the king out of his difficulty by the interpretation of his dream. But they were anxious to mix in their heathen religion with that of the Hebrews. Had Daniel and his fellows consented to such a compromise, they would, in the view of the Babylonians, have been complete as statesmen, fit to be entrusted with the affairs of the kingdom. But the four Hebrews entered into no such arrangement. They were true to God, and God upheld them and honored them." **Manuscript Releases**, volume 16, pp. 336, 337*

Power of Persuasion

Nebuchadnezzar attempted to persuade Daniel and his friends that his god was more powerful than theirs (**Daniel 1:1, 2**). After all, he reasoned, had not his god given him the victory over the Hebrews?

With regards to this Ellen White wrote:

*"The fact that these men, worshipers of Jehovah, were captives in Babylon, and that the vessels of God's house had been placed in the Temple of the Babylonish gods, was boastfully cited by the victors as evidence that their religion and customs were superior to the religion and customs of the Hebrews." **Patriarchs and Prophets**, pp. 479, 480*

Changing the Diet

Nebuchadnezzar attempted to influence Daniel and his friends by appointing them a Babylonian diet (**Daniel 1:5**). By appointing a substitute diet, the king was attempting to take the place of God who had originally appointed man's diet.

Man's original diet was 'appointed' by God (**Genesis 1:29**). It consisted of water to drink and fruits to eat. It was a vegetarian diet. The expression '*to you it shall be for food*' (**Genesis 1:29**) is the same as **Daniel 1:5** where the '*king appointed for them*' their food. In other words, Nebuchadnezzar was taking over the prerogatives of God. He was providing a diet different than that which God had originally appointed for man. Thus the king is attempting to exercise the prerogatives of the Creator.

There were six problems with Babylon's food:

First, the meats were **not prepared** according to the specifications of the dietary laws given by God to Moses (see **Leviticus 17:14, 15; Acts 15:29**). It was customary for the gentiles to eat the blood and fat of animals which was forbidden by God.

Second, some of the meats were **unclean**. The gentile nations ate swine's flesh and also mice (see **Isaiah 66:17; Deuteronomy 14:7, 8**).

*"Among the viands placed before the king were **swine's flesh** and other meats which were declared unclean by the Law of Moses, and which the Hebrews had been expressly forbidden to eat. Here Daniel was brought to a severe test. Should he adhere to the teachings of his Fathers concerning meats and drinks, and **offend the king**, and probably lose not only his position but his life? Or should he disregard the commandment of the Lord, and **retain the favor of the king**, thus securing great intellectual advantages and the most flattering worldly prospects?"*

*Daniel did not long hesitate. He decided to stand firm in his integrity, let the result be what it might. He "purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank" (**Daniel 1:8**)*

*There are many among professed Christians today who would decide that Daniel was too particular, and would pronounce him narrow and bigoted. They consider the matter of eating and drinking as of too little consequence to require such a decided stand--one involving the probable sacrifice of every earthly advantage. But those who reason thus will find in the Day of Judgment that they turned from God's express requirements and set up their own opinion as a standard of right and wrong. They will find that what seemed to them unimportant was not so regarded of God. His requirements should be sacredly obeyed." **The Sanctified Life**, pp. 19, 20*

Third, a portion of the meat had been offered to **idols** (see **Deuteronomy 28:37, 38; 1 Corinthians 8**)

*"A second consideration of these youthful captives was that the king always asked a blessing before his meals, and **addressed his idols as Deity**. He set apart a portion of his food to be presented **to the idol gods whom he worshiped**, and also a portion of the wine. This act,*

according to their religious instruction, consecrated the whole to the heathen god. To sit at the table where such idolatry was practiced, Daniel and his three brethren deemed would be a dishonor to the God of heaven. These four children decided that they could not sit at the king's table to eat of the food placed there, or to partake of the wine, all of which had been **dedicated to an idol god**. This would indeed **implicate them with heathenism**, and dishonor the principles of their national religion and their God." **Manuscript Releases**, volume 4, p. 126

"To Daniel and his companions, at the very outset of their career, there came a decisive test. The direction that their food should be supplied from the royal table was an expression both of the king's favor and of his solicitude for their welfare. But a portion having been **offered to idols**, the food from the king's table was **consecrated to idolatry**; and in partaking of the king's bounty these youth would be regarded as uniting in his **homage to false gods**. In such homage loyalty to Jehovah forbade them to participate. Nor dared they risk the enervating effect of luxury and dissipation on physical, mental, and spiritual development." **Education**, pp. 54, 55

Fourth, on the table were most likely found **delicacies** that God had forbidden his people to indulge in (see **Proverbs 23:1-3**).

Fifth, Daniel and his friends carefully studied the story of **Nadab and Abihu** and understood the effect that wine has upon their ability to distinguish the holy from the common (**Leviticus 10; Isaiah 5:20-23**).

"They were acquainted with the history of Nadab and Abihu, the record of whose intemperance had been preserved in the parchments of the Pentateuch." **The Youth's Instructor**, June 4, 1903

Finally and most importantly, Daniel and his friends understood that their physical habits were closely **linked with their mental and spiritual welfare**:

"Anything that lessens physical strength **enfeebles the mind** and makes it **less capable** of discriminating between **right and wrong**. We become less capable of **choosing** the good and have less strength of will **to do** that which we know to be right." **Christ's Object Lessons**, p. 346

"What if Daniel and his companions had made a compromise with those heathen officers and had yielded to the pressure of the occasion by eating and drinking as was customary with the Babylonians? **That single instance** of departure from principle would have weakened their sense of right and their abhorrence of wrong. Indulgence of appetite would have involved the sacrifice of physical vigor, **clearness of intellect**, and **spiritual power**. One wrong step would probably have led to others, until, their connection with Heaven being severed, they would have been swept away by temptation." **The Sanctified Life**, p. 23

Daniel chose to be faithful to God. The expression 'purposed in his heart' means that '**he made up his mind**'. It was a **decision of the will** which led to **right action**. Notice that there were other Hebrews present in Nebuchadnezzar's court (**Daniel 1:6**) but only Daniel and his friends chose to be faithful to principle. And in the rest of the book of Daniel, God used **only these four Hebrews** to bring honor and glory to His name (see **chapters 2, 3 and 6**). When we are faithful to God, He will use us in a powerful way in His service and for His glory.

Changing Names

Nebuchadnezzar changed the names of the Hebrew worthies thus indicating that it was his intention to change their characters.

In the Bible the giving of names is a sign of **authority** (see for example **Genesis 1:19, 20; 5:2**).

The expression 'gave names' is used exclusively when God gives names (see **Deuteronomy 12:3-5**). Only God has the right to change a name because only God can change the character (see for example **Genesis 32:27, 28**).

Ellen White understood what Nebuchadnezzar was up to when he changed the names of the Hebrew worthies:

*"The names of Daniel and his companions were changed to names representing **Chaldean deities**. Great significance was attached to the names given by Hebrew parents to their children. Often these stood for **traits of character** that the parent desired to see developed in the child. The prince in whose charge the captive youth were placed "gave unto Daniel the name of Belteshazzar; and to Hananiah, of Shadrach; and to Mishael, of Meshach; and to Azariah, of Abednego."*

*The king did not compel the Hebrew youth to renounce their faith in favor of idolatry, but he hoped to bring this about **gradually**. **By giving them names** significant of idolatry, by bringing them daily into close association with idolatrous customs, and under the influence of the seductive rites of heathen worship, **he hoped to induce them** to renounce the religion of their nation and to unite with the worship of the Babylonians." **Prophets and Kings**, pp. 480, 481*

*"Anciently the name of a child stood for his character, and the names given to these children were characteristic of what it was expected **they would become**. They were young in years, and this change in their names it was believed would make an impression on their minds. In a little while, it was hoped, their former religion would be forgotten, and they would become in **character and purpose** like the Chaldean youth about them." **The Youth's Instructor**, October 29, 1907*

In Hebrew the word 'El' means 'God'. The word 'Yah' stands for Yahweh. So, when we find a name like 'Elijah' it means 'my God is Yahweh'. The name '**Daniel**' means 'God is my judge'. This name was changed to 'Belteshazzar' which means 'may Bel protect'. The name **Hananiah** means 'the grace of Yahweh'. This name was changed to Shadrach which means 'the command of Aku'. The name **Mishael** means 'who is what God is?' This name was changed to Meshach which means 'who is what Aku is?' The name **Azariah** means 'the help of Yahweh'. This name was changed to Abednego which means 'the servant of Nabu'. It is obvious that the king changed the names of the Hebrew worthies **to honor his gods** in place of the God of heaven!

Daniel 4:8, 9 clearly reveals that Daniel was given a name in honor of the Babylonian God Bel. We see here a battle between Daniel's God and Nebuchadnezzar's god. As we shall see, the God of Daniel prevails (see **Daniel 2:1**).

Faithfulness of Daniel and his Three Friends

Daniel and his three friends never recognized the supremacy of the Babylonian gods. **Daniel chapters 2-6** clearly reveal that they remained faithful to Yahweh all their lives.

Daniel and his friends never used their Babylonian names to refer to themselves. They always employed their Hebrew names (see **Daniel 7:28; 8:1, 15, 27; 10:2, 7**). Also, God never called them by their Babylonian names.

Though Daniel and his friends studied in the school of Babylon, they did not allow themselves to be brainwashed. They did not employ the Babylonian methods of divination (**Daniel 2**); they always sought the Lord in prayer (see **Daniel 2:17, 18; 6:10**). For this reason, Daniel and his friends were considered outcasts by their peers (see **Daniel 3:8, 12; 6:4-6**).

Daniel and his friends refused to eat the food of Babylon. Instead, they asked for water and 'pulse' (**Daniel 1:8**). According to the World Book Dictionary, pulse is 'the seeds of a group of plants such as peas, beans, and lentils used as food, a plant that yields such seeds.' The word comes from the Latin word *puls*.

"Daniel's clearness of mind and firmness of purpose, his strength of intellect in acquiring knowledge, were due in a great degree to the plainness of his diet in connection with his life of prayer." 4 Testimonies for the Church, p. 515

Daniel and his friends excelled physically (**Daniel 1:15**), mentally (**Daniel 1:19, 20**) and spiritually (**Daniel 1:17**).

Daniel's secret of victory:

- Fervent and constant prayer (see for example, **Daniel 2, Daniel 6 and Daniel 9**).
- Daniel was an avid student of Scripture (see **Daniel 9:1, 2**).
- Daniel stood as a faithful witness for God (**Daniel 1, 3, 6**).
- Daniel was temperate in all things (**Daniel 1**).
- Daniel stood for principle:

*"How did he become fitted for a position of so great trust and honor? It was his faithfulness in the little things that gave complexion to his whole life. He honored God in the smallest duties, and the Lord co-operated with him. To Daniel and his companions God gave "knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom; and Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams." **Daniel 1:17**. Christ's Object Lessons, pp. 356, 357*

The End Time Dimension of Daniel

The experiences of Daniel and his friends illustrate and prefigure the experience of God's final remnant:

Daniel had **no blemish** (Daniel 1:4; 6:4, 5) or fault. The same will be true of the end-time generation (see Revelation 14:5).

Daniel was **filled with the Holy Spirit** (Daniel 6:3; 4:8, 9; 5:11-14) as will the end time generation.

Daniel and his friends were men of **prayer**:

*“Daniel's clearness of mind and firmness of purpose, his strength of intellect in acquiring knowledge, were due in a great degree to the plainness of his diet, in connection with his life of prayer” **Counsels on Diet and Foods**, p. 82*

Daniel was **greatly beloved** (Daniel 9:23; Revelation 3:9).

Daniel and his friends followed **strict temperate habits**.

*“Let none who profess godliness regard with indifference the health of the body, and flatter themselves that intemperance is no sin and will not affect their spirituality. A close sympathy exists between the physical and the moral nature. The standard of virtue is elevated or degraded by the physical habits. Excessive eating of the best of food will produce a morbid condition of the moral feelings. And if the food is not the most healthful, the effects will be still more injurious. Any habit which does not promote healthful action in the human system degrades the higher and nobler faculties. . . Indulgence of appetite strengthens the animal propensities, giving them the ascendancy over the mental and spiritual powers.” **Maranatha**, p. 81*

Daniel **witnessed in the courts of the kings** of Babylon and Medo-Persia, God's people will also stand in the courts of kings (Luke 21:12).

The lives of Daniel and his friends were governed by **principle**. They did not allow the **circumstances** that surrounded them to influence their decisions and behavior. They were faithful even in the smallest duties (see Luke 16:10; Jeremiah 12:5) and they would have rather died than be unfaithful to God:

*“It was faithfulness in **little things** that gave complexion to their whole life. They honored God in the **smallest duties**, as well as in the larger responsibilities.” **Prophets and Kings**, p. 487*

*“Daniel possessed the grace of genuine meekness. He was true, firm, and noble. He sought to live in peace with all, while he was unbending as the lofty cedar wherever principle was involved. In everything that did not come in collision with his allegiance to God, he was respectful and obedient to those who had authority over him; but he had so high a sense of the claims of God that the requirements of earthly rulers were held subordinate. He would not be induced by any selfish consideration to swerve from his duty.” **The Sanctified Life**, p. 20*

The issues involved in the final conflict will be the same: God's law and worship (compare Daniel 3 and 6).

A **death decree** was proclaimed against Daniel and will be proclaimed against God's people (see **Revelation 13:15**).

Daniel and his friends went through a severe **time of trouble** and trial but came through **victoriously** as will God's faithful remnant at the end of time (**Revelation 15:2; Daniel 12:1**).

Daniel was **hated by the religious leaders** of his day as will happen with the remnant at the end of time (see notes on **Daniel 3**).

Daniel denounced the placing of **unholy wine** in holy vessels. The same will happen at the end (**Daniel 5; Revelation 17:4, 5**).

Daniel was in an insignificant **faithful minority** while the majority was in apostasy. The same will be true at the end.

Daniel and his friends were **delivered from their enemies** and their enemies were destroyed with the very weapons they intended to use on God's people. The furnace slew those who threw the three young men in. The lions ate those who prepared the plot against Daniel. Evil Haman died in the gallows he had built for Mordecai. At the end, the weapons which were to slay God's people will be used to slay the ministers who plotted against them (see **The Great Controversy**, pp. 655, 656).

The bottom line is that Daniel had **four main characteristics** which the remnant will possess at the end: 1) He had the testimony of Jesus, 2) He kept the commandments of God, 3) He was a staunch worshiper of the true God, 4) He had the faith of Jesus—an unbreakable confidence and trust in God just like Jesus did (**Revelation 12:17; 14:12** for the end time application).

At the end, God's people will gain the victory in the four areas in which Daniel and his friends were victorious:

1. God's people will **not drink the wine** of Babylon nor eat her food. The food and the wine represent Babylon's false doctrines and traditions (see **John 4:34; John 6:63; Revelation 18:2, 3; John 6:51-58; Isaiah 4:1; 55:2, 10, 11**).
2. God's people will **refuse the name of the beast** (**Revelation 13:17; 15:2-4**). In fact, they will have the name of God on their foreheads just as Daniel and his friends had godly names (**Revelation 14:1**).
3. God's people will not flinch at the **false god** of end time Babylon. Though all power will appear to be on Babylon's side, though God's people will be a small minority, He will deliver them because He is the King of kings and Lord of lords (see **Revelation 13:4; 17:14; Daniel 11:44; 12:1**).
4. God's people will **refuse to be brainwashed** by the false theories and traditions of Babylon (see **Revelation 16:13, 14; 17:1-5**).

LESSON #7 – NOTES ON DANIEL 2

Chapters 1 and 2 of Daniel are linked by the last verse of chapter one. The fact that Daniel was given wisdom in all visions and dreams prepares us for the experience in **Daniel 2**. In chapter one Daniel and his friends passed the test while the wise men failed. In chapter 2 Daniel and his friends passed the test with flying colors while the wise men failed the test. This indicates clearly that the God of Daniel was superior to the God of Babylon (see **Genesis 41:24** for the parallel in the story of Joseph).

Basic Elements of Historicism

- While the apocalyptic chain prophecies of Daniel do not repeat, the stories in the historical section do, but on a global and spiritual scale.
- Historicism is better called the historical flow method.
- The broad sweep of the historical flow method covers from the days in which the prophet wrote till the end of time.
- There are no gaps or parentheses in the historical flow.
- The final war will be fought on the battlefield of hermeneutics. The war will be between futurism and historicism.

Play and Counterplay

In **Daniel 2** we find a play and counterplay of events between God and Satan. I like to compare the movements of history with a game of chess. On one side of the table is seated God while on the other is seated Satan. God moves and then Satan countermoves and so the game goes on. The comforting news is that there is no chance that God will lose because he already knows all of Satan's moves before the game began. On the other hand, Satan must take calculated guesses about how God is going to move and when you have to guess you are bound to make mistakes.

"In the annals of human history the growth of nations, the rise and fall of empires, appear as dependent on the will and prowess of man. The shaping of events seems, to a great degree, to be determined by his power, ambition, or caprice. But in the word of God the curtain is drawn aside, and we behold, behind, above, and through all the play and counterplay of human interests and power and passions, the agencies of the all-merciful One, silently, patiently working out the counsels of His own will." Education, p. 173

- **Daniel 2:29:** God **knew** that the king was **thinking** about the future of his kingdom when he went to bed.
- **Daniel 2:1:** God **gave him a dream** to answer his **concerns** about the future.
- **Daniel 2:3:** **God then veiled** the dream from the king's memory. Why did God do this?
- **Daniel 2:10:** God knew that the king **would call the experts** who were immersed in the occult. God wanted to unmask the false religion of Babylon and clearly reveal that occultic methods don't work.
- This story clearly shows that **Satan cannot read** the mind. I am sure that he was **dying to tell the astrologers** the dream and its meaning so that all would believe that the religion of Babylon was true.

*"Satan cannot read our thoughts, but he can see our actions, hear our words; and from his long knowledge of the human family, he can shape his temptations to take advantage of our weak points of character." **Review and Herald**, February 27, 1913*

- **Deuteronomy 18:9-12:** God had **forbidden occultic practices**. All of these methods mentioned in Deuteronomy are based on **wrong understanding of the state of the dead**.

God Communicates

- **Daniel 2:11:** the wise men complained that only their gods could reveal the dream to the king but they did not dwell with flesh. The gods of the pagans conceal their plans.
- **John 1:14:** In contrast to the gods of the pagans, the God of the **Bible** becomes **flesh** and **communicates** His will to human beings through Jesus.

Satan Plans to kill God's followers but instead they are brought to prominence in the kingdom

- **Daniel 2:12, 13:** Satan took advantage of the situation and influenced the mind of the king to kill all of the wise men of Babylon.
- Satan had seen the faithfulness of Daniel and his friends to God in **Daniel 1**. He knew that these young men would be a **potential problem** for him and so he decided to wipe them out.
- Instead of being successful in wiping them out, Daniel and his friends were **brought to prominence** in the kingdom and given cabinet positions.

God's method of revealing the future

Amos 3:7: God does nothing in human history without revealing His secrets to His servants the prophets. Here once again we are faced with the fact that the God of the Bible wishes to communicate His will to His creatures.

Daniel 2:17-19: God showed that He was in control by revealing the dream and its meaning to Daniel. God did not instruct Daniel to consult the crystal ball, the signs of the zodiac, the

psychics, the channelers or the necromancers. God revealed the secret when Daniel and his friends prayed!!

Isaiah 46:9, 10: The true God is distinguished from all false gods by the fact that He **knows** the end from the beginning.

Daniel 2:27, 28: Daniel did not claim the credit. It was God who revealed the secret and it was God who got the credit.

The Dream

- **Daniel 2:31-35:** The outline of the dream.
- History is **not evolving** but **rather devolving** as can be seen by the decreasing value of the metals. History is not evolving toward a golden age created by the ingenuity of man but rather devolving into a state of confusion and chaos.
- While the metals decrease in value, they **increase in strength:**

*“The image revealed to Nebuchadnezzar, while representing the **deterioration of the kingdoms** of the earth in power and glory, also fitly represents the **deterioration of religion and morality** among the people of these kingdoms. As nations forget God, in like proportion they become **weak morally.**” **4 Bible Commentary**, p. 1168*

- The lack of moral value in the nations leads them to impose morality by force.
- All kingdoms will fall but the kingdom of God will embrace the entire earth and will last forever.

The Meaning of the Dream

- **Daniel 2:37, 38:** **Babylon** is the head of gold. It ruled from 605 to 539 BC.
- **Daniel 2:39:** The next kingdom was **Medo-Persia** which ruled from 539 to 331 BC. We don't even need to read in the history books to know this. **Daniel 5** clearly points out the fact that the kingdom of Babylon was followed by the Medes and Persians.
- The third kingdom was **Greece**. This kingdom ruled from 331 to 168 BC. Once again, it is not even necessary to go to the history books to discover that Medo-Persia was followed by Greece. **Daniel 8** makes it clear that the kingdom that followed the Medes and Persians was Greece.
- **Daniel 2:40:** The fourth kingdom was the **Roman Empire** and Rome ruled from 168 BC to 476 AD. That Rome was the fourth power is clearly seen in **Revelation 12**. Notably, this kingdom is called “the Iron **monarchy** of Rome” by historian **Edward Gibbon** in his six volume series, **The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.**

- **Daniel 2:41:** 168BC-476 AD The Roman Empire was divided into **Ten kingdoms** as a result of the barbarian invasions. **Still iron** in the feet but a **different kind** of Rome. An **amalgamated Rome**. Same territory but **different type** of kingdom.

The Feet

- The iron that existed in the legs continues in the feet. This indicates that **Rome continues its existence** in the feet but it is a **different kind** of Rome, an **amalgamated** Rome with two elements that don't belong together.
- The feet of the image take us all the way from the year 476 AD to the second coming of Christ so they cannot represent merely the nations of Western Europe.
- The papacy has two stages of dominion, one in Europe during the 1260 years and the other in the whole world when the deadly wound is healed. The final fulfillment of the feet stage of the image is foretold in **Revelation 17** when the kings of the earth will be of one mind for a short period of time.
- The clay is of a very special type, it is **potter's clay (Daniel 2:41)**.
- In the LXX the word for clay is *ostrakinon*. Ostraca were pieces of potter's clay vessels that had broken.
- The potter's clay is fragile (**Daniel 2:42**). In **Romans 9:20, 21** the apostle Paul describes the fragility of man as the fragility of potter's clay. The iron is described as strong (**Daniel 2:40**). Because the clay is fragile it desires to unite with an element that is stronger in order to subsist in a contentious world. The clay wishes to join together with something that is strong in order to survive.
- The **iron** and the **clay** each have their place and legitimate function **separately**. It is only when they are **mingled** that **both are weakened**.
- **Daniel 2** is presenting God's perspective of history. In the sight of God the union of the iron and the clay is an illegitimate union and therefore not a true union at all.
- In **Daniel 2 all is symbolic**: the gold, the silver, the bronze, the iron, the Stone and the mountain. Therefore, the potter's clay **must also be symbolic**.

Meaning of the Potter's Clay

Jeremiah 18:1-6: The potter's clay is used to represent Israel, God's **Old Testament church**.

*"The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying: ² "Arise and go down to the **potter's** house, and there I will cause you to hear My words." ³ Then I went down to the **potter's** house, and there he was, making something at the wheel. ⁴ And the vessel that he made of **clay** was marred in the hand of the **potter**; so he made it again into another vessel, as it seemed good to the **potter** to make. ⁵ Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying: ⁶ "O house of Israel, can I not do with you as this **potter**?" says the Lord. "Look, as the **clay** is in the **potter's** hand, so are you in My hand, O house of Israel!"*

Revelation 12 makes it clear that God's Old Testament church **is one** with the New Testament church. God does not have two mutually separable peoples. Only one woman is used to symbolize both stages of God's church. The woman that brings the Messiah into the world is the same as the one who later flees into the wilderness for 1260 years. Thus it would be legitimate to affirm that God's Old Testament church or people is represented by the potter's clay. God formed his church at Mt. Sinai. As a result of apostasy, Israel was taken into Babylonian captivity (the marring of the vessel). But after the captivity God once again established Israel in their land (the making of another vessel).

Genesis 2:7 affirms that Jesus **formed** man's literal body out of dust the dust of the ground:

*"And the Lord God **formed** man of the **dust** of the ground. . ."*

Isaiah 64:8 (see also **Job 33:6; 13:12**) informs us that God worked as a **potter** and **formed** our bodies out of **clay**:

*"But now, O Lord, You are our Father; we are the **clay**, and You our **potter**; and all we are the work of **Your hand**."*

The literal body that God formed out of clay was perfect and had all of its body parts, each created to fulfill a certain function. But the body was lifeless.

God then breathed into the body the **spirit of life** and the body lived and all the body parts began to fulfill the function for which they were created:

Genesis 2:7: ". . . and breathed into his nostrils the **breath of life**; and man became a living being."

In **Daniel 2** we are not dealing with literal realities but rather with spiritual ones. In other words, the potter's clay that God uses to create the body is not literal but symbolic. The question is: What is represented by the creation of the literal body?

Colossians 1:18 tells us that the church is the body of Christ. In other words, the creation of man's literal body represents the creation of Christ's spiritual body—the church.

*"And He is the head of the **body, the church**, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may have the preeminence."*

Immediately before the death of Christ, the apostles were intensely divided. They were all striving to occupy the first positions in Christ's future kingdom. They were like a bunch of body parts strewn all over the place. But in **Acts 2:1** we are told that the **body of Christ** was **joined together in one accord**. All the members now belonged to the same body but each member was created to fulfill a different function:

*"When the Day of Pentecost had fully come, they were all with **one accord** in one place."*

Though the church had been formed and was united, something was yet missing. The Spirit of life needed to energize the body so that each member could fulfill its specific function. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit entered the body of Christ:

Acts 2:2-4: *“And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. ³ Then there appeared to them divided tongues, as of fire, and one sat upon each of them. ⁴ And they were all **filled with the Holy Spirit** and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”*

This metaphor of the body is used by the apostle Paul to refer to the church. The body is one, and the members fulfill their function because they are all energized by the Holy Spirit:

I Corinthians 12:12, 13: *“For as the **body** is **one** and has **many members**, but all the members of that **one body**, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. ¹³ For by **one Spirit** we were all baptized into **one body** — whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free — and have all been made to drink into **one Spirit**.”*

Ezekiel 37:10-11: The Babylonian captivity tore Israel apart but after the captivity all the members of the body come together and then the **Spirit of life entered** them. This represents the **people of God** in the Old Testament.

*“So I prophesied as He commanded me, and breath came into them, and they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceedingly great army. ¹¹ Then He said to me, “Son of man, **these bones are the whole house of Israel**. They indeed say: ‘Our bones are dry, our hope is lost, and we ourselves are cut off!’”*

It is safe to conclude that the potter’s clay symbolizes God’s church. That is to say, during the foot stage of the image the political power of Rome would continue (the iron) but it would be mixed with the church (the clay). This is exactly what happened during the period of papal dominion.

The church of the feet stage felt that it had to unite with the state in order to guarantee its continuing existence. What the church failed to realize is that this illegitimate union weakened both the church and the state. The church should have realized that the guarantee of her continued existence is found in the protection of the One who molded her into existence. The strength of the church does not reside in using the power of the political systems of the world. Her power resides in fulfilling her mission of preaching the gospel to the world by the power of the Holy Spirit. What God is saying in Daniel 2 is: “What God has cast asunder, let no man join together.” The church’s only legitimate union is with her husband, Jesus Christ. When she joins the state she is committing fornication. Fornication in the sight of God is not union at all!

Daniel 2, Daniel 7 and Revelation 13

The ten toes of the image reappear again in **Daniel 7** and **Revelation 13** but with a different symbolism. While in **Daniel 2** the clay is added to the iron in the ten toes of the feet, in **Daniel 7** the little horn arises among the ten horns of the fourth beast:

Ten Toes —————> Clay (religious power)
Ten Horns —————> Little Horn (religious power)

The legs of iron and the ten toes of the image and the dragon beast and its ten horns represent the same **political kingdoms**. But as Daniel saw clay added to the iron in the feet he now sees a little horn rise from the head of the fourth beast **among the ten horns**. As the clay was radically different than the metals that preceded it, so this horn is radically different than the beasts and the horns that preceded it. The text clearly indicates that this horn leaned on the political power of the fourth beast to carry on activities that were religious in character. It spoke blasphemy against the Most High, persecuted the saints of the Most High and thought that it could change God's times and Law. The little horn in Daniel 8 also had strong religious characteristics: It trampled on God's sanctuary, attacked the Prince of the host, removed the daily and set up the abomination of desolation. The apostle Paul even described the audacity of this power as it sat in the temple of God claiming to be God.

In **Revelation 13** we once again see how the little horn **combined the political power** of Rome with **religious activities**. In **Revelation 13:2** we are told that the dragon beast (the fourth beast of **Daniel 7**, the legs of iron in **Daniel 2**) gave its authority, throne and power to the beast (the little horn, the clay). The beast then carried on a religious warfare against God by blaspheming his name, His tabernacle and those who dwell in heaven. The beast also persecutes the saints. It is obvious that this was a **religio-political** power.

The Feet and Revelation 17

The final fulfillment of the feet of the image is found in **Revelation 17**. In this chapter we once again encounter a dragon like beast that has ten horns. The ten horns are parallel the ten toes of the image and the ten horns of the dragon like beast in **Daniel 7**. But the ten horns in **Daniel 7** and **Revelation 13** represent the history of the church during the 1260 years (as denoted by the time periods in **Daniel 7:25** and **Revelation 13:5**). The ten horns in **Revelation 17** on the other hand will be fulfilled when the deadly wound of the beast is healed. In **Revelation 17** the ten horns are universalized to include the kings of the earth and the whole world (**Revelation 16:13, 14, 16; 17:2, 12, 13, 17; 13:3**).

It is significant that these kings not only join hands politically. There is a **religious power** that manipulates them and uses them for its own ends. **Revelation 17** portrays a **great harlot** who is seated on many waters and fornicates with the kings of the earth (**Revelation 14:8; 17:2; 18:3, 9**). She gives wine to the nations and kills the saints of the Most High. This is the picture of the end time apostate church that will link up with the kings of the world to establish a New World Order on earth created by the power and prowess of man. But this union is not a union

at all in the sight of God because it is illegitimate. When a man commits adultery with a woman there is union but in the sight of God there is no union because God has not united them. The apparent union of the harlot with the kings will fall apart when the waters of the Euphrates dry up and the kings of the earth hate the harlot (**Revelation 17:16**). Jesus will then come as King of kings and Lord of lords (**Revelation 17:14**). This kingdom will be established without hands because it will be established by Christ.

Revelation 17:1, 2: Presents the **same mixture** but with **different symbols**. The great harlot represents an apostate church. How did she become apostate? The answer is: By fornicating with the kings of the earth. Thus the mixture of the iron with the clay represents the same truth as the harlot fornicating with the kings of the earth.

*“Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me, ‘Come, I will show you the judgment of the **great harlot** who sits on many waters,² with whom the **kings of the earth committed fornication**, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication.’”*

Ellen White’s Perspective

*“We have come to a time when God’s sacred work is represented by the feet of the image in which the iron was mixed with the miry clay. God has a people, a chosen people, whose discernment must be sanctified, who must not become unholy by laying upon the foundation wood, hay, and stubble. Every soul who is loyal to the commandments of God will see that the distinguishing feature of our faith is the seventh-day Sabbath. If the government would honor the Sabbath as God has commanded, it would stand in the strength of God and in defense of the faith once delivered to the saints. But statesmen will uphold the spurious sabbath, and will mingle their religious faith with the observance of this child of the papacy, placing it above the Sabbath which the Lord has sanctified and blessed, setting it apart for man to keep holy, as a sign between Him and His people to a thousand generations. The **mingling of churchcraft and statecraft is represented by the iron and the clay**. This **union is weakening** all the power of the churches. This **investing the church with the power of the state** will bring evil results. Men have almost passed the point of God’s forbearance. They have **invested their strength in politics**, and have **united with the papacy**. But the time will come when God will punish those who have made void His law, and their evil work will recoil upon themselves (**Manuscript 63, 1899**). **Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, Volume 4 p. 1168*

*“Earthly powers are shaken. We need not, and cannot, expect union among the nations of the earth. Our position in the image of Nebuchadnezzar is represented by the toes, in a divided state, and of a crumbling material, that will not hold together.” **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 1 p. 361*

The Stone

What is represented by the Stone that struck the image on its feet?

The answer is that in the Old Testament the stone clearly has messianic undertones as can be seen in **Isaiah 28:16; 8:14, 15; Psalm 118:22**. In the New Testament Jesus applied this stone terminology to Himself. (**Matthew 21:42-44; Luke 20:18; Acts 4:11; I Peter 2:4-8**)

I Peter 2:6: The stone is placed in the mountain and the mountain is Zion.

"Therefore it is also contained in the Scripture, 'Behold, I lay in Zion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious, and he who believes on Him will by no means be put to shame.'"

Luke 20:18: In this verse Jesus seems to be alluding to the prophecy of **Daniel 2** and applying it to individuals:

*"Whoever falls on that stone will be broken; but on whomever it falls, it will **grind him to powder**."*

Not Made with Hands

What does the expression 'not with hands' mean?

A comparison of **Daniel 2:34; 8:25 and 11:45** indicate that the expression 'without hands' means 'without human intervention.' In other words, the end of human history will be brought about by the supernatural irruption of God into human history. This is in contrast to the concept which was originated by St. Augustine and developed by Roman Catholicism where the stone represents the church taking over the world and establishing God's kingdom here.

Hebrews 9:11: *"But Christ came as High Priest of the good things to come, with the greater and more perfect tabernacle **not made with hands**, that is, **not of this creation**."*

Mark 14:58: *"We heard Him say: 'I will destroy this temple **made with hands**, [the body he received from Mary] and within three days I will build another **made without hands** [His supernatural resurrected body]."*

The Mountain that Fills the whole Earth

Revelation 17:9, 10 (Jeremiah 51:25); **Isaiah 2:1-5:** In Scripture mountains represent **kingdoms**.

The mountain in **Daniel 2** is symbolic of the **everlasting kingdom** that will fill the whole earth. This can be seen clearly by comparing **Daniel 2:34, 35 with 2:44:**

Daniel 2:34, 35: *"You watched while a stone was cut out without hands, which struck the image on its feet of iron and clay, and broke them in pieces. ³⁵ Then the iron, the clay, the bronze, the silver, and the gold were crushed together, and became like chaff from the summer threshing*

floors; the wind carried them away so that no trace of them was found. And the stone that struck the image became a **great mountain and filled the whole earth.**"

Daniel 2:44: "And in the days of these kings the God of heaven will **set up a kingdom** which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it **shall stand forever.**"

Daniel 2:45: The Mountain is Zion which represents the everlasting kingdom of Jesus that will fill the whole earth (**Isaiah 9:6, 7**) "*Inasmuch as you saw that the stone was **cut out of the mountain** without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold — the great God has made known to the king what will come to pass after this. The dream is certain, and its interpretation is sure.*"

Daniel 7:26, 27: An everlasting kingdom given to **Jesus and then the saints.**

Final Call

Matthew 21:44: Whoever falls upon the rock and is converted will be broken but whoever does not will be ground to powder: "*And whoever falls on this stone will be broken; but on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder.*"

Matthew 3:11, 12: We must allow the Holy Spirit as fire to consume sin in us. If we don't allow the fire to consume sin then the fire will consume us: ¹¹"*I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but He who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. He will baptize you with the **Holy Spirit and fire.*** ¹²"*His winnowing fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly clean out His threshing floor, and gather His wheat into the barn; but He will burn up the chaff with **unquenchable fire.***"

John 3:3, 5: **Unless we are born again we cannot see or enter the kingdom of God.**

"*Jesus answered and said to him, "Most assuredly, I say to you, unless one is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."... ⁵ Jesus answered, "Most assuredly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."*

Review and Meaning

- The world is not spiraling out of control. God sits on His throne and guides world events.
- Everything in this prophecy has been fulfilled precisely as God has announced and therefore we can be sure that the final event will also be fulfilled
- We are in the **toenails of human history.**
- The next great event in history is the second coming of Christ

LESSON #8 – NOTES ON DANIEL 3

Beast, Image, Number: Old Testament Background

Babylon was the ruling power in the world of the time (**Daniel 3:1**) “Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was sixty cubits and its width six cubits. He set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon.”

Connection between Daniel 2 and 3

- God had delineated in **Daniel 2** the sequence of kingdoms that would arise between the days of Nebuchadnezzar and the second coming of Jesus.
- Nebuchadnezzar did not like the scenario that God had presented and he attempted to **change God’s prophetic** scenario.
- This idea came from the **religious leaders**.
“The wise men of his realm, taking advantage of this and of his return to idolatry, proposed that he make an image similar to the one seen in his dream, and set it up where all might behold the head of gold, which had been interpreted as representing his kingdom.” ***Prophets and Kings***, p. 504.
- The word “**gold**” in **Daniel 2 and 3** links the chapters.
- The word “**image**” is identical in both chapters.
- The expression “**set up**” is repeatedly used in the chapter.
- Remember that in **Daniel 2:44** God had stated that He was going to “**set up**” his **indestructible** kingdom (Daniel 3:1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 14, 15 and 18). Nebuchadnezzar attempted to counteract God’s scenario by setting up an image totally of gold!

“Instead of reproducing the image as he had seen it, he would excel the original. His image should not deteriorate in value from the head to the feet, but should be entirely of gold--symbolic throughout of Babylon as an eternal, indestructible, all-powerful kingdom, which should break in pieces all other kingdoms and stand forever.” ***Prophets and Kings***, p. 504

“And it is not surprising that in a land where idol worship was of universal prevalence, the beautiful and priceless image in the plain of Dura, representing the glory of Babylon and its magnificence and power, should be consecrated as an object of worship. This was accordingly provided for, and a decree went forth that on the day of the dedication all should show their

supreme loyalty to the Babylonian power by bowing before the image. Prophets and Kings, pp. 505, 506

But the image was not only a sign of the indestructible and eternal nature of Babylon. To bow before the image was not only a sign of allegiance to the civil power like pledging allegiance to the flag. The image was really a religious symbol of loyalty to the Babylonian pantheon. Thus the king bellowed out to the three young Hebrews:

Daniel 3:14: *"Is it true, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego, that you do not serve my gods or worship the gold image which I have set up?"*

God's people were captive in Babylon (Jeremiah 51:45)

"My people go out of the midst of her! And let everyone deliver himself from the fierce anger of the Lord."

Nebuchadnezzar for a time lived as a beast (Daniel 4:16)

"Let his [Nebuchadnezzar's] heart be changed from that of a man, let him be given the heart of a beast, and let seven times pass over him."

The religious leaders of Babylon enticed Nebuchadnezzar to set up an image in his honor. Repeatedly **Daniel 3** quotes Nebuchadnezzar using the expression 'which I have set up' (**Daniel 3:1, 2, 3 [2x], 5, 7, 12, 14, 18**).

The dimensions of the image: 60x6 (3:1)

"Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was sixty cubits and its width six cubits [90 feet tall and 9 feet wide]. He set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon."

"Babylonian mathematics was based on the sexagesimal system, in which the basic counting units were the numbers 6 and 60. (The sexagesimal system has been accepted universally for the measurement of arcs and angles and for divisions of time." Ranko Stefanovic, Revelation of Jesus Christ, p. 417

- If what **Herodotus** says is correct, the image weighed **800 talents of gold** which would be equivalent to over **30 tons (Daniel 3:1)**. In antiquity gold was called 'the dew of the sun' because it was believed that it had dripped down from the sun onto the earth. Gold was used to represent the sun god because gold is the color of the sun.
- **Sexagesimal** system originated in **Babylon** (the number system based on the number 6—60 seconds, 60 minutes, 24 hours, 360 days, 360 degrees).
- If we multiply **60 x 6** the total is **360** which was a very **sacred number** in Babylon.
- **360 degrees** and **360 days** represent the **full cycle of time** and the **full circle of space**.
- **Thirty six** gods were placed to rule over the Babylonian pantheon. Each ruled over **10 degrees of space** and **10 days of time**.

- When the numbers from 1-36 are added in sequence the total is **666** and the number 666 was known as “**the great number of the sun.**” **All the gods** were included in this one summary number. In Babylon the sun god was called **Marduk**. He was thought of as the **absolute ruler of all time and all space.**
- The Babylonian **priestly system** expressed this belief in practical terms by wearing **amulets** or **medallions** around their necks.
- The medallions [*Sigilla solis*] were made of **pure gold** because gold is the **color of the sun**. It is no coincidence that in **Isaiah 14:4** Babylon is called the **golden kingdom** and that in **Daniel 2** Babylon is represented by the **head of gold**. The medallions or amulets were **circular** (like the sun) and had a **hexagon within the amulet.**
- On the **obverse (front)** side of the amulet there was a **large square** with **36 smaller squares** within. In each of the smaller squares there was a number from **1-36** and beneath the large square was the **number 666.**
- On the **reverse side** of the seal or amulet there was a **raging lion with eagle’s wings** (**yellow** in color like the sun) whose **mane** is portrayed as the **rays of the sun** (see **Malachi 4:2** where the sun is portrayed as having wings). It is no coincidence that Babylon is portrayed as a **lion in Daniel 7** and that **sphinxes** were at each of the **entrances to the city.**
- Later Gnostic amulets, following the religion of ancient Babylon, combine the number 666 with a lion. The mane of the lion is portrayed as the rays of the sun. Our glyph # 6 is actually the sign of a coiled serpent and had its origin in ancient India. It is really the sign of a coiled cobra and in many Romantic languages the sound of the number six reminds us of the hiss of the serpent!
- In astrology, **Leo, the lion**, rules over the **hottest period** of the year (**July 23-August 22**).
- Babylon is the king of kingdoms, the sun is the king of heavenly bodies, gold is the king of precious metals, the eagle is the king of birds and the # 666 is the king of numbers.
- The **Romans acquired much of their religious system from Babylon** but they established a **different number system**. They chose **six letters** from their **Latin alphabet** and gave each a numerical value. The sum total of all six numbers is **666.**
- Thus the number **666** is to be identified with **Babylon** and with **Rome** (also called Babylon in **I Peter 5:13**).
- Thus those who worshipped the image would be **honoring Babylon** and worshipping the **sun god** whose **number is 666.**

The primary issue in this controversy was worship

- The question was **who will you worship**: the image or the true God (**Daniel 3:28**).

“Nebuchadnezzar spoke, saying, “Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego, who sent His Angel and delivered His servants who trusted in Him, and they have frustrated the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they should not serve nor worship any god except their own God!”

- This word is used **11 times** in the chapter (**3:5-7, 10-12, 14, 15, 18, 28**).
- The **law of God** is also involved, primarily the **first table** which has to do with **worship to the true God**.
- We worship God because He is the **Creator (Psalm 95:6)** and the **sign** of worship to the Creator is the **Sabbath (Revelation 14:7)**.

There was a union of church and state (Daniel 3:2)

- *“And King Nebuchadnezzar sent word to gather together the satraps, the administrators, the governors, the counselors, the treasurers, the judges, the magistrates, and all the officials of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which King Nebuchadnezzar had set up.”*
- Notice all the **political rulers** who were present and in **order of rank**. All the **civil powers** of the Babylonian **world** were present there for this religious celebration.
- The **government** was enforcing a **religious decree**. To refuse to worship was considered high **treason against the government**.
- The story of **Daniel 3** illustrates what happens when the civil power seeks to **establish** religion. **Daniel 6** will illustrate what happens when the civil power attempts to forbid the **free exercise** of religion.

The decree to worship was universal (Daniel 3:4)

- Representatives from all the nations of the day were present for this religious celebration enforced by the state. All the great political leaders of the day were present and bowed before the image (see **Daniel 3:2, 3, 7**). The expression ‘peoples, nations and languages is reminiscent of **Revelation 17:15**.
- *“Then a herald cried aloud: “To you it is commanded, O peoples, nations, and languages ...”*

Time and again the chapter emphasizes that music played a significant role in connection with false worship (Daniel 3:5, 7, 10 and 15). So to speak, everyone was expected to dance to Babylon's tune:

- *"To you it is commanded, O peoples, nations, and languages,⁵ that at the time you hear the sound of the horn, flute, harp, lyre, and psaltery, in symphony with all kinds of music, you shall fall down and worship the gold image that King Nebuchadnezzar has set up. . ."*

A death decree was given against those who did not worship the image of the beast (Daniel 3:6, 11, 15 and 19)

- *". . . and whoever does not fall down and worship shall be cast immediately into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."*

There was an insignificant yet faithful remnant that refused to worship the image of the beast (Daniel 3:12). If the king could eradicate this remnant, his triumph would be complete

- *"There are certain Jews whom you have set over the affairs of the province of Babylon: Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego; these men, O king, have not paid due regard to you. They do not serve your gods or worship the gold image which you have set up."*

The religious leaders accused the three young men to the civil power (Daniel 2:2, 4, 5, 10, 12; 3:9-12)

- *"Therefore at that time certain Chaldeans came forward and accused the Jews. . . There are certain Jews whom you have set over the affairs of the province of Babylon: Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego; these men, O king, have not paid due regard to you. They do not serve your gods or worship the gold image which you have set up."*
- The Chaldeans were the religious leaders of Babylon, the priestly caste. These religious leaders hated God's remnant because of their religious convictions.

There was a shaking in the Valley of Dura (Daniel 1:3)

- When Nebuchadnezzar took Daniel and his three friends captive to Babylon he left King Zedekiah to rule in Jerusalem. In **2 Kings 24:14-17** we are told that the king *' . . . carried into captivity all Jerusalem: all the captains and all the mighty men of valor, ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths.'*
- Would not Zedekiah be expected to be present at the dedication? We know that in the year **594 BC (Jeremiah 51:59)** King Zedekiah made a **trip to Babylon**. Was it to worship the image?

- Furthermore, there were other Hebrew youth who were placed in governmental positions when Daniel and his friends were taken to Babylon. Is it just possible that they bowed before the image?

Nebuchadnezzar attempted to intimidate the remnant who kept the commandments of God and worshipped only Him (Daniel 3:15)

- **The king's strategy consisted in three steps:** Fascination, intimidation, annihilation. Everything in the story of **Daniel 3** sought to 'wow' the senses. The music, the majestic image, the presence of the political leaders from all over the world the peer pressure, were all meant to mesmerize those who were present for the dedication of the image. When the Hebrew worthies were unwilling to be hypnotized by the majesty of the occasion, the king sought to use intimidation and threats. When the threats did not work, the king resorted to the final solution: Annihilation!
- The king roared as he said to the faithful remnant: **Daniel 3:15:** *"And who is the god who will deliver you from my hands?"*
- Ellen White makes a very **insightful remark** about the body language of the king when he spoke these words. She says that he spoke them *"with hand stretched upward in defiance"*. (Signs of the Times, May 6, 1897)

The answer of the faithful remnant was respectful yet firm (Daniel 3:16-18)

- *"Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego answered and said to the king, "O Nebuchadnezzar, we have no need to answer you in this matter. ¹⁷ If that is the case, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us from your hand, O king. ¹⁸ But if not, let it be known to you, O king, that **we do not serve your gods**, nor will we worship the gold image which you have set up."*

The king's rage (Daniel 3:19)

The reaction of the king is noteworthy:

Daniel 3:19: *"Then Nebuchadnezzar was **full of fury**, and **the expression on his face changed** toward Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego. He spoke and commanded that they heat the furnace seven times more than it was usually heated."*

- Ellen White vividly describes the **face of Nebuchadnezzar** after the young men spoke: *"Satanic attributes made his countenance appear as the countenance of a demon."* Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Volume 4 p. 1169

- **God** would **shortly answer** this charge: *“I will deliver them.”* The Husband would protect his bride, the Shepherd would protect his sheep, the Head would care for the body and the Sovereign would keep his covenant with His servants.
- The same mistake was made by **Pharaoh**. He had said: “I do not know Yahweh and I will not let His people go.” He challenged the God of heaven and the **Lord fought for Israel** and delivered them.

Time of trouble for the three young men (Daniel 3:20-23)

- They **faced** the **beast**, his **image** and the **civil rulers** and the death decree **without flinching**. There was no human way to survive.

Furnace heated seven times hotter (3:19)

- The number 7 indicates that the furnace was heated to the **maximum heat** because the number 7 represents totality or completeness. This was a manifestation of the fullness of the king’s wrath.
- The **furnace represents affliction** by which God **purifies his people** (Isaiah 48:10, 11; Psalm 12:6; 13:12; Job 23:10; Isaiah 33:14-16; Malachi 3:2, 3; Revelation 3:18). The faith of the three worthies was severely tested but they came forth as pure gold. Their faith was also a witness that brought honor and glory to the true God before the all the nations of the world.
- The young men **claimed the promise** of Isaiah 43:2.
- The young men did not form their character in the crisis. Their character was exhibited in the crisis. Their faithfulness in **Daniel 1** in the small things prepared them to pass greater tests.

Their tormentors died instead (Daniel 3:22)

Christ Himself stood up to deliver His faithful remnant in the midst of the time of trouble (Daniel 3:25)

“Look!” he answered, “I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire; and they are not hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.”

“As His witnesses were cast into the furnace, the Savior revealed Himself to them in person, and together they walked in the midst of the fire.” Prophets and Kings, pp. 508, 509

- Notice that the king described the **Son of God as an Angel**, that is, **Michael the Archangel (Daniel 3:25, 28)** or the Angel of the LORD.
- How did the king know what the Son of God looked like: Ellen White responds:

"The Hebrew captives had told Nebuchadnezzar of Christ, the Redeemer that was to come, and from the description thus given the king recognized the form of the fourth in the fiery furnace as the Son of God." Christ Triumphant, p. 178

- The Hebrew worthies **went through the tribulation** but they were **shielded** by divine power (**Daniel 3:24-27**).
- **Christ is the Hero of this story**, not the young men!!

The word 'deliver' is used in certain strategic parts of the chapter (3:15, 17, 28, 29)

- *"Now if you are ready at the time you hear the sound of the horn, flute, harp, lyre, and psaltery, in symphony with all kinds of music, and you fall down and worship the image which I have made, good! But if you do not worship, you shall be cast immediately into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. And who is the god who will deliver you from my hands?"*
- *"If that is the case, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us from your hand, O king."*
- *"Nebuchadnezzar spoke, saying, "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego, who sent His Angel and delivered His servants who trusted in Him, and they have frustrated the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they should not serve nor worship any god except their own God!"*
- *"Therefore I make a decree that any people, nation, or language which speaks anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made an ash heap; because there is no other God who can deliver like this."*

An Important Principle

Literal Israel was literally captive in literal Babylon, the literal king behaved like a literal beast, set up a literal image, commanding everyone to literally bow and worship it; literal Jews refused to literally bow and therefore were thrown into a literal fiery furnace and were delivered from the literal flames. But in the end time application that which was literal and local in the Old Testament story will be worldwide and spiritual at the end of time.

The power which will rule the world in the end-time will be spiritual and global Babylon (Revelation 14:8; 16:12-16, 19; 17:1, 2, 5, 18, 21)

- Babylon will once again present a **counterfeit prophetic scenario** wanting to establish a **new world order different** than the new world order which Jesus has promised to establish.
- The arrogance of Babylon in the end time will be no less than in the days of Daniel. In **Revelation 18:7** end time Babylon boasts: 'I sit as queen, and [I] am no widow, and will not see sorrow.' In **Isaiah 47:7** Babylon boasts: 'I shall be a lady forever'. And in **verse 8** she blasphemously claims the title that belongs only to Yahweh, the great 'I AM: 'I am, and there is no one else besides me; I shall not sit as a widow, nor shall I know the loss of children'.
- At the very end of human history, the Papacy, apostate Protestantism and the kings of the earth will unite to establish a New World Order such as was envisioned by the builders of the Tower of Babel (see **Genesis 11:1-9**).
- The second coming of Jesus as the solution to the world's problems will be cast aside and men will attempt to establish a golden age on earth that will stand forever:

*"Papists, who boast of miracles as a certain sign of the true church, will be readily deceived by this wonder-working power; and Protestants, having cast away the shield of truth, will also be deluded. **Papists, Protestants, and worldlings** will alike accept the form of godliness without the power, and they will see in **this union** a grand movement for the conversion of the world and the ushering in of the **long-expected millennium**."*
***The Great Controversy**, pp. 588, 589*

God's people will once again be captive in Babylon and this is the reason they are called to come out of her (Revelation 18:4)

- *"And I heard another voice from heaven saying: "Come out of her, my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her plagues."*
- *"Of Babylon, at the time brought to view in this prophecy, it is declared: "Her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." **Revelation 18:5**. She has filled up the measure of her guilt, and destruction is about to fall upon her. But God still has a people in Babylon; and before the visitation of His judgments these faithful ones must be called out, that they partake not of her sins and "receive not of her plagues." Hence the movement symbolized by the angel coming down from heaven, lightening the earth with his glory and crying mightily with a strong voice, announcing.*
- *The sins of Babylon. In connection with his message the call is heard: "Come out of her, My people." These announcements, uniting with the third angel's message, constitute*

the final warning to be given to the inhabitants of the earth.” The Great Controversy, p. 604

In Revelation there is a power which is described as the beast and the beast is a symbol of the Roman Catholic Papacy (Revelation 13:2)

- “Now the beast which I saw was like a leopard, his feet were like the feet of a bear, and his mouth like the mouth of a lion. The dragon gave him his power, his throne, and great authority.”

The beast will have an image built in its honor. The image is a replica of the Papacy that is raised up in its honor by Protestant America (Revelation 13:11-18)

- **Revelation 13:14:** “And he deceives those who dwell on the earth by those signs which he was granted to do in the sight of the beast, telling those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the beast who was wounded by the sword and lived.”
- “In order for the United States to form an image of the beast, the religious power must so control the civil government that the authority of the state will also be employed by the church to accomplish her own ends.” The Great Controversy, p. 443
- But in the very act of enforcing a religious duty by secular power, the churches would themselves form an image to the beast; hence the enforcement of Sunday keeping in the United States would be an enforcement of the worship of the beast and his image.” The Great Controversy, p. 448
- “The ‘image to the beast’ represents that form of apostate Protestantism which will be developed when the Protestant churches shall seek the aid of the civil power for the enforcement of their dogmas.” The Great Controversy, p. 445
- As the idea to build the image was not Nebuchadnezzar’s but rather that of the religious leaders, so the idea of building an image of and to the beast will be the idea of the religious leaders of the Protestant churches in the United States.

The Mark of the Beast will be Imposed by Force

Revelation 13:15: “He was granted power to give breath to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak and cause as many as would not worship the image of the beast to be killed.”

- The mark of the beast is the exact **opposite of the seal of God**. The **seal** of God is the **Sabbath** so the **mark** of the beast must be a another day of worship that seeks to counterfeit God’s genuine day.

- The first angel's message in **Revelation 14:7** calls us to **worship the creator** in contrast to **worshipping the beast** and his image in the third angel's message (**Revelation 14:9-11**).

Ellen White remarks:

*“An **idol sabbath** has been set up, **as the golden image** was set up in the plains of Dura. And as Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, issued a decree that all who would not bow down and worship this image should be killed, so a proclamation will be made that all who will **not reverence the Sunday** institution will be punished with **imprisonment and death.**” Manuscript Releases, Volume 14 p. 91*

The number of the beast is 666:

- The beast has a **blasphemous** name (**Revelation 13:1**).
- What is **blasphemy**? Blasphemy is when a mere man claims to be God on earth and also claims to have power to forgive sins (**Mark 2:7; John 10:33**).
- The blasphemous name has a **number** (**Revelation 13:17**).
- **How do you get** a number from a name?
- In ancient times numbers were **written with letters**.
- **What language** do we employ?
- It must be in **Latin** because this is a **Roman power** (**Revelation 13:2**).

The image and mark must have something to do with the sun

- Is it the **same to worship the sun** as it is to **worship on Sunday**? In principle it is the same because an idol is created by men's hands for worship while Sunday has been created by man for worship. Anything that man creates for worship in place of what God has created for worship is an idol.
- The pope has an official name whose number value is 666: **Vicarius Filii Dei**. Notably, the word **Antichrist** means 'one who occupies the place of Christ'.
- Ellen White draws the parallel:

“History will be repeated. False religion will be exalted. The first day of the week, a common working day, possessing no sanctity whatever, will be set up as was the image at Babylon. All nations and tongues and peoples will be commanded to worship this spurious sabbath. This is Satan's plan to make of no account the day instituted by God, and given to the world as a memorial of creation. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, Volume 7 p. 976

- “We are to warn men and women against the worship of the beast and his image— against the worship of the idol Sunday. But in doing this work, we need not begin a warfare against unbelievers. We are simply to present the Word of the Lord, in its true dignity and purity, before the minds of those who are ignorant or indifferent regarding its teachings. . . . We need not tell them that they will go to hell unless they keep the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. The truth itself, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit, will convict and convert hearts.” ***Christ Triumphant***, p. 178
- The Papacy boasts that it has changed the day of worship from Sabbath to Sunday by the authority and **as the representative** of Jesus Christ. In this way the papacy claims to exercise the power and prerogatives of God because it is **Vicarius Filii Dei**. Sunday has been created as the idol sabbath made by man for worship.

Once again worship will be the central issue and it will be worldwide (Revelation 13:3, 8, 16; 14:6; 16:13, 14; 17:15)

- **Revelation 14:6:** “Then I saw another angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to those who dwell on the earth — to **every nation, tribe, tongue, and people.**”
- **Revelation 13:3:** “And I saw one of his heads as if it had been mortally wounded, and his deadly wound was healed. And **all the world** marveled and followed the beast.”
- **Revelation 17:15:** “Then he said to me: “The waters which you saw, where the harlot sits, are **peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.**”
- **Revelation 13:8:** “**All who dwell on the earth** will worship him, whose names have not been written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.”
- **Revelation 13:16:** “He causes **all**, both small and great, rich and poor, free and slave, to receive a mark on their right hand or on their foreheads.”
- **Revelation 16:13, 14:** “And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs coming out of the mouth of the dragon, out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. ¹⁴ For they are spirits of demons, performing signs, which go out **to the kings of the earth and of the whole world**, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.”
- “The decree enforcing **the worship of this day** is to go forth to **all the world**”. ***Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary***, Volume 7 p. 967

But the commandments will also be an issue, especially the first table of the law (Revelation 12:17; 14:12)

Revelation 12:17: “And the dragon was enraged with the woman, and he went to make war with the rest of her offspring, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.”

Revelation 14:12: *"Here is the patience of the saints; here are those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."*

There will be a union of church and state (Revelation 17:1, 2; 18:3)

- *"The dignitaries of church and state will unite to bribe, persuade, or compel all classes to honor the Sunday." **The Great Controversy**, p. 592*
- **Revelation 17:1, 2:** *"Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me, "Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters ² **with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication**, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication."*
- **Revelation 18:3:***"For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, the **kings of the earth have committed fornication with her**, and the merchants of the earth have become rich through the abundance of her luxury."*
- *"When the leading churches of the United States, uniting upon such points of doctrine as are held by them in common, **shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions**, then Protestant America will have formed **an image** of the Roman hierarchy, and the infliction of civil penalties upon dissenters will inevitably result." **The Great Controversy**, p. 445*

A death decree will be proclaimed against God's faithful remnant (Revelation 13:15)

- *"This argument [the one based on John 11:51] will appear conclusive; and a decree will finally be issued against those who hallow the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, denouncing them as deserving of the severest punishment and giving the people liberty, after a certain time, to put them to death. Romanism in the Old World and apostate Protestantism in the New will pursue a similar course toward those who honor all the divine precepts." **The Great Controversy**, p. 615*
- *"Fearful is the issue to which the world is to be brought. The powers of earth, uniting to war against the commandments of God, will decree that "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond" (**Revelation 13:16**), shall conform to the customs of the church by the observance of the false sabbath. All who refuse compliance will be visited with civil penalties, and it will finally be declared that they are deserving of death." **The Great Controversy**, p. 604*

The death decree will be universal (Revelation 13:15, 16)

- *“As the Sabbath has become the special point of controversy throughout Christendom, and religious and secular authorities have combined to enforce the observance of the Sunday, the persistent refusal of a small minority to yield to the popular demand will make them objects of universal execration.” The Great Controversy, p. 615*

As in all apostasies of history, music and external display will play a significant role in the end time (Revelation 18:22)

- Satan knows **what type of music to use to dull our spiritual senses** and make us **more susceptible** to his temptations.
- *“Many Protestants suppose that the Catholic religion is unattractive and that its worship is a dull, meaningless round of ceremony. Here they mistake. While Romanism is based upon deception, it is not a coarse and clumsy imposture. The religious service of the Roman Church is a most impressive ceremonial. Its gorgeous display and solemn rites fascinate the senses of the people and silence the voice of reason and of conscience. The eye is charmed. Magnificent churches, imposing processions, golden altars, jeweled shrines, choice paintings, and exquisite sculpture appeal to the love of beauty. The ear also is captivated. The music is unsurpassed. The rich notes of the deep-toned organ, blending with the melody of many voices as it swells through the lofty domes and pillared aisles of her grand cathedrals, cannot fail to impress the mind with awe and reverence. This outward splendor, pomp, and ceremony, that only mocks the longings of the sin-sick soul, is an evidence of inward corruption. The religion of Christ needs not such attractions to recommend it. In the light shining from the cross, true Christianity appears so pure and lovely that no external decorations can enhance its true worth. It is the beauty of holiness, a meek and quiet spirit, which is of value with God. The Great Controversy, pp. 566, 567*

God will have a faithful remnant which will refuse to worship the image to the beast (Revelation 12:17; 14:12; 15:2-4)

There will be a shaking among God’s people (Matthew 24:10-12)

- *“To stand in defense of truth and righteousness when the majority forsakes us, to fight the battles of the Lord when champions are few--this will be our test. At this time we must gather warmth from the coldness of others, courage from their cowardice, and loyalty from their treason. The nation will be on the side of the great rebel leader.” Testimonies for the Church, Volume 5 p. 136*
- *“As the storm approaches, a **large class who has professed faith in the third angel's message, but has not been sanctified through obedience to the truth**, abandon their*

position and join the **ranks of the opposition**. By uniting with the world and partaking of its spirit, they have come to view matters in nearly the same light; and when the test is brought, they are prepared to choose the easy, popular side. Men of talent and pleasing address, who once rejoiced in the truth, employ their powers to deceive and mislead souls. They become the most bitter enemies of their former brethren. When Sabbath keepers are brought before the courts to answer for their faith, these apostates are the most efficient agents of Satan to misrepresent and accuse them and by false reports and insinuations to stir up the rulers against them.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 608

- ‘The time is not far distant when the test will come to every soul. The mark of the beast will be urged upon us. Those who have step by step yielded to worldly demands and conformed to worldly customs will not find it a hard matter to yield to the powers that be, rather than subject themselves to derision, insult, threatened imprisonment, and death. The contest is between the commandments of God and the commandments of men. In this time the gold will be separated from the dross in the church. True godliness will be clearly distinguished from the appearance and tinsel of it. Many a star that we have admired for its brilliancy will then go out in darkness. Chaff like a cloud will be borne away on the wind, even from places where we see only floors of rich wheat. All who assume the ornaments of the sanctuary, but are not clothed with Christ's righteousness, will appear in the shame of their own nakedness. **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 5 p. 81

Protestant religious leaders will be the foremost to accuse the remnant of God

Just like in the days of Elijah, John the Baptist, Jesus and the middle ages:

- “Those who honor the Bible Sabbath will be denounced as enemies of law and order, as breaking down the moral restraints of society, causing anarchy and corruption, and calling down the judgments of God upon the earth. Their conscientious scruples will be pronounced obstinacy, stubbornness, and contempt of authority. They will be accused of disaffection toward the government. Ministers who deny the obligation of the divine law will present from the pulpit the duty of yielding obedience to the civil authorities as ordained of God. In legislative halls and courts of justice, commandment keepers will be misrepresented and condemned. A false coloring will be given to their words; the worst construction will be put upon their motives.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 592
- “As the controversy extends into new fields and the minds of the people are called to God's downtrodden law, Satan is astir. The power attending the message will only madden those who oppose it. The clergy will put forth almost superhuman efforts to shut away the light lest it should shine upon their flocks. By every means at their

command they will endeavor to suppress the discussion of these vital questions.” The Great Controversy, p. 607

Satan will manifest his wrath (Revelation 12:17)

There will be a similar question as was asked by Nebuchadnezzar (Revelation 13:3, 4)

- *“I saw one of its heads as if it had been mortally wounded, and its deadly wound was healed. And all the world marveled and followed the beast. ⁴ So they worshiped the dragon who gave authority to the beast; and they worshiped the beast, saying: “Who is like the beast? Who is able to make war with him?”*

There will be a severe time of trouble and God’s people will appear doomed

Daniel 11 has the sequence: **King of the north** goes out to **annihilate** many then **Michael stands up** to defend his people, then they are **delivered**.

- *“He numbers the world as his subjects; but the little company who keep the commandments of God are resisting his supremacy. If he could blot them from the earth, his triumph would be complete.” The Great Controversy, p. 618*
- *“When the protection of human laws shall be withdrawn from those who honor the law of God, there will be, in different lands, a simultaneous movement for their destruction. As the time appointed in the decree draws near, the people will conspire to root out the hated sect. It will be determined to strike in one night a decisive blow, which shall utterly silence the voice of dissent and reproof.” The Great Controversy, p. 635*

The fiery furnace is the seven last plagues where the totality of God’s wrath is to be poured out. The wicked will be destroyed but not the righteous

- *“Their affliction is great, the flames of the furnace seem about to consume them; but the Refiner will bring them forth as gold tried in the fire. God’s love for His children during the period of their severest trial is as strong and tender as in the days of their sunniest prosperity; but it is needful for them to be placed in the furnace of fire; their earthliness must be consumed, that the image of Christ may be perfectly reflected.” The Great Controversy, p. 621*

The wicked oppressors of God's people will perish with their own weapons

- *“The very ones that once admired them most will pronounce the most dreadful curses upon them. The very hands that once crowned them with laurels will be raised for their destruction. The swords which were to slay God's people are now employed to destroy their enemies. Everywhere there is strife and bloodshed.” The Great Controversy, p. 655*

Jesus will personally intervene to deliver His people

- **Daniel 12:1:** *“At that time Michael shall stand up, the great prince who stands watch over the sons of your people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that time. And at that time your people shall be delivered, every one who is found written in the book.”*

This quotation is found in the chapter titled: ‘God’s People Delivered’:

- *“When the protection of human laws shall be withdrawn from those who honor the law of God, there will be, in different lands, a simultaneous movement for their destruction. As the time appointed in the decree draws near, the people will conspire to root out the hated sect. It will be determined to strike in one night a decisive blow, which shall utterly silence the voice of dissent and reproof. The people of God--some in prison cells, some hidden in solitary retreats in the forests and the mountains--still plead for divine protection, while in every quarter companies of armed men, urged on by hosts of evil angels, are preparing for the work of death. It is now, in the hour of utmost extremity that the God of Israel will interpose for the deliverance of His chosen.” The Great Controversy, p. 635*

God will demand unswerving loyalty:

- *“The season of distress before God's people will call for a faith that will not falter. His children must make it manifest that He is the only object of their worship, and that no consideration, not even that of life itself, can induce them to make the least concession to false worship. To the loyal heart the commands of sinful, finite men will sink into insignificance beside the word of the eternal God. Truth will be obeyed though the result be imprisonment or exile or death. Prophets and Kings, pp. 512, 513*

A fireproof character

- **Isaiah 33:14-16.** We must have a sterling character. Be faithful in the small things (**Luke 16:10; Jeremiah 12:5**)

Final Comforting Promise

Important are the lessons to be learned from the experience of the Hebrew youth on the plain of Dura. In this our day, many of God's servants, though innocent of wrongdoing, will be given over to suffer humiliation and abuse at the hands of those who, inspired by Satan, are filled with envy and religious bigotry. Especially will the wrath of man be aroused against those who hallow the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; and at last a universal decree will denounce these as deserving of death.

The season of distress before God's people will call for a faith that will not falter. His children must make it manifest that He is the only object of their worship, and that no consideration, not even that of life itself, can induce them to make the least concession to false worship. To the loyal heart the commands of sinful, finite men will sink into insignificance beside the word of the eternal God. Truth will be obeyed though the result be imprisonment or exile or death.

*As in the days of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, so in the closing period of earth's history the Lord will work mightily in behalf of those who stand steadfastly for the right. He who walked with the Hebrew worthies in the fiery furnace will be with His followers wherever they are. His abiding presence will comfort and sustain. In the midst of the time of trouble--trouble such as has not been since there was a nation--His chosen ones will stand unmoved. Satan with all the hosts of evil cannot destroy the weakest of God's saints. Angels that excel in strength will protect them, and in their behalf Jehovah will reveal Himself as a "God of gods," able to save to the uttermost those who have put their trust in Him. ***Prophets and Kings***, pp. 512, 513*

LESSON #9 – NOTES ON DANIEL 4

Daniel 4 and 5: Comparison and Contrast

The chiastic structure of Daniel 1-7 (Daniel 2 & 7, 3 & 6 and 4 & 5) indicates that **Daniel 4 and 5** are closely related:

- Both chapters describe arrogant, self-centered Babylonian kings.
- In Daniel 5:18-22 the prophet tells Belshazzar the story of Nebuchadnezzar's madness. This links the two chapters together.
- Both chapters describe the fall of Babylonian kings. But while the fall of Nebuchadnezzar in **Daniel 4** was temporary and remedial, the fall of Belshazzar was final and retributive.
- **Why** was Nebuchadnezzar's judgment temporary and remedial? Why was there room for repentance for Nebuchadnezzar and not for Belshazzar? The reason is provided in Daniel 5:18-22. Belshazzar sinned with a 'high hand'. He had the entire history of his grandfather before him and yet decided to purposely spite it. He did not repent and humble his heart and therefore God closed the door of probation for Babylon and for him. It did not have to be this way. Jeremiah 51:9 states:

"We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed. Forsake her, and let us go everyone to his own country; for her judgment reaches to heaven and is lifted up to the skies."

- At the end of human history it will be shown that Babylon could have repented but she refused to even in the face of great light (**Revelation 16**). The experiences of Nebuchadnezzar and his grandson have a message for the kings and kingdoms of the earth at the end of time. While the story of Nebuchadnezzar reveals what could have been, the story of Belshazzar reveals, tragically, what will be.

General Structure of Daniel 4

The king's poetic anthem of praise in Daniel 4:1-3 should probably be included as the conclusion of chapter 3. The LXX presents it this way. When Daniel's three friends were

delivered from the furnace, the king was impressed with God's signs and wonders. But at the end of chapter 4 we will find that he was deeply impressed with God's character as a person. His concept of God had changed from One who performs signs and wonders to a God who can humble the proud and perform the greatest miracle of all, transform the stony heart of a haughty despot to that of a humble child.

First and Third Person

Verses 2-27 are the first person because the king is describing his own experience.

Verses 28-33 (while Nebuchadnezzar is beside himself) are in the third person because someone else is telling the story.

Verses 34-37 return to the first person because the king is 'all there' once more.

Flow of the Chapter

- Nebuchadnezzar receives the dream (Daniel 4:4, 5).
- The king calls the wise men (Daniel 4:6, 7). These verses clearly reveal that the king himself knew that the religion of Babylon was bankrupt so at last he has to call Daniel (Daniel 4:18).
- Daniel comes to the rescue (Daniel 4:8, 9).
- The king tells Daniel the dream (Daniel 4:10-17).
- The king affirms his trust that Daniel will be able to interpret the dream (Daniel 4:18).
- Daniel is troubled about the meaning of the dream and yet chooses to tell the king the truth (Daniel 4:19).
- Daniel repeats the dream to Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 4:20-26).
- Daniel counsels the king to 'shape up' to prevent God's judgment (Daniel 4:27).
- The king manifests his arrogant pride one year later (Daniel 4:28-32).
- God's voice pronounces the sentence upon the king (Daniel 4:31, 32).
- The sentence is executed and the king 'loses it' for seven years (Daniel 4:33)
- A sane Nebuchadnezzar praises God for humbling him (Daniel 4:34-37).

Practical Lessons from Daniel 4

The Relentless God

We can learn valuable lessons about the process of the king's conversion the first of which is how God patiently works to transform human hearts into His image. God is relentless in seeking our salvation:

God's Persistence

Daniel 1, Daniel and his three friends were first introduced to Nebuchadnezzar. There is no doubt that the king was impressed with their wisdom because he could see that they were ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers (see **Daniel 1:20**). The king must have wondered about the secret of their success. God was setting the stage for future developments. Yet the king at that time was quite sure that he was in control so he enrolled the young men in the Babylonian educational system, appointed their diet, changed their names and constantly emphasized that his god was greater than their God.

Daniel 2:47: After Daniel told the king his dream and its meaning (in **Daniel 2**), the king seemed to recognize that the Hebrew God was the God of gods. At this point, however, the Hebrew God is not the ONLY God but the greatest of all the gods.

Chapter 3: Clearly indicates that even after the events of **Daniel 2** the king was still an idolater at heart as well as boastful, arrogant and cruel. He was not truly converted. Yet God still bore with him.

The spectacular events of chapter 3 did nothing to convert the heart of the proud king. Notice four things about the king's decree in **Daniel 3:29**:

- **First**, Jehovah is not his God but rather the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.
- **Second**, the king's decree does not forbid the worship of other gods but simply forbids 'speaking against the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego.'
- **Third**, the king's cruelty is still manifested when he threatens to cut in pieces anyone who speaks negatively about the God of the three Hebrew worthies. His cruelty reminds us of Saddam Hussein.
- **Finally**, according to **Daniel 4:1-3** Nebuchadnezzar conceived of the Hebrew God as a great worker of signs and wonders but he does not at this point know God as his personal friend.
- We see that God is a patient God. God does not give up on the king. He has a passion for the salvation of the king. God was constantly on the king's track—He wanted him as his loving child.

At the beginning of Daniel 4 the king was still a servant of 'his god' (verse 8) and this in spite of all that had occurred in **Daniel 1-3**. The king had repeatedly seen the bankruptcy of the Babylonian religion. In each of the first four chapters the Hebrew religion was clearly proved to be superior.

- In **Daniel 1** the Hebrew young men were proved ten times superior to the Babylonian priests.
- In **Daniel 2** the Chaldeans could not tell or interpret the dream.

- In **Daniel 3** the **Chaldeans accused** the three young men and **God delivered them** from the evil plot.

In spite of all of this, the king **called these charlatans again** in **Daniel 4:7** (on the bankruptcy of the Babylonian methods of divination see **Isaiah 47:12, 13**).

Nebuchadnezzar's concept of the God's was that of the Chaldeans in **Daniel 2:11**—a totally **transcendent god** who is **uninterested** in human affairs. Ancient gods were conceived of as **self-serving despots and tyrants** who did not care about human beings except to have them **cater to their every whim and fancy**.

But slowly, and surely, the **Hebrew God changed the king's concept of God**. He came to see that **God wanted to communicate** His will to human beings. He came to see him as a God who is **interested in human affairs** generally and in **specific persons** in particular. In fact, he came to realize that the Hebrew God was **interested in saving him!** He slowly came to realize that God is **not only the high and lofty one** but is also with those of **humble and contrite heart**. That is, God is **concerned** about His earthly children. He saw this clearly when **Jesus Himself came into the furnace** to deliver His servants from certain death.

In **Daniel 1-4** we see the Hebrew God as the **patient and long-suffering** God who does **all in His power** to save. God even gave the king **twelve months** after the dream to repent in order to avert punishment (**Daniel 4:29**). After all, the **prophecy was conditional** (**Daniel 4:27**) and the judgment **could be averted** if the king repented and changed his ways.

But as the memory of his **dream faded** from his mind, *'he lost confidence in the interpretation of the dream, and jested at his former fears'* (Ellen G. White, **Prophets and Kings**, p. 519)

The king's confession at the end of chapter 4 reveals that he was finally **truly converted** to God.

The Question of When

At **what point in the life** of the king did the events of chapter 4 take place? We know that Nebuchadnezzar **ruled for 43** years (**605-562** BC). Was he converted toward the **beginning**, at the **middle** or toward the **end** of his reign? There can be little doubt that the events of **Daniel 4** took place toward the **end** of the king's life.

First, **Daniel 4:4** explains that the king **was at peace** in his house and **flourishing** in the palace. This is a common expression which means that he was **enjoying the fruits** of his conquests. In other words, the wars of **conquest were over**. It is at the time when **things go best** that we **forget God** the most.

We know that the **last military campaign** that the king undertook was in his **37th regnal year** (568 BC) when he **conquered Egypt**. Ellen White explained that Egypt was given by God into the king's hand as a reward for his long and somewhat fruitless siege of Tyre which lasted some **13 years** (**The Youth's Instructor**, October 11, 1904). We have quite a bit of information about Nebuchadnezzar throughout **most of his life except** for the last seven years (**568-562** BC, inclusive reckoning).

Why is there this period of **historical silence** in Nebuchadnezzar's record? Undoubtedly the king was enjoying his good '**vegetarian cuisine**' along with the beasts of the field. This means that the king was most likely **converted in the 37th year** of his reign. It surely did **take God a long time to prevail** over the **proud ruler!**

Ellen White confirms that his insanity came late in his life:

*"In the early part of his acquaintance with Daniel, the king had found that he was the only one who could give him relief in his perplexity, and now at a **later period**, when another perplexing vision is given him, he remembers Daniel."* **Manuscript Releases**, volume 13, p. 63

We know that the king was sane when he conquered Jerusalem in **605 BC**. We know that he was sane when Jerusalem fell for a second time in **597 BC**. He was still sane when he destroyed Jerusalem in **586 BC**. We know that he was sane when he fought against Tyre for a period of 13 years from **582-569 BC**. We know that he conquered Egypt in the year **568 BC**. Nebuchadnezzar's madness is to be placed during the last seven years of his life.

God worked with the king for **a long 37 years** and finally **conquered his heart!** God wanted Nebuchadnezzar to be his.

Regarding the king's final and true conversion, Ellen White writes:

*"The once proud monarch had become a **humble child** of God; the **tyrannical, overbearing ruler**, a **wise** and **compassionate** king. He who had defied and blasphemed the God of heaven, now acknowledged the power of the Most High and earnestly sought to promote the fear of Jehovah and the happiness of his subjects. Under the rebuke of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, Nebuchadnezzar had learned at last **the lesson which all rulers need to learn--that true greatness consists in true goodness.**"* **Prophets and Kings**, p. 521

*"King Nebuchadnezzar, before whom Daniel so often honored the name of God, was finally **thoroughly converted** and learned to "praise and extol and honor the King of heaven."* **Review and Herald**, January 11, 1906

We are even told that after his conversion, the king became a **witness for God** by presenting his testimony to others:

*"The king upon the Babylonian throne became a witness for God, **giving his testimony**, warm and eloquent, from a grateful heart that was partaking of the mercy and grace, the righteousness and peace, of the divine nature"* **The Youth's Instructor**, December 13, 1904

Greater than any sign of wonder (such as revealing dreams, delivering people from a furnace, healing people, speaking in tongues) is the **change of a person** from having a **self-centered heart** to one who makes **God and fellow human beings first**. The **greatest miracle** of all is the change of a **sinner into a saint**. It will be truly exciting to meet the **Nebuchadnezzar in the kingdom**.

Message to World's Political Leaders

Another lesson we can learn from the experience of the king is that even though **God gives dominion to human rulers**, He is **still the absolute** arbiter and guide of human history.

The dream of the tree reminds us of the dominion which was originally given to **man at creation** over the birds of the air, the beasts of the field and all the earth (see **Genesis 1:26, 28**). The **original dominion** was to be **loving, kind, just and merciful**. It was to bring **life and peace** to all the inhabitants of the earth.

But when **Adam sinned** human rulers became **despotic and tyrannical** and **abused** their dominion. Rulers were always to remember that they were **vice-regents of God** to bless their subjects but soon they **forgot** this and they **exploited** those whom they were supposed to protect and benefit.

Nebuchadnezzar thought he was king because of his **superior wisdom and ability**. In his own words:

*"Is not this great Babylon that **I** have built for a royal dwelling by **my** mighty power and for the honor of **my** majesty?" (Daniel 4:30)*

But, really, **why** was Nebuchadnezzar really the king?

The central theme of the book of Daniel is found in **chapter 2 and verse 21**. **Three ideas** come to view in this verse: **1)** God is in control of the times, **2)** God sets up kings and removes kings and **3)** God gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those that know understanding. These **three ideas can clearly be discerned** in **Daniel 4**.

First of all, God **changed Nebuchadnezzar's times** by making seven times pass over him. While he was planning for a **brilliant future** God changed his itinerary. **Secondly**, God placed him on the throne, **removed him** from the throne and then restored him to it. **Third**, God also **took away his wisdom** and understanding in the **wink of an eye**. This shows that **God is in control** of historical events, even when human beings refuse to cooperate. Regarding Nebuchadnezzar's illness, Ellen White remarks:

*"As the beasts have no knowledge of God, and therefore do not acknowledge his sovereignty, so Nebuchadnezzar had been unmindful of God and his mercies. Prosperity and popularity had led him to feel independent of God, and to use for his own glory the talent of reason that God had entrusted to him. Messages of warning were sent to him, but he heeded them not. The **heavenly Watcher** took cognizance of the king's spirit and actions, and in a moment **stripped the proud boaster of all that his Creator had given him.**" *Youth's Instructor*, March 28, 1905*

*"In a moment the **reason that God had given him** was taken away; **the judgment** that the king thought perfect, the **wisdom** on which he prided himself, was **removed**, and the once mighty ruler was a **maniac**. His hand could no longer sway the scepter. The messages of warning had been unheeded; now, stripped of the power his Creator had given him, and driven from men, Nebuchadnezzar "did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his*

hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws." Prophets and Kings, p. 520

"The instant that the words were uttered, the sentence of judgment was pronounced. The king's reason was taken away. The judgment that he had thought so perfect, the wisdom that he had prided himself on possessing, were removed. The jewel of the mind, that which elevates man above the beasts, he no longer retained." Testimonies for the Church, Volume 8 p. 126

Message of Daniel Chapters 1-4

Daniel Chapters 1 – 4: reveal a God who is in absolute control of history:

Chapter 1:

The Hebrews were taken captive to Babylon because 'God gave them' into the king's hand (**Daniel 1:1, 2**). God also gave them wisdom and understanding.

Chapter 2:

Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon because God placed him there (**Daniel 2:37, 38**). It is God who determines how history will flow and it is He who will establish a kingdom which shall never be destroyed. Only a God who is able to reveal the future history of the world can mold events so that they reach the climax which He has established (see **Isaiah 46:9, 10**).

Chapter 3:

When the king flexed his muscles and attempted to change God's perspective of history (God's times) and kill everyone who did not agree, God showed him that his power is limited—there were three young men who would not bow to the king's authority. When the king threw them into the furnace God overturned their death sentence by personally delivering them from the fire.

Chapter 4:

This chapter reveals, in multiple ways, that God is in control of history (**Daniel 17, 24-26, 32, 34, 35 and 37**). God took away the king's throne, preserved it while he was insane and then restored it to him at the end of the seven times. Notice carefully some of the expressions used in this chapter: "they shall" (**verses 25 and 32**), "was driven" (**verse 33**) "was established", "was added" (**verse 36**). These passive verbs indicate that someone besides the king is doing these things. And who is doing it? The answer is in **verse 17**: the Watchers from heaven.

Why do nations rise and fall? Daniel's counsel to Nebuchadnezzar gives the answer to this question (see **Daniel 4:27**). Notice also the following verses on why nations fall (**Proverbs 14:34; 16:12; 20:28; Psalm 33:12**).

The Greatest Lesson of All

The greatest lesson from **Daniel 4** was expressed by **Jesus** over six hundred years later:

“He who exalts himself will be humbled and he who humbles himself will be exalted.” (Matthew 23:12).

Notice in this verse that the proud person **exalts himself** and therefore **someone else humbles** him. On the other hand the lowly person humbles himself and someone else exalts him. That is, if we don't take care of the humbling, **God will!!**

The **mystery of iniquity** is characterized by a desire to ascend:

- At the very beginning of human history Eve desired to **exalt herself** to the **level of God** but she and her husband ended up in **the dust** (see **Genesis 3:1-6, 19**). In this context it is interesting that the word '**humility**' comes from **humus** which means 'dust' or 'dirt'. When we realize that we are **but dust**, then God can do something great for us and through us.
- **Ezekiel 28** explains that Lucifer manifested what I call the four sins of pride: **1) He became proud of his wisdom** and corrupted it (**Ezekiel 28:12**), **2) he was filled with pride** because of his **beauty** (**Ezekiel 28:12, 17**), **3) he exalted himself** because of his **riches** (**Ezekiel 28:4, 5**), **4) he aspired to a position of power** (**Ezekiel 28:2, 3, 6; Isaiah 14:12-14**). Because he exalted himself, he will be **cast down** to the pit (**Ezekiel 28:8, 17, 18**). It is worth remembering that **without the jewel of reason** that God gives us we would have none of these four qualities. In order to be wise you **must have a brain** and the brain must be able to reason!
- **Isaiah 14** depicts Lucifer's desire to ascend to the very heights of God's throne and for this reason he was cast **down and shall be cast down** (**Ezekiel 14:12, 14 and 15**).
- **Absalom** aspired to **take David's throne** and ended up buried in the pit (**2 Samuel 18:17, 18**).
- The **man of lawlessness** wants to make himself God but will end up thrown into the **fiery abyss** (**2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4**).

The **Mystery of Godliness**, on the other hand, is characterized by a desire to descend:

- **1 Timothy 3:16** begins with God coming down and taking human flesh and it ends up with him going up and being received in glory.
- **Psalm 22:1-21** describes the suffering and humiliation of Jesus even to the point of being placed in the dust. But **Psalm 22-30** describe the glorious exaltation of Jesus in the heavenly courts.
- **Philippians 2:6-11** tells us that because Jesus humbled Himself, he was highly exalted and given a name that is above every name.

- The declaration of Jesus, “*He who humbles himself will be exalted and he who exalts himself will be humbled*” is used in **three different contexts** in the gospels. **1) Matthew 23:12** where Jesus spoke about the pride of the **Pharisees**, **2) Luke 14:11** where Jesus spoke about those who always wish to **occupy the first seats**, **3) Luke 18:14** where Jesus contrasts the **Pharisee and the Publican**. Jesus also expressed the same concept when He stated that the **first shall be last and the last shall be first** (see Matthew 20:16; Mark 9:35; 10:31). Jesus also illustrated the principle in action when he instituted the **ordinance of humility** (see John 13).
- See also James 4:6, 10; 1 Peter 5:5, 6.
- The law of life is the **law of service**. The law of death is the law of **self-service**. The secret of life is to give of yourself to others. The **Sea of Galilee** receives to give and it is full of life. The **Dead Sea** receives and does not give and it has no life.
- When Nebuchadnezzar **looked up to God**, he came to his senses again (Daniel 4:34).

Conclusion

Jesus has **eternally subordinated** Himself to the Father. Even **before sin** came into this world the Son executed the **Father's plans** and was subject to His authority. And yet the Father and the Son are **equals** but they have **different functions**. Voluntary subordination according to God's plan **does not mean inferiority**. While Jesus was **on earth** He was also subordinate to His Father even to the point of saying: “*the Father is greater than I.*” **Now**, the Father is still the **head of Christ** (1 Corinthians 11:3). Finally, when **sin is eradicated** from the universe, Jesus will **subject Himself eternally** to His Father (1 Corinthians 15:24-28). Does this have anything to say about the present push for **women's ordination**? Is the demand for a **higher position** divine or demonic?

LESSON #10 – NOTES ON DANIEL 5

According to the Bible, **Babylon will never be rebuilt** (Jeremiah 50:38-40; Isaiah 13:19-22). Yet in Revelation Babylon plays a very important role in end time events. Is there not a contradiction between the prophecies that say that Babylon would never be rebuilt and the book of Revelation where Babylon plays a very important role in the consummation of human history? There is really no contradiction. The Babylon of the book of Revelation is actually the **spiritual fulfillment** of what the literal city represented. Notice how the principle is clearly enunciated by Louis F. Were:

“In the Old Testament times the Lord had the Jewish nation as His chosen race, with its capital in Jerusalem. Satan then also had a kingdom, with its capital in Babylon. After the rejection of the Jewish people as His chosen nation, the Lord chose members of all nations to make up His kingdom on earth. Satan also changed his kingdom into a church—that is, anciently a nation opposed a nation, but in the New Testament it is a false church that opposes the true church.”
Louis F. Were, **The Fall of Babylon in Type and Antitype**, p. 8

Ellen White supports this point of view. In referring to the Loud Cry message of Revelation 18:1-4 she describes the spiritual nature of end time Babylon:

*“The sins of **Babylon** will be laid open. The fearful results of enforcing the observances of the church by civil authority, the inroads of spiritualism, the stealthy but rapid progress of the papal power—all will be unmasked. By these solemn warnings the people will be stirred. Thousands upon thousands will listen who have never heard words like these. In amazement they hear the testimony that **Babylon is the church**, fallen because of her errors and sins, because of her rejection of the truth sent to her from heaven.”* **The Great Controversy**, pp. 606, 607

This principle means that the literal things connected with Old Testament Babylon (such as wine, cup, idols, harlot, Euphrates, etc.) must be interpreted in a symbolic manner in the book of **Revelation**.

Daniel was about **84 years old** and Belshazzar was about **36** when the events of **Daniel 5** took place.

Sources for the Study of Daniel 5

The Biblical sources:

- **Daniel 5**: an eyewitness account
- **Isaiah 13-14**
- **Jeremiah 25**
- **Jeremiah 50, 51**
- **Isaiah 47**

The secular sources:

- The Cyrus Cylinder (in the British Museum in London).
- The Nabonidus Chronicle (in the British Museum in London).
- Greek historian Herodotus (Histories I. 191) stated that the city fell while the king's court was drinking wine and Xenophon (Cyropaedia VII.5.30) wrote that Cyrus killed the king of Babylon upon his entrance into the city.
- For many years historical critical scholars affirmed that the account in **Daniel 5** was historically inaccurate for three reasons:
 - 1) There was no mention of King Belshazzar in secular history.
 - 2) According to secular sources, the last king of Babylon was known to be Nabonidus, not Belshazzar.
 - 3) It makes no sense that Daniel would be offered the third place in the kingdom. Why wouldn't he be offered the second place?

The discovery of the Nabonidus Chronicle has resolved all three problems. In the Nabonidus Chronicle Belshazzar is mentioned by name. He is spoken of as co-regent with his father, Nabonidus, who had gone to the desert oasis of Teima in Arabia to recover from some unexplained illness. In the words of the *Verse Account of Nabonidus* (British Museum Tablet 38,299):

*"He [Nabonidus] entrusted the 'camp' to his oldest (son), the first-born, the troops everywhere in the country he ordered under his (command). He let (everything) go, entrusted the kingship to him and, himself, he started out for a long journey." (Quoted in C. Mervyn Maxwell, **God Cares**, volume 1, p. 91)*

This clearly explains the reason why the book of Daniel refers to Daniel as the third in the kingdom!

Ellen White confirms what has been revealed by secular history:

*“Admitted to **a share** in kingly authority at fifteen years of age, Belshazzar gloried in his power and lifted up his heart against the God of heaven.” ***The Youth’s Instructor***, May 19, 1898*

Other Biblical details that are corroborated by secular history are:

- **A banquet** was in progress the very night that Babylon fell (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.5.15).
- The king of Babylon **was killed** the night that Babylon fell (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* VII.V.24-32).
- The Persians **diverted the River Euphrates** and then marched into the city in the dry riverbed (Herodotus, *The Histories*, I: 189-192).

Babylon, the Greatest City of Antiquity

According to the discoveries of archeologists, Babylon had **two sets of walls**—the outer walls and the inner walls. Both were actually double walls. The two inner walls were twelve and twenty-two feet wide respectively. The two walls making up the outer defenses were twenty-four and twenty-six feet wide. Thus, in order for enemies to get into the inner city where the palace and the main temple were located, they would have had to go through or over close to **eighty-five feet of walls** and each wall was well defended! We know that horses could actually gallop on top of the outer walls.

The city had 53 major temples and 955 smaller sanctuaries or shrines. It had 384 altars throughout the city streets. The greatest temple was the **Great Ziggurat**, which was built in honor of the patron sun-god Marduk. This temple was 300 feet wide at its base and 300 feet high. Inside the temple the predominant colors were purple and scarlet.

The city proper covered an area of **12 miles** and thus was the second largest city in antiquity. The entrances to the city were guarded by lion sphinxes.

Crucial to the protection of Babylon was the **Euphrates River** which ran through the center of the city from north to south. Great brass gates protected the city where the river entered and exited the city (see **Isaiah 45:1-3**). The Euphrates guaranteed a constant source of water and food for the city. It is also noteworthy that when the city was taken in **October** by Darius and Cyrus, the Euphrates River was at its lowest ebb.

Nebuchadnezzar had built an elaborate **system of canals** outside the city to divert the excess water when the river was at flood stage. These channels took the water to a nearby lake.

According to the testimony of the prophet Isaiah, Babylon was a **very rich city** (**Jeremiah 51:13**). It was truly the golden city. Babylon’s great banquet hall has also been excavated by archeologists. It measured 56 X 171 feet.

The Sins of Babylon

According to the Bible, the kingdom of Babylon was guilty of a catalogue of sins:

Sin #1:

Babylon attempted to force all nations to practice her **idolatry and false worship** (Daniel 3; Daniel 5:1-4, 23, 24).

Babylon forced all nations to drink her wine. In fact, drinking wine at the banquet hall led Belshazzar to **blur the distinction** between the holy and the common and then led him to worship the works of his own hands (see Jeremiah 25:27-38; 51:7, 8; Daniel 5:1-4). In a similar story, when **Nadab and Abihu** drank wine they were also unable to distinguish between the holy and the common and this led to their death (Leviticus 10; see also Isaiah 5:20-24; Ezekiel 22:26).

Notice how Ellen White links the sin of Belshazzar with the sin that will be committed by the Christian world at the end of time:

*“The command for the observance of the holy Sabbath of the Lord is placed in the very bosom of the Decalogue, and is so plain that none need err as to its import, and yet it is treated with as great profanation **as were the sacred vessels at the feast of Belshazzar**. God sanctified and blessed the seventh day, setting it apart to be observed as holy time. Yet the Sabbath of the Lord has been used as a **common working day**, while a day which possesses no sanctity whatever has been **put in the place** of God's sanctified day.” **Signs of the Times**, July 27, 1891*

Let's ask a series of questions about true worship and its sign:

- What distinguishes the true God from all false gods? The fact that God created the heavens and the earth (Psalm 96:5).
- Why do we worship God? Because He is the Creator (Psalm 95:1-6).
- Did God create, so to speak, '**with His own hands**' a holy day that was to be used by man to worship the true God? (Genesis 2:2, 3; Exodus 20:8-11; 31:12-18). Yes, God made the Sabbath, so to speak, '**with His own hands**'. He created it as holy time to remind man that He was the Creator.
- What stands at the heart of all worship? The Sabbath stands at the heart of all worship (Revelation 14:7; Isaiah 66:22, 23).

Now let's formulate another series of questions about false worship and its sign:

- Does the Sunday teach us to distinguish between the true Creator God and all false gods? No.
- Did God make Sunday as a day of worship or was Sunday made for worship by the hands of man?

- When we worship on a day made for worship by the hands of man, what sins are we committing? **Idolatry and false worship**, right? Idolatry and false worship are intimately intertwined. An idol is anything that man makes for worship which God has not made for worship. Thus we have the expression: *‘they worshiped the works of their own hands* (see **Psalm 115:4; Isaiah 2:8; 31:7; Jeremiah 1:16; Acts 7:41**).
- In actual fact, to worship on Sunday is the same in principle as worshipping the sun!

Now let’s ask two final series of questions:

- Who created the sun? God, right?
 - Did God create the sun for worship? No
 - What sin would I commit if I turn the sun into an object of worship? Idolatry!
-
- Who created the first day of the week? God, right?
 - Did God create the first day of the week for worship? No, it is a common work day.
 - What sin would I commit if my own hands turn the first day of the week into a day of worship? Idolatry, right?

This is the reason why Ellen White has called Sunday the idol sabbath:

*“The Sabbath question is one that will demand great care and wisdom in its presentation. Much of the grace and power of God will be needed to **cast down the idol** that has been erected in the **shape of a false sabbath.**” **9 Testimonies for the Church**, p. 211*

Sin #2:

Babylon was involved deeply in **occultic practices** and each of these practices is based in some way with the false doctrine of the **immortality of the soul** (see **Daniel 5:7; Isaiah 47:9, 12, 13; Revelation 18:23**)

Sin #3:

One of the greatest sins of Babylon was its **persecution of God’s people**. Babylon is the enemy, par excellence, of God’s people (**Daniel 1:1-4**). It is impossible to study about Babylon without making reference to God’s people (**Jeremiah 50:6, 7, 11, 23, 28, 33, 34; 51:5, 24, 34-37, 44, 49; Isaiah 14:16, 17**). It was **Babylon** which destroyed the city of Jerusalem, its temple and its wall. God promised that He would punish Babylon as vengeance for ‘His temple’ (**Jeremiah 51:11** and **Daniel 8:10-12**). In this context God is spoken of as the **Goel** (redeemer) who will defend the cause of His people (see **Ruth 3:9; 2:20; Numbers 35:19; Isaiah 51:9**). Like a **shepherd** cares for his sheep, the **head** cares for the body, the **husband** cares for the wife and the **sovereign** cares for his vassal, so God will care for His own people.

Babylon Apparently Inviolable

When Belshazzar celebrated his banquet, the enemy already had the city surrounded. The question is, why would the king have a banquet when the enemy was at the gates? The simple answer is that Belshazzar considered the city to be **invincible and impregnable**.

Isaiah 47:7, 8, 10 describes the arrogant self-security of Babylon on its last night. She claimed to be the “I am” and she boastfully denied that she would become a **widow** or lose her **children**. It is significant that Babylon in **Isaiah 47** is described as being composed of a **three-fold union**. The first part of the union was Babylon, the **harlot**. The second part of Babylon was composed of Babylon’s **children**. Finally, the last part of Babylon consisted of **her lovers** with whom she committed fornication. The book of Revelation will pick up on this three-fold union (see **Isaiah 47:9; Revelation 17:1-5**)

Ellen White well describes the false security that Babylon felt on its last fateful night:

*“It was not long before reverses came. He [Belshazzar] had been defeated in battle by Cyrus, and for two years had been besieged in the city of Babylon. Within that seemingly **impregnable fortress**, with its **massive walls** and its gates of brass, **protected by the river Euphrates**, and supplied with provisions for a **twenty years' siege**, the voluptuous monarch felt secure, and passed his time in mirth and revelry.” **Review and Herald**, February 8, 1881 (see also **Prophets and Kings**, p. 523 where Ellen White remarks: “Babylon was besieged by Cyrus, nephew of Darius the Mede, and commanding general of the combined armies of the Medes and Persians.”).*

Babylon’s Close of Probation

Why did God spare Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom while He destroyed Belshazzar’s? The answer is found in **Daniel 5:18-22**. Belshazzar had the benefit of Nebuchadnezzar’s experience and in spite of this knowledge he chose to spite God. At the end of time the Christian world will also reject the noon-day light with which **God will fill the world** (**Revelation 18:1-5**). This will be the unpardonable sin. There will be no more that God can do for spiritual Babylon.

We know that Babylon fell on the **14th day of Tishri** which is the seventh month of the Jewish calendar. Four days before, the **Day of Atonement** had concluded (the tenth day of the seventh month). Is it just possible that the judgment of Babylon took place four days before the Day of Atonement? (see **Daniel 7:8** where the little horn—a symbol of end time spiritual Babylon—is judged on the Day of Atonement!)

The ancients believed that the gods used **balances** to weigh the good and evil deeds of each human being. If the bad outweighed the good deeds then divine punishment would come. God spoke to Belshazzar in a language that he could understand (on this concept of God weighing our deeds see **Ezekiel 5:1; I Samuel 2:3; Job 31:6; Proverbs 16:2**).

Scholars have puzzled as to why Belshazzar’s wise men were not able to read the writing on the wall. After all, the words **were written in Chaldee** which was their native tongue. It was not

that they could not read the words. They simply could not understand what the words meant. An entire truth was expressed in each key word and therefore an interpretation was needed.

Ellen White makes the following striking comment about the handwriting on the wall:

*"A light like the lightning followed the forming of every letter, and lingered there, making them living characters of awful and terrible significance to all who looked upon them. "Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin." Their very ignorance of those letters traced upon the wall, standing there flashing with light, sent terror to their sinful hearts. Their aroused consciences interpreted these letters to be a denunciation against them. Suspicion, fear, and alarm took hold upon king and princes." **Testimonies to Ministers**, p. 436*

It will be noticed that in **Daniel 5:23** the silver and the gold are **inverted** in the list of metals. Why is this? Simply because Babylon at this point is history! God had judged her and found her wanting. The next kingdom will be the silver kingdom—the Medes and Persians.

The inscription said:

- *Mene*: 'numbered'
- *Mene*: 'numbered'
- *Tekel*: 'weighed'
- *Upharsin*: 'divided'

Of these words only *upharsin* is plural to suggest the **duality** into which kingdom would be divided—Medes and Persians. The 'u' in *upharsin* is translated 'and'. In other words, the inscription read: "*numbered, numbered, weighed and divided.*" Of course, this would not make much sense to Belshazzar unless someone told him what had been numbered, what had been weighed and what would be divided.

The Fall of Babylon

Cyrus came from the north and the **rising sun** and surrounded the city (**Isaiah 41:2, 25; 46:11**). Cyrus did not come alone. We are told that **other kings** also accompanied him from the north (**Jeremiah 50:3, 9, 41; 51:11, 28**).

Cyrus is a **type of Christ**. His name means 'the sun'. He was called in righteousness (**Isaiah 45:13; 42:6**). He is called God's 'shepherd' (**Isaiah 44:24-28**). He came from a 'far country' (**Isaiah 46:11**). He is called God's 'anointed' or 'messiah' (**Isaiah 45:1**). He delivered God's captive people from Babylon and prepared a way for them to return to their homeland to build the city, the temple and the walls (**Isaiah 45:13**).

Cyrus diverted the water of the River Euphrates by creating a dam of logs where the river entered the city. Thus, the waters filled the canals outside the city and the riverbed dried up in order to allow the entrance of Cyrus' armies into the city. Even though the entrances to the city were protected by great brass gates, these gates had been left open on the fateful evening (see **Jeremiah 50:12, 23, 38; 51:12, 13, 36, 41-43, 54-56; Isaiah 44:27**).

Ellen White agrees with the account of the Nabonidus Chronicle where we are told that the city of Babylon was taken without a fight:

“Cyrus and his army marched up the bed of the river Euphrates; for trenches had been dug, and the river turned from its course, so that there was no obstruction to their entering the city, provided the gates were opened. The guardsmen were indulging in merriment and revelry, and the city was left without defense. Before the officers were aware, the enemy had entered the city, and escape was impossible. Those in one part of the city were slain or captured before those in another part knew that the city was invaded. No alarm was sounded, no cry could be raised to warn the people that the forces of Cyrus were upon them.” **Signs of the Times**, December 29, 1890

“In the unexpected entry of the army of the Persian conqueror into the heart of the Babylonian capital by way of the channel of the river whose waters had been turned aside, and through the inner gates that in careless security had been left open and unprotected, the Jews had abundant evidence of the literal fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy concerning the sudden overthrow of their oppressors.” **Prophets and Kings**, p. 552

“Babylon was besieged by Cyrus, nephew of Darius the Mede and commanding general of the combined armies of the Medes and Persians. But within the seemingly impregnable fortress, with its massive walls and its gates of brass, protected by the river Euphrates, and stocked with provision in abundance, the voluptuous monarch felt safe and passed his time in mirth and revelry.” **Prophets and Kings**, p. 523

Cyrus was acclaimed as a deliverer even by the populace of Babylon. Ellen White describes how Daniel shared the prophecies of Isaiah with Cyrus which eventually led him to give a decree for God's people to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple:

“As the king saw the words foretelling, more than a hundred years before his birth, the manner in which Babylon should be taken; as he read the message addressed to him by the Ruler of the universe, [Isaiah 45:5, 6, 4, 13 quoted] his heart was profoundly moved, and he determined to fulfill his divinely appointed mission.” **Prophets and Kings**, p. 557

The waters which dried up are then symbolically spoken of as drowning of Babylon (see **Jeremiah 51:27, 42, 55, 63, 64**). We can just imagine Jeremiah giving Seraiah the scroll of **Jeremiah 50 and 51** and then telling him to travel to Babylon in the fourth year of king Zedekiah's reign (594/93 BC). He was instructed that once there, he should go to the banks of the Euphrates, read the scroll and then tie a stone to it and cast it into the depths of the River. When Seraiah did this Babylon was at the height of its power and it appeared that what Jeremiah had prophesied was impossible. The imagery here is that the Euphrates River would rise to annihilate the very power which it had previously supported and protected. This theme will be picked up later in the book of Revelation.

At its fall Babylon would be left naked (**Isaiah 47:3**). She would lose her lovers and her children and would no longer be the lady of kingdoms (**Isaiah 47:5**).

Babylon would have to sit in the dust (**Isaiah 47:1**). The kings that had fornicating with her would eat her up (**Jeremiah 25:14**) and she would be burned with fire (**Isaiah 47:14**). All of these details will be picked up in **Revelation 17**.

Babylon would be left alone. There would be no one to help her any longer (**Jeremiah 50:32**). There would be no remnant left in Babylon (**Jeremiah 50:26, 30; 51:3**). She would be totally destroyed (**Jeremiah 51:58**). Plagues would fall upon her (**Jeremiah 50:13**).

The fall of Babylon would be sudden and unexpected (**Isaiah 47:5**). Notice how the apostle Paul picks up on this and applies it eschatologically in **I Thessalonians 5:1-4**; see also **Jeremiah 51:8**.

At her fall all the merchants of the nations would wail (**Jeremiah 51:8, 54; Isaiah 13:6; Isaiah 47:15**). She would be totally demolished (**Jeremiah 50:13; 51:26**). All of Babylon's great leaders were to fall by the sword (**Jeremiah 50:35-37; 25:30-38**).

There was to be a mighty earthquake connected with the fall of Babylon (**Jeremiah 50:46**). She would drink the wine of God's wrath (**Jeremiah 51:57**).

Conclusions and Lessons

God's people were to heed God's call and flee from Babylon to Jerusalem before Babylon was destroyed (**Jeremiah 51:6, 17-20, 45; 50:4, 5, 8, 19, 20 and 28**). God's people would the return to Jerusalem singing the song of the redeemed (**Jeremiah 51:48**). Babylon received as she gave (**Jeremiah 50:29**).

*"Perilous is the condition of those who, growing weary of their watch, turn to the attractions of the world. While the man of business is absorbed in the pursuit of gain, while the pleasure lover is seeking indulgence, while the daughter of fashion is arranging her adornments--it may be in that hour the Judge of all the earth will pronounce the sentence: "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." **Daniel 5:27.**" **The Great Controversy**, p. 491*

*"Babylon is a symbol of the world at large. When its doom was made certain, its kings and officers seemed to be as men insane, and their own course hastened its destiny. When the doom of a nation is fixed, it seems that all the energy, wisdom, and discretion of its former time of prosperity, deserts its men of position, and they hasten the evil they would avert. Outside enemies are not the greatest peril to an individual or a nation. The overthrow of a nation results, under the providence of God, from some unwise or evil course of its own." **Signs of the Times**, December 29, 1890*

"The condemnation that will fall upon the nations of the earth in this day will be because of their rejection of light, and will be similar to that which fell upon the kings of Babylon; it will be because they have failed to make the most of present light, present opportunities for knowing what is truth and righteousness. Our condemnation in the judgment will not result from the fact

that we have lived in error, but from the fact that we have neglected heaven-sent opportunities for discovering truth. The means of becoming conversant with the truth are within the reach of all; but, like the indulgent, selfish king, we give more attention to the things that charm the ear, and please the eye, and gratify the palate, than to the things that enrich the mind, the divine treasures of truth. It is through the truth that we may answer the great question, "What must I do to be saved?" ***Signs of the Times***, July 27, 1891)

"In the balances of the sanctuary the Seventh-day Adventist church is to be weighed. She will be judged by the privileges and advantages that she has had. If her spiritual experience does not correspond to the advantages that Christ, at infinite cost, has bestowed on her, if the blessings conferred have not qualified her to do the work entrusted to her, on her will be pronounced the sentence: "Found wanting." By the light bestowed, the opportunities given, will she be judged." ***Testimonies for the Church***, Volume 8 p. 247

LESSON #11 – DANIEL 5 AS THE BACKGROUND TO REVELATION 16 AND 17

Tips for the Study of Armageddon

- Look for the pattern or the broader picture and how the pieces fit together. Don't merely look for events but rather for the sequence or order of events. For example, the Elijah passages of the Bible.
- Learn the Old Testament story well because it is the foundation for the typological application.
- Don't assume that Ellen White will quote the verses or even necessarily use their language.
- Learn to ask questions about the passage. For example, I asked the question: Why does **Revelation 15** say that the 144,000 will sing the Song of Moses and the Lamb? What will the final deliverance have to do with Moses? Is it possible that the final deliverance will follow the same pattern as the events of the Exodus?

Introduction

The book of Revelation describes seven devastating plagues that will fall upon planet earth after the door of human probation closes (**Revelation 15:5-8**). These plagues will partially return the earth to the condition that it was in before creation week—without form and void and in darkness (**Jeremiah 4:19-27**). In our study today I would like us to study the final three of these plagues.

We will do our study of this subject from **three different perspectives** and look for parallels in the thematic structure: (1) **Revelation 16:10-21**; (2) **Exodus 14 and 15** and (3) the book **The Great Controversy**, pp. 635-637

Model #1: Revelation 16:10-21

Fifth Plague

Revelation 16:10, 11: Central theme: Darkness on the kingdom of the beast and sores and gnawing the tongue.

Revelation 16:10, 11: *“Then the fifth angel poured out his bowl on the throne of the beast, and his kingdom became full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues because of the pain. They blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and did not repent of their deeds.”*

Important questions about the fifth plague:

- Who is the beast?

This is the same beast of **Revelation 13** and the little horn of **Daniel 7** that spoke blasphemies against the Most High, persecuted the saints of the Most High, thought it could change times and law and ruled for 1260 years.

- The throne is the center of government where the beast rules from. This plague falls on the governing authority of the beast. His center of power is in Vatican City within the confines of the ancient city of Rome.
- The kingdom over which the beast rules is worldwide.

Revelation 13:3: *“And I saw one of his heads as if it had been mortally wounded, and his deadly wound was healed. And all the world marveled and followed the beast.”*

Revelation 13:7: *“It was granted to him to make war with the saints and to overcome them. And authority was given him over every tribe, tongue, and nation.”*

Revelation 17:1, 2: *“Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me, “Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters,² with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication.”*

Revelation 17:15: *“Then he said to me: “The waters which you saw, where the harlot sits, are peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.”*

Notice that there is a clear distinction between the ruling authority and his kingdom.

- Darkness (this is a supernatural global darkness because the beast’s kingdom is global).
- They gnaw their tongues in pain and God sends them a panic that will lead them to kill one another with the weapons they were going to use to destroy God’s people.

Zechariah 14:12, 13: *“And this shall be the plague with which the LORD will strike all the people who fought against Jerusalem. Their flesh shall dissolve while they stand on their*

feet, their eyes shall dissolve in their sockets, and their tongues shall dissolve in their mouths. ¹³ It shall come to pass in that day that a great panic from the LORD will be among them. Everyone will seize the hand of his neighbor, and raise his hand against his neighbor's hand."

- No room for repentance—this is after the close of probation.

Sixth Plague

Revelation 16:12-16: Central themes: Waters of the Euphrates dries up thus preparing the way for the arrival of the Kings from the East

"Then the sixth angel poured out his bowl on the great river Euphrates, and its water was dried up, so that the way of the kings from the east might be prepared."

Important Questions about the sixth plague:

- What is represented by the great river Euphrates? (hint: **Isaiah 8:7, 8; 17:12, 13**)
- What is meant by the drying up of its waters?
- Who are the kings from the east ('the rising sun') and how is the way prepared for their arrival?

The Old Testament background

In order to answer these questions we must study the story of the fall of ancient Babylon. The story is found in **Daniel 5, Jeremiah 50 and 51** and **Isaiah 41** and the descriptions given by the historians Xenophon and Herodotus

- The Euphrates River was the greatest asset of Babylon and also its greatest potential liability.
- Babylon was practicing idolatry and drinking wine the night of its fall.
- Cyrus came with his armies from the north and from the east.
- He dried up the riverbed of the Euphrates by diverting it to the channels that had been built outside the city.
- Cyrus and his armies entered the city and Babylon fell.
- God's people were delivered.

This entire scenario is applied symbolically and globally in Revelation chapter 17

Questions about Revelation 17:

- Which of the seven angels speaks to John in **Revelation 17:1**?
- What does a harlot represent in Scripture (**Ezekiel chapters 16 and 23**).
- What does prophecy mean when it says that she fornicates with the kings of the earth?
- What is the name of the harlot woman?
- What are the waters upon which the harlot sits?
- What will the kings end up doing with the harlot?

Revelation 17:1, 2: The harlot woman sits on many waters

*“Then **one** of the seven angels [**which one?**] who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me: ‘Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters, with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication.’”*

Revelation 17:5: Name of the woman is Babylon

*“And on her forehead a name was written: MYSTERY, **BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.**”*

Revelation 17:15: The waters represent the kingdom of the harlot because she sits on them like the beast sits on the throne.

“Then he said to me, “The waters which you saw, where the harlot sits, are peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.”

Revelation 17:16: The kings will hate the harlot and make her desolate, naked and burn her with fire.

“And the ten horns which you saw on the beast, these will hate the harlot, make her desolate and naked, eat her flesh and burn her with fire.”

Seventh Plague

Revelation 16:17-21: Central themes God’s voice saying “it is done” followed by an earthquake, thunder, lightning, terrific precipitation and the disappearance of mountain ranges and islands.

*“Then the seventh angel poured out his bowl into the air, and a **loud voice** came out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, “**It is done!**”¹⁸ And there were **noises** and **thunderings** and **lightnings**; and there was a **great earthquake**, such a mighty and great earthquake as had not occurred since men were on the earth.¹⁹ Now the **great city** was **divided into three parts**, and the cities of the nations fell. And great Babylon was remembered before God, to give her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath.²⁰ Then every **island** fled away, and the **mountains** were not found.²¹ And great hail from heaven fell upon men, each*

hailstone about the weight of a talent. Men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail, since that plague was exceedingly great.”

Model #2: Exodus 14, 15

The fall of Babylon in the days of Belshazzar is in the background of the fifth, sixth and seventh plagues. But I want to suggest that there is another story in the Old Testament that also stands in the background—the story of the Exodus of Israel from Egypt.

The Captivity and Flight

- Israel was captive in Egypt.
- God said to Pharaoh “Let my people go.”
- Captivity was made difficult because the people wanted to keep the Sabbath.
- God’s people came out.

Shut in and no Escape

- **Exodus 14:3:** After God’s people came out they shut in and there appeared to be no escape.
- **Exodus 14:5-9:** Pharaoh prepares to attack.

The Fifth Plague: Darkness

- **Exodus 14:19, 20:** Darkness upon the Egyptians and light upon God’s people.

The Sixth Plague: Waters dry up or divided and then slay the Egyptians

- **Exodus 14:21:** Waters divided and dry up.
- **Exodus 14:26-28:** Waters slay the Egyptians.

Seventh Plague: Natural Calamities

- **Psalm 77:16-20:** The ‘natural’ phenomena that accompanied this event are exactly parallel to the seventh plague in the book of Revelation.
- **Exodus 14:23-25:** A great panic fell upon the Egyptians. They forgot their murderous rage against Israel and sought to escape.
- **Exodus 14:17, 18:** The honor and glory for the deliverance went to God.
- In fighting the people of God the Egyptians were fighting the God of the people. This must be understood in the context of the **covenant**. Israel was in a covenant relationship with God and therefore He had promised to protect them.

- The voice from heaven told Saul on the **road to Damascus**: “Why do you persecute Me?” In persecuting the church Saul was persecuting Christ.
- **Matthew 25**: Jesus said in Matthew 25: “In that you have done it unto one of these the least My brethren, you have done it unto Me.”
- In antiquity a **Suzerain** was required to protect a vassal who had entered a covenant relationship with him.
- The good **Shepherd** in the Old Testament protected his sheep.
- The head looks out for the good of the body.
- The **husband** is committed to protecting his wife because of the marriage covenant (see Jeremiah 31:32).

After God’s victory over Pharaoh and his armies, Israel sang the **Song of Moses** (**Exodus 15**).

Model #3: The Perspective of Ellen G. White

As is frequently her custom, Ellen White does not quote the verses for the fifth and sixth plagues but she interprets the symbols in matter of fact language and follows the same literary arrangement.

An example **Revelation 4 and 5**:

- **One** on the throne (not identified by name).
- **Four living creatures** (presented in symbolic terms).
- **24 elders** (symbolic language).
- **Seven lamps** (symbolic language).
- **Lamb** as though it had been slain (symbolic language).

In **The Desire of Ages**, pp. 833-835 Ellen White interprets the symbolic language of **Revelation 4 and 5**:

- The one on the throne is the Father.
- The four living creatures are cherubim and seraphim.
- The 24 elders are the representatives of the worlds that never sinned.
- The seven lamps of fire represent the Holy Spirit.
- The Lamb as though it had been slain is Jesus Christ.

Ellen White does the same thing with **Daniel 11:40-45**. She never quotes these verses or even alludes to the language. Yet she comments on this passage in **The Great Controversy** with luxury of detail.

Let’s notice how Ellen White interprets the fifth, sixth and seventh plagues in matter of fact language. I have added explanatory remarks in brackets:

The Great Controversy, p. 635:

“When the protection of human laws shall be withdrawn from those who honor the law of God, there will be, in different lands, a simultaneous movement for their destruction [similar to Pharaoh who gathers his armies to attack Israel]. As the time appointed in the decree [Revelation 13:15; Esther 3:8] draws near, the people will conspire to root out the hated sect. It will be determined to strike in one night a decisive blow, which shall utterly silence the voice of dissent and reproof.

The people of God--some in prison cells, some hidden in solitary retreats in the forests and the mountains--still plead for divine protection [like Israel did at the edge of the Red Sea], while in every quarter companies of armed men, urged on by hosts of evil angels are preparing for the work of death [Pharaoh and his armies come and there is no escape]. It is now, in the hour of utmost extremity that the God of Israel [notice the allusion to ancient Israel] will interpose for the deliverance of His chosen. . .

*With shouts of triumph, jeering, and imprecation, throngs of evil men are about to rush [the Euphrates is at flood stage: See the meaning of the word rush in **Isaiah 17:12, 13** and **8:7, 8**] upon their prey, when, lo, a dense blackness, deeper than the darkness of the night, falls upon the earth [the fifth plague of darkness]. Then a rainbow, shining with the glory from the throne of God, spans the heavens and seems to encircle each praying company [light for God’s people]. The angry multitudes [symbolically represented as the ‘waters’ upon which the harlot sits] are suddenly arrested [the waters of the Euphrates are dried up]. Their mocking cries die away. The objects of their murderous rage are forgotten. With fearful forebodings they gaze upon the symbol of God’s covenant and long to be shielded from its overpowering brightness. . .*

In the next chapter (‘The Desolation of the earth’) Ellen White comes back to describe this climactic moment but adds some very important details:

*“The people see that they have been deluded. They accuse one another of having led them to destruction; but all unite in heaping their bitterest condemnation upon the ministers [who are the leaders of the harlot and her daughters]. Unfaithful pastors have prophesied smooth things [this is why the fifth plague afflicts the tongue]; they have led their hearers to make void the law of God and to persecute those who would keep it holy. Now, in their despair, these teachers confess before the world their work of deception. The multitudes [the waters of the Red Sea and the Euphrates] are filled with fury [they withdraw their support and then avalanche themselves against the apostate system]. “We are lost!” they cry, “and you are the cause of our ruin;” and they turn upon the false shepherds. The very ones that once admired them most will pronounce the most dreadful curses upon them. The very hands that once crowned them with laurels will be raised for their destruction. The swords which were to slay God’s people are now employed to destroy their enemies [Zechariah 14:12, 13 is fulfilled when the swords turn upon the religious leaders]. Everywhere there is strife and bloodshed. **The Great Controversy**, p. 655, 656*

*"And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem; Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them; and they shall lay hold everyone on the hand of his neighbor, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbor." **Zechariah 14:12, 13.** In the mad strife of their own fierce passions, and by the awful outpouring of God's unmingled wrath, fall the wicked inhabitants of the earth—priests, rulers, and people, rich and poor, high and low. "And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried." **Jeremiah 25:33.**" **The Great Controversy**, p. 657*

At the bottom of page 636 and top of 637 Ellen White comments on the seventh plague:

*"In the midst of the angry heavens is one clear space of indescribable glory, whence comes the voice of God like the sound of many waters, saying: "It is done." **Revelation 16:17.***

*That voice **shakes the heavens and the earth.** There is a **mighty earthquake**, "such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great." **Verses 17, 18** The firmament appears to open and shut. The glory from the throne of God seems flashing through. The mountains shake like a reed in the wind, and ragged rocks are scattered on every side. There is a roar as of a coming tempest. The sea is lashed into fury. There is heard the shriek of a hurricane like the voice of demons upon a mission of destruction. The whole earth heaves and swells like the waves of the sea. Its surface is breaking up. Its very foundations seem to be giving way. **Mountain chains** are sinking. Inhabited **islands disappear.** The seaports that have become like Sodom for wickedness are swallowed up by the angry waters. Babylon the great has come in remembrance before God, "to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath." **Great hailstones, every one** "about the weight of a talent," are doing their work of destruction." **Verses 19, 21***

In **The Great Controversy**, pp. 648, 649 explains that the 144,000 sing the Song of Moses and the Lamb, the song of their deliverance from Babylon.

Final question: What will determine whose side you are on in this great battle?

Revelation 16:15: "Behold, I am coming as a thief. Blessed is he who watches, and keeps his garments lest he walk naked and they see his shame."

Revelation 3:18: "I counsel you to buy from Me gold refined in the fire, that you may be rich; and white garments, that you may be clothed, that the shame of your nakedness may not be revealed; and anoint your eyes with eye salve, that you may see."

Revelation 22:10-15: "And he said to me, "Do not seal the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. ¹¹ He who is unjust, let him be unjust still; he who is filthy, let him be filthy still; he who is righteous, let him be righteous still; he who is holy, let him be holy still." ¹² "And behold, I am coming quickly, and My reward is with Me, to give to everyone according to

his work. ¹³ *I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last.*"
¹⁴ *Blessed are those who do His commandments that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city.* ¹⁵ *But outside are dogs and sorcerers and sexually immoral and murderers and idolaters, and whoever loves and practices a lie."*

LESSON #12 – NOTES ON DANIEL 6

Introductory Matters

The events of this chapter occurred sometime between 539 and 537 BC. Daniel was around 84 years old at this time.

There is a close relationship between **Daniel 3** and **Daniel 6**. In **Daniel 3** King Nebuchadnezzar attempted to impose false worship but in **Daniel 6** King Darius attempted to forbid true worship. Thus they established and forbade the free exercise of religion.

Daniel was absent in the experience of **Daniel 3**. We do not know where he was at that time. Some think that he might have been ill, that the king purposely told him to stay away or that he was on some mission. Only God knows why. However, the experience of **Daniel 6** shows that if Daniel had been there, he would have chosen to be faithful.

The Historical Experience of Daniel 6

Daniel was full of the Holy Spirit (**Daniel 6:3**; see also **Daniel 4:8, 9; 5:12, 14**).

Daniel had the Spirit of Prophecy. Notice that both Daniel and Ellen White had similar experiences while they were in vision (see **Daniel 10:8, 16-19**). Both Daniel and Ellen White had a passion to understand **Daniel 8:14**.

Daniel was faithful in his secular duties (**Daniel 6:4**) and therefore proved himself faithful when the large test came. He had no fault (a better translation would be ‘corruption’) in the performance of his daily duties in the king’s court. He was totally trustworthy.

Daniel kept God’s law even at the risk of death (**Daniel 6:5**). The law was the key issue of the conflict, primarily the first table. Notice that Daniel’s enemies could find no violation of the second table of the law by Daniel and therefore sought to legislate the first table. There is a conflict here between the laws of God and the laws of men.

Another issue in this controversy was worship. While in **Daniel 3** Babylon sought to establish false worship and disobedience to God’s law, in **Daniel 6** Medo-Persia sought to forbid the free exercise of Daniel’s right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience (**Daniel 6:5, 12, 15**).

Daniel had an unbreakable and unshakeable faith in his God (in the **LXX, Daniel 6:23** uses the same Greek word for 'faith' as is found in **Revelation 14:12**).

The enemies of Daniel worked in an underhanded way to deceive the civil power into proclaiming a religious decree forbidding true worship. In this, Darius overstepped his legitimate bounds of authority—he legislated the first table which is God's exclusive domain.

The decree forbidding true worship was given by the civil power in written form (**Daniel 6:7-9**). Thus we have the civil power legislating the affairs of God. It is important to realize that the king was not Daniel's enemy. The king only became a menace to Daniel when he listened to the advice of his counselors who were enemies of Daniel.

Daniel was a man of prayer (**Daniel 6:10, 11**). After stating that Daniel knelt for prayer three times a day, Ellen White makes the following profound remark:

"True reverence for God is inspired by a sense of His infinite greatness and a realization of His presence." **Prophet and Kings**, pp. 48, 49

Why didn't Daniel just close his windows so as not to offend his enemies? After all, isn't religion a private affair? Why ruffle the feathers of his enemies? Ellen White responds:

"As Daniel, according to his custom, made his supplications three times a day to the God of heaven, the attention of the princes and rulers was called to his case. He had an opportunity to speak for himself, to show who is the true God, and to present the reason why He alone should receive worship, and the duty of rendering Him praise and homage. And the deliverance of Daniel from the den of lions was another evidence that the Being whom he worshiped was the true and living God." **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 5 p. 453

This story reveals that the power of human rulers is limited. When Darius gave this decree, he sought to reveal his 'almighty power'. But once he signed the decree, he became the slave of his own law, he was bound by his own decree and could not deliver Daniel no matter how much he tried. This made it necessary for One who is truly Almighty to deliver Daniel. The intervention of God shows that He overrules the erroneous decisions of human kings and can do what they never could.

Why did God allow Daniel, His beloved servant, to be thrown into the lion's den? Why not deliver him right before he was cast in? Notice the profound explanation given in **Prophets and Kings**, pp. 543, 544:

*"God did not prevent Daniel's enemies from casting him into the lions' den; He permitted evil angels and wicked men thus far to accomplish their purpose; but it was that He might make the deliverance of His servant more marked, and the defeat of the enemies of truth and righteousness more complete. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee" (**Psalm 76:10**), the psalmist has testified. Through the courage of this one man who chose to follow right rather than policy, Satan was to be defeated, and the name of God was to be exalted and honored."*

Daniel had to face a death decree because he chose to worship the true God and to violate the religious decree of the civil power. He went through a severe time of trouble and his faith was sorely tested. Yet Daniel passed the test with flying colors. From the time of his arrival in Babylon, Daniel had made up his mind that he would be faithful to God no matter what happened (see Pastor Bohr's Notes on Daniel One).

Daniel's enemies suffered the very fate that they had determined for him (**Daniel 6:24, 25**). When the king discovered what his advisors were up to, he was filled with wrath against them. The civil power which was to punish Daniel now turned on the enemies of Daniel.

The word 'deliver' is at the very core of **Daniel 6**. It is used in **Daniel 6:14, 16, 20 and 27**. It is also used several times in **Daniel 3**. The only other place it is used is in **Daniel 12:1**. This indicates that these three stories are intimately related.

Daniel was delivered because he had a covenant relationship with his God (see **Daniel 6:22**). He stood innocent before God.

At the end of this story, Darius still did not get the point that the state cannot legislate in matters related to God. His decree that everyone 'tremble and fear before the God of Daniel' was well intended but illegitimate. A political ruler can no more legislate the worship of the true God than he can the worship of a false god (see **Daniel 6:26**)

Daniel represents the end time remnant of God which will possess the same character and mission as Daniel. But the end-time remnant will witness to spiritual Babylon.

1. The final remnant will have the testimony of Jesus which is the spirit of prophecy (**Revelation 12:17; 19:10; 22:8, 9**). It is not accidental that Ellen White's experience while in vision was very similar to Daniel's. Neither is it coincidental that both were extremely interested in understanding and proclaiming the prophecy of **Daniel 8:14**.
2. The final remnant will keep the commandments of God (**Revelation 12:17; 14:12**) and this will awaken the wrath of their enemies.
3. The final remnant will worship the true Creator (**Revelation 14:7**) and will refuse to worship the beast or his image (**Revelation 14:9-11**). Once again, the issue will be worship.
4. In the final crisis the remnant will have the faith of Jesus (**Revelation 14:12**)

God's end time remnant will be filled with the Holy Spirit in the latter rain (**Joel 2:28-32; Revelation 14:14-18; 18:1-5**).

The end time remnant will be faithful in the daily duties of life. They will be honest and trustworthy in the small things and thus will stand firm when the big test comes (on this principle see **Luke 16:10; Jeremiah 12:5**). For example, if we are not faithful in our tithe now, what makes us think that we will be willing to give up everything, including life, when the final test comes? If we are not faithful in our Sabbath observance now, how will we be willing to give

up our lives over this same issue later? We cannot allow anyone to find fault with us in any of our business transactions or other duties of our daily lives. How can we claim to be faithful to God whom we cannot see if we are unfaithful to our fellow human beings whom we can see?

Faithfulness to God's law will be the central issue in the final conflict, primarily the first table. But note: The wicked will not be able to find any fault in our observance of the second table so they will accuse us with regards to the first table.

Another related issue in the final conflict will be worship. The first amendment to the Constitution states: 'Congress shall make no law neither respecting the establishment of religion nor forbidding the free exercise thereof.' At the end, the beast and his image will not only establish religion (by enforcing Sunday observance), but will also forbid the free exercise of religion (by forbidding Sabbath observance). Thus Sunday laws will eventually become anti-Sabbath laws.

God's people in this crisis will have an unshakable and unbreakable faith like the faith that Jesus had (see **Revelation 14:12**).

The religious leaders of the United States in particular and the world in general will deceive the political rulers into thinking that the remnant is a threat to the welfare of the state (see **John 11:50** and **The Great Controversy**, p. 615). They will persuade the presidents and rulers to proclaim religious laws. They will legislate the first table of God's law which is totally illegitimate.

The final worship decree will be written and 'notarized' by the political rulers of the world (see **Revelation 13:15** and **Esther 3:8**).

God's people must be a people of prayer. Ellen White explains that in the time of trouble God's people will cry out day and night for their deliverance (see **The Great Controversy**, p. 630). Like Jacob, they will not let go until they have the absolute assurance of God's acceptance.

Why will God allow His people to through this terrible time of tribulation? Why doesn't God simply remove them from earth to heaven before the time of trial? Ellen White explains:

"The wrath of man shall praise Thee," says the psalmist; "the remainder of wrath shalt Thou restrain." God means that testing truth shall be brought to the front and become a subject of examination and discussion, even if it is through the contempt placed upon it. The minds of the people must be agitated. Every controversy, every reproach, every slander, will be God's means of provoking inquiry and awakening minds that otherwise would slumber." **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 5 p. 453

In **Ezekiel 38 and 39** when the wicked come against God's people, the Lord does not prevent them. He allows them to surround the city so that God's glorious deliverance of His people can be seen by the entire universe.

Once again it will be seen that the power of the wicked rulers of the world is limited. Their laws will appear to be irrevocable. It will appear as if God's people are at the point of being

annihilated but God will intervene to deliver when men could not do so. It is no coincidence that Ellen White describes the moment of deliverance in the chapter titled: "God's People Delivered" (see **The Great Controversy**, p. 635).

God's people will come face to face with a death decree (**Revelation 13:15**) because they insist on worshiping God as He has commanded. This will lead to a time of trouble such as has never been seen in the history of the world (see **The Great Controversy**, pp. 613-634).

The wicked will suffer the same fate which they desired for the righteous. The kings of the earth will turn on the harlot (**Revelation 17:16, 17; The Great Controversy**, pp. 655, 656).

God's people will be in a covenant relationship with their Lord and this will guarantee their protection. The final fulfillment of this experience is in **Daniel 11:44, 45**. There, the king of the north (the same as the little horn, the beast and the man of sin) will go out to slay God's people. At that moment, Michael will stand up to DELIVER His people who are in a covenant relationship with Him.

LESSON #13 – NOTES ON DANIEL 7

Introductory matters

Daniel received the vision of **Daniel 7** in the first year of King Belshazzar. This would be 553 BC just fourteen years before the fall of Babylon in the year 539.

The **great controversy theme** is at the very center of the book of Daniel in general and of **Daniel 7** in particular. This central theme can be described in the following way:

Since the inception of sin in heaven, there has been an invisible, cosmic controversy between Christ and Satan. Although this is heavenly conflict, it is reflected on Earth in a visible battle between the followers of Christ and the followers of Satan. In the course of this battle, Satan and his wicked followers have appeared to prevail over God and his people, but in the end God and his people will prevail because he controls and guides history to its desired end.

The passive voice of many of the verbs of **Daniel 7** clearly points to someone who is directing history from behind the scenes. We will notice this when we do a verse by verse study of the chapter.

The Links between Daniel Two and Daniel Seven

Before anything else is said, we must recognize that historicism should be the governing principle in the study both outlines (See the charts at the end of this material, *'The Four Prophetic Outlines of Daniel'*, and *'Sequence of Powers in Daniel 2, 7 and Revelation 13.'*)

There are several reasons for linking **Daniel 2** and **Daniel 7**: **First** of all, in the chiastic structure of the book of **Daniel**, **chapters 2 and 7** are on the same branch of the candelabra (See *'The Literary Structure of Daniel 1-7'*) **Secondly**, **Daniel 2** and **Daniel 7** have the same number of basic elements. **Daniel 2** has four metals and **Daniel 7** has four beasts. Notice how the enumeration of the basic elements is the same in both chapters:

Daniel 2

'Gold'
'After thee'
'Third'
'Fourth'

Daniel 7

Lion (7:4)
Bear = 'second' (7:5)
Leopard = 'another' (7:6)
Dragon = 'fourth' (7:7)

In the **third** place, the **Iron** characterizes the fourth kingdom in both lists. In **Daniel 2** the legs are of iron and in **Daniel 7** the dragon beast has great teeth of **iron**. A **fourth** consideration is that **Daniel 2:44, 45** and **Daniel 7:14** describe the last kingdom—the everlasting kingdom—with very similar terminology. In both, the everlasting kingdom follows the fourth power in the sequence.

A Look at the Literary Structure of Daniel Seven

Without exception, earthly events in **Daniel 7** are described in prose while heavenly events are described in poetry. In Hebrew thinking, extremely important events are frequently depicted in poetic language. We will see in our study of **Daniel 7** that earthly events are not isolated from heavenly events. There is a close connection indeed between heavenly and earthly events:

Verses 2-8	Earth	Prose
Verses 9-10	Heaven	Poetry
Verses 11-12	Earth	Prose
Verses 13-14	Heaven	Poetry
Verses 15-22	Earth	Prose
Verses 23-27	Heaven	Poetry

The vision of **Daniel 7** is structurally divided into **four parts**, each concluding with the setting up of the everlasting kingdom:

Vision: **Daniel 7:1-14:** The full vision in its chronological sequence.

Explanation: **Daniel 7:15-18:** Daniel wants to know the meaning of the vision. An angel gives a brief explanation ending with the eternal kingdom.

Inquiry: **Daniel 7:19-22:** Daniel desires to know about the fourth beast, the ten horns, the little horn and the everlasting kingdom.

Explanation: **Daniel 7:23-27:** The angel provides the final and fullest explanation of the fourth beast, the ten horns, the little horn and the everlasting kingdom.

Daniel 7:9-10, 22, and 26 clearly reveal that the judgment occurs immediately after, and as a result of, the malignant work of the little horn in **Daniel 7: 8, 21, and 25**. This means that the judgment could not have taken place at the cross or in apostolic times or even when a person dies. The judgment must have begun sometime after 1798.

Another important structural item of **Daniel 7** is that the fourth beast has **three periods** of existence. First it rules for a period by itself. Then ten horns grow from its head. Finally, after the ten horns have governed for a period of time, a little horn arises among them to rule over them. This clearly shows that Rome would rule in three consecutive stages (see **Daniel 7:23-24**). In Revelation we will find that Rome will have a fourth stage when the beast's deadly wound is healed.

It is also important to remember that the judgment in **Daniel 7** has three distinct stages:

- **INVESTIGATIVE:** The books are opened (**Daniel 7: 9, 10**).
- **VERDICT OR SENTENCE:** Given in favor of the saints (**Daniel 7: 22**).
- The time came when the saints **POSSESSED** the kingdom. It is clear that the judgment has an **investigative** stage, a **sentencing** stage and an **execution** stage (**Daniel 7:22, last part**).

Not only does each outline of Daniel expand upon the previous outlines, but each outline also enlarges upon itself as the chapter progresses. For example, as we have already seen, **Daniel 7** repeats the same events four times yet each time the final events of the outline are amplified and intensified. The interest of Daniel is clearly focused on the end-time. The first powers of the outline are brought to view primarily to give us a sequence and framework for end-time events. For an exemplification of this, see the chart at the end of this material, "**A Synoptic View of the Four Parts of Daniel 7**".

A Verse by Verse Study of Daniel Seven

Verse 1:

The date for this chapter, as we have already seen, is 553. The text clearly states that Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed. This is what we might call a 'prophetic dream'. Daniel also had 'prophetic visions' while he was awake. It is remarkable that Ellen White also had both kinds of prophetic communications from the Lord.

Verse 2:

'Winds' in prophetic language are symbolic of strife, war, bloodshed and destruction. Jeremiah, a contemporary of Daniel, makes this very clear in **Jeremiah 25:31-33**. Ezekiel, another of Daniel's contemporaries, also affirms the same (**Ezekiel 7:1-2**). In **Revelation 7:1-4** when the four angels release the winds, the result is a universal conflagration and destruction (**Revelation 6:12-17**). Concerning the 'winds', Ellen White remarks:

*"Winds are a symbol of strife. The four winds of heaven striving upon the great sea represent the terrible scenes of conquest and revolution by which kingdoms have attained to power." **The Great Controversy**, p. 440*

The 'sea' symbolizes multitudes of unconverted peoples who are inimical to the people of God (see, **Isaiah 17:12-13; 8:7-8; 60:5; Revelation 17:15**). When symbolic winds and waters are placed together the meaning is, 'nations which are warring for world dominion.' It is of great importance that these four beasts arise from the sea, while the winds of strife are blowing. In contrast, **Revelation 13:11** depicts a beast which arises from the earth, where there are no waters and no winds!!

Verse 3:

Several things must be taken into account when we examine this verse.

1) Do the four beasts represent four **kings** or four **kingdoms**? The answer is simple. The four beasts represent four kingdoms which were ruled over by a succession of kings (study carefully, **Daniel 2:37-39; 7:17, 23; 8:20-22; Revelation 17:12; 20:4-6; 1:5-6**).

2) Why are wild beasts employed as symbols? Notice the following inspired comment:

*“Earthly governments prevail by physical force; they maintain their dominion by war; but the founder of the new kingdom is the Prince of Peace. The Holy Spirit represents worldly kingdoms under the symbol of fierce beasts of prey; but Christ is ‘the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.’” **Christ’s Object Lessons**, p. 77*

In this context it is significant that the two beasts of **Daniel 8**, in contrast to the four beasts of chapter seven, are domestic sanctuary animals (more on this when we study **Daniel 8**).

3) It is worthy of notice that the fulfillment of prophecy moves from east to west. The lion and bear are powers which bear sway in Asia. The leopard governs toward the eastern part of Western Europe and the dragon rules in the western portion of Western Europe. When we study Revelation, we will see that the second beast of **Revelation 13** rules west of Europe (the United States of America). While Protestant eyes are fixed on the east as the place for the fulfillment of Bible prophecy, it is fulfilling in the west right before their eyes and they can’t see it because they are looking in the wrong place!!

Verse 4:

The lion represents Babylon. Everything connected with Babylon is ‘top of the line’. Gold is the most precious metal, the lion is the king of beasts, the eagle is the king of birds, etc. Archeological excavations have proven that lion sphinxes were very common in ancient Babylon. Jeremiah affirms that the lion represents Babylon (see, **Jeremiah 4:7; 50:17**).

‘Wings’ in Bible prophecy represent speed of conquest (see **Ezekiel 17:3, 12; Lamentations 4:19; Habakkuk 1:6-8**). The plucking of the wings symbolizes the reality that Babylon will no longer be swift to conquer the nations. A lion with a man’s heart is cowardly (even though fictional, the story of the Wizard of Oz picks up on this. Richard the Lionhearted, king of England, was so called because of his great courage). Babylon’s cowardice is clearly displayed by King Belshazzar when the kingdom fell to the Medes and Persians (see **Daniel 5:6**).

Notice the passive verbs in this verse: ‘wings **were** plucked’, ‘it **was** lifted up,’ it ‘**was made** to stand,’ and ‘a man’s heart **was given** to it’. It is clear that someone else is guiding history!!

Verse 5:

The bear symbolizes the kingdom of the Medes and Persians (**Daniel 8:20**). This is made clear in **Daniel 5** where the Medes and Persians are described as the conquerors of Babylon. The fact

that the bear was higher on one side than on the other indicates that one of these co-ruling kingdoms was to be more powerful than the other. This is made clear in **Daniel 8:3** where we are told that the ram has two horns and the highest one comes out last. This is remarkably true to history. When the kingdom began, the Medes were dominant but at the end the kingdom was ruled exclusively by Persian kings and the Medes receded into the background (see the chart at the end of this material, *'The Dynastic Succession of the Medes and Persians'*).

The three ribs in the bear's mouth represent the three provinces which the Medes and Persians conquered in order to ascend to power: **1)** Lydia (ancient Turkey/Anatolia) was conquered in 547. **2)** Babylon, was overcome in 539 and, **3)** Egypt, was forced to submit in 525.

Notice, once again, that someone is active behind the scenes of history: **'they said unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.'** It is obvious that someone is giving the Medes and Persians permission to conquer. 'They' in this verse no doubt refers to the watchers or angels who are the emissaries of God in the guidance of human events (compare **Ezekiel 1** where the angels carry on God's redemptive purpose on earth).

Verse 6:

The leopard represents the kingdom of Greece. The leopard in itself is a swift animal, but this leopard has wings. This must mean that Greece would conquer the world in a swifter fashion than Babylon. And this is exactly what happened.

Alexander the Great conquered the whole Near East (from Egypt to the Indus Valley in India) in just 3 years. Nebuchadnezzar took 13 years to just reach a stalemate with Tyre. In contrast, Alexander conquered Tyre in just eight months.

It is important to underline that the leopard did not have the four heads when it began to rule. How do we know this? The answer is, by a comparison of **Daniel 7** with **Daniel 8**. In **Daniel 8** the he-goat (a symbol of **Greece, 8:21**) governed for a period with a notable horn on its head (Alexander the Great). Only after the great horn was broken, did four others come out to replace it. So, just as the he-goat governed for a period and then sprouted four horns, so, the leopard ruled for a period and then it grew four heads. It is clear that the four heads and the four horns came up after the leopard and he-goat had ruled for a period of time (see, **Daniel 8:5-8**).

In **Daniel 7** the leopard was swift, but it was made even swifter by wings. In **Daniel 8** the he-goat is so swift he does not even touch the ground. Once again we are told that a power outside history is guiding world affairs: 'and dominion **was given** to it'. Notice that the leopard did not take dominion. Rather, dominion was given to it!!

Verse 7:

The dragon beast represents the Roman Empire (168 BC-476 AD). This empire came to be known as the 'iron monarchy of Rome'. Edward Gibbon, **The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire**, volume 4, p. 161

The ten horns represent the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided when it fell apart. These ten kingdoms, according to Edward Gibbon, were: The Alemanni, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Visigoths, the Saxons, the Ostrogoths, the Lombards and the Heruli (see, M. H. Brown, **The Sure Word of Prophecy**, pp. 54, 55).

*“The historian Machiavel, without the slightest reference to this prophecy, gives the following list of the nations which occupied the territory of the Western Empire at the time of the fall of Romulus Augustulus [476 A. D], the last emperor of Rome: The Lombards, the Franks, the Burgundians, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Vandals, the Heruli, the Sueves, the Huns, and the Saxons: ten in all.” (H. Grattan Guinness, **The Divine Program of the World’s History**, p. 318)*

Already in the fourth century, Jerome had spoken of the fragmentation of the Roman Empire in the following terms:

*“Moreover the fourth kingdom, which plainly pertains to the Romans, is the iron which breaks in pieces and subdues all things. But its feet and toes are partly of iron and partly of clay, which **at this time** [note that Jerome was living when this was happening] is most plainly attested. For just as in its beginning nothing was stronger and more unyielding than the Roman Empire, so at the end of its affairs nothing is weaker.” (Jerome, **Commentary on Daniel**, comments on 2:40, column 504).*

In the days when Jerome lived, the Roman Empire was falling apart. The barbarian tribes from the north had descended upon the empire with a vengeance and broke it up into the nations which today constitute Western Europe.

Verse 8:

We must now take a closer look at the little horn. There are at least eleven identifying characteristics in chapter seven:

- 1) The little horn arises **from the fourth beast** (**Daniel 7:8**). The fourth beast represents Rome, so the little horn must be a Roman power.
- 2) The little horn arises **among the ten horns**. The ten horns are the divisions of Western Europe, so the little horn must arise in Western Europe (**Daniel 7:8**). Notice that these first two characteristics restrict the geographical location of the little horn to Western Europe.
- 3) The little horn rises **after the ten horns** (**Daniel 7:24**). According to historians, the ten horns were complete in the year 476 AD, so this must mean that the little horn was to arise to power sometime after 476 AD.
- 4) The little horn was to **pluck up three of the first [ten] horns by the roots** (**Daniel 7:8**). This means that these three nations would be uprooted from history. **Daniel 7:20-21** explains that three of the first horns would **fall** before the little horn, and **Daniel 7:24** tells us that the little horn would **subdue** three horns. In other words, three of the first ten nations would disappear from history!!

- 5) The little horn was to **speak great words against the Most High (Daniel 7:21, 25)**. **Revelation 13:5** explains what these words would be, namely, **blasphemy**. And, what is blasphemy according to the Bible? It is when a merely human power claims to be God on earth and when it thinks it can exercise the prerogatives and functions of God (see, **John 10:30-33; Mark 2:7**).
- 6) The little horn was to be a **persecuting** power against God's people. This is stated in **Daniel 7:21** and repeated in **verse 25**.
- 7) The little horn would think it could **change God's 'times', that is to say, God's timetable of prophetic events**. (**Daniel 2:21**). We shall see that the little horn invented false systems of prophetic interpretation to rival historicism.
- 8) The little horn would even have the audacity to THINK that it could **change God's holy law**. (**Daniel 7:25**).
- 9) The little horn would be different from the ten horns. It would be an amalgamation of **church and state** (**Daniel 7:24**).
- 10) This power would govern for **a time, times and half a time** (**Daniel 7:25**). This comes out to 42 months or 1260 days (see, **Revelation 13:5-6; 12:6, 13-15**). In Bible prophecy, literal days are symbolic of years, so this power was to govern for 1260 years (we will study the year/day principle later on in this material).
- 11) The little horn had **eyes like a man**. In Bible Prophecy, eyes are symbolic of wisdom (see, **Ephesians 1:18; Revelation 5:6**). Even today, an owl is a symbol of wisdom because of its large eyes. In other words, this power was to depend on human wisdom.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PAPACY AS THE FULFILLMENT OF THE LITTLE HORN PROPHECY:

Characteristic #1: The Papacy is **Roman** in all its dimensions. Notice the following:

- 1) The clay in the feet of the image of Daniel 2 represents the church. But notice that the feet also have the iron of the legs. This must mean that the religious system which succeeds the Roman Empire will continue to be Roman.
- 2) The religion of the Roman Catholic Papacy was inherited from Rome. It is well known that Constantine the Great brought all sorts of pagan practices into the church. This is recognized by both secular and church historians. In fact, the name 'Supreme Pontiff' (*Pontifex Maximus*) was used by the pagan Roman emperors. After the Edict of Milan was signed in the year 312 A. D., Christians were restored as *bona fide* citizens of the Roman Empire. The result of this is described by Dave Hunt:

"Freedom at last from persecution seemed like a gift from God. Unfortunately, it set the stage for an apostasy that would envelop Christendom for more than a millennium. Christ's bride had been wedded to paganism." (Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, pp. 202-203)

Constantine, emperor of the Roman Empire, was the architect of this Edict of Milan (313 A. D.) Regarding Constantine, Hunt remarks:

*“A brilliant military commander, Constantine also understood that there could be no political stability without religious unity. Yet to accomplish that feat would require a union between paganism and Christianity. How could it be accomplished? The Empire needed an **ecumenical religion** that would appeal to every citizen in a multi-cultural society. Giving Christianity official status was not enough to bring internal peace to the Empire: Christianity had to undergo a transformation so that pagans could ‘convert’ without giving up their old beliefs and rituals.*

*Constantine himself exemplified this expediency. He adopted Christ as the new god that had given him victory in the crucial battle at Milvian Bridge in 312 A. D., and brought him into Rome as its conqueror. Yet, as Caesar, he continued to function as the Pontifex Maximus of the Empire’s pagan priesthood, known as the Pontifical College. . . As a ‘Christian’ Emperor, he automatically became the de facto civil head of the Christian church and seduced her with promises of power. Thus began the destruction of Christianity and the process that created Roman Catholicism as it is today.”(Dave Hunt, **Global Peace**, pp. 106-107)*

*“It was ‘Christianity’, in fact, which gave the Empire a unity and continuity that held it together culturally and religiously. When the Empire later disintegrated politically under the onslaught of the Barbarians, it was held together religiously by the all-pervasive presence of the Roman Catholic Church with its ingenious ecumenical **blend of paganism and Christianity** still headquartered in Rome.” (Dave Hunt, **Global Peace**, p. 110)*

The great philosopher and historian, Will Durant, remarks:

*“When Christianity conquered Rome, the ecclesiastical structure of the pagan church, the title and vestments of the Pontifex Maximus, the worship of the Great Mother and a multitude of comforting divinities, the sense of super-sensible presences everywhere, the joy or solemnity of old festivals, and the pageantry of immemorial ceremony, passed like maternal blood into the new religion, and **captive Rome captured her conqueror**. While Christianity converted the world, the world converted Christianity. . .” (Will Durant, **Civilization: Caesar and Christ**, Volume 3, p. 657.*

John Henry Cardinal Newman makes this admission:

“We are told in various ways by Eusebius, that Constantine, in order to recommend the new religion to the heathen, transferred into it the outward ornaments to which they had been accustomed in their own. It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees, incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness, holy water; asylums; holy days and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the fields; sacerdotal vestments; the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning East, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant, and the Kyrie

Eleisen, are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the church.” (Henry Cardinal Newman, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, p. 373)

Philip Schaff, one of the greatest church historians ever to wield a pen, wrote the following:

*“But the elevation of Christianity as the religion of the state presents also an opposite aspect to our contemplation. It involved great risk of degeneracy to the church. The Roman state, with its laws, institutions, and usages, was still deeply rooted in heathenism, and could not be transformed by a magical stroke. The christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church. The world overcame the church, as much as the church overcame the world, and the temporal gain of Christianity was in many respects cancelled by spiritual loss. The mass of the Roman Empire was baptized only with water, not with the Spirit of the gospel, and it smuggled heathen manners and practices into the sanctuary under a new name. The very **combination** of the cross with the military ensign by Constantine was the most doubtful omen, portending an unhappy **mixture** of the temporal and the spiritual powers.” (Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, p. 93, bold is mine)*

- 3) The **architecture** at the Vatican is Roman. Recently, I made a visit to the ruins of the old city of Rome and then on the same day visited Vatican City. The architecture is virtually identical. Also, the old city of Rome was filled with statues of gods and heroes as is Vatican City.
- 4) The Papal church is called the **Roman** Catholic Church.
- 5) The official language of the Vatican is **Latin**, the language of ancient Rome.
- 6) In official documents, the Vatican employs **Roman numerals**.
- 7) The headquarters of the Papacy is **Vatican City**, which is located in the geographical location of ancient Rome. Says the Catholic Encyclopedia:

“It [Vatican City] is within the city of Rome, called the city of seven hills, that the entire area of Vatican State proper is now confined”. (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Tomas Nelson Publishers, 1976. Article: ‘Rome’)

- 8) Historians and theologians consistently emphasize that Papal Rome inherited and perpetuated the Roman Empire but in a different way: It was a **religious-political** system. Notice the following quotations from church historians and theologians:

“Within three centuries, the Roman Church had transformed the administrative organization of the Roman Empire into an ecclesiastical system of bishoprics, dioceses, monasteries, colonies, garrisons, schools, libraries, administrative centers, envoys, representatives, courts of justice, and a criminal system of intricate laws all under the direct control of the pope. His Roman Palace, the Lateran, became the new Senate. The new senators were the cardinals. The bishops who lived in Rome and the priests and deacons helped the pope to administer this new imperium.” (Malachi Martin, The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church, p. 105, italics mine)

*“The Roman Church in this way privily pushed itself into the place of the Roman World-Empire, of which it is the actual continuation; the empire has not perished, but has only undergone a transformation. . . That is no mere ‘clever remark,’ but the recognition of the true state of the matter historically, and the most appropriate and fruitful way of describing the character of this Church. It still governs the nations. . . It is a political creation, and as imposing as a World-Empire, because [it is] the **continuation of the Roman Empire**. The Pope, who calls himself ‘King’ and ‘Pontifex Maximus,’ is Caesar’s successor.” (Adolph Harnack, **What is Christianity?** pp. 269-270)*

“The Empire was falling into decay. The Barbarians knew that its life was failing, that the old organism was worn out, and they hastened to take possession of the remains. From every direction they came for the spoils. The Saxons and the Angles settled in Great Britain; the Franks invaded Northern Gaul; the Visigoths made Spain and the region south of the Loire their own; the Burgundians took possession of the upper valley of the Rhone; the Vandals made conquests in Africa. The Ostrogoths and Lombards were waiting for their turn to come. Among these new invaders, some were heretics, others were pagans. What is to become of the Church? Are its days numbered, and is the Empire to bring it down as its companion into an open tomb?

*No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire. It will have to pass through days of distress. It will witness calamity after calamity, ruins heaped upon ruins. But in the midst of the greatest sadness, it will receive precious consolations. One after another, these barbarian peoples will submit to its laws, and will count it a glory to be the Church’s children. The frontiers of the Church will be extended; its institutions, for a moment shaken by the Barbarians, will be consolidated, developed, and will adapt themselves to their surroundings. The papacy, most sorely tried of all, will make a new advance. At length a **second empire** will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master. More than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.” (Joseph Turmel, **The Latin Church in the Middle Ages**, p. v, vi. Emphasis supplied)*

*“The all-conquering barbarians were storming the gates of Augustine’s city when the saint died in 430. The North African town of Hippo was one of the last imperial outposts to be attacked. Rome had already gone under. Only four years before, St. Augustine’s **City of God** had laid the theological groundwork for the church to **step into the void** left by the collapsing Roman Empire.” (Douglas Auchincloss, **City of God and Man, Time**, 76 (December 12, 1960), p. 64, emphasis supplied.*

*“The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330 left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organization. The Bishop of Rome, **in the seat of the Caesars**, was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the political as well as the spiritual head. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favored the **evolution** of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume*

military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognized the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand, how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasized and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan]. The importance of this fact must not be overlooked. The organization of the Church was thus put on the same divine basis as the revelation of Christianity. This idea once accepted led inevitably to the medieval Papacy.” Alexander Clarence Flick, **The Rise of the Mediaeval Church** pp. 168, 169, emphasis supplied.

“During the whole medieval period there was **in Rome a single spiritual and temporal authority** [the papacy] exercising powers which in the end exceeded those that had ever lain within the grasp of the Roman emperor.” R. W. Southern, **Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages**, volume 2, pp. 24-25 emphasis supplied.

“The papacy is no other than **the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire**, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.” (Thomas Hobbes, as quoted in, Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, p. 95) emphasis supplied.

“Christian Rome was the **legitimate successor of pagan Rome**.... Christ had triumphed [and] Rome was ready to extend its sway to the heavens themselves.” (W. H. C. Frend, **The Rise of Christianity**, p. 773) emphasis supplied.

“The Roman Christian Church was a church of world-wide importance and power, and her bishop the most influential. Out of the ruins of **political Rome** arose the great **moral empire** in the ‘giant form’ of the Roman Church. In the marvelous rise of the Roman Church is seen in strong relief the majestic office of the Bishop of Rome.” (Alexander Clarence Flick, **The Rise of the Mediaeval Church**, p. 150) emphasis supplied

“When the Western empire fell into the hands of the barbarians, the Roman bishop was the only surviving **heir of this imperial past**, or, in the well-know dictum of Hobbes, ‘the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.’” (Philip Schaff, **History of the Christian Church**, vol. 3, p. 287) emphasis supplied

“Long before the fall of Rome, there had begun to grow up within the Roman Empire an **ecclesiastical state**, which was **shaping itself upon the imperial model**. This **spiritual empire**, like the secular empire, possessed a hierarchy of officers, of which deacons, priests or presbyters, and bishops were the most important. . . . Another consequence of the fall of the Roman power in the west was the development of the Papacy. In the absence of an Emperor in the west, the popes rapidly gained influence and power and soon built up an **ecclesiastical empire** that in some respects took the place of the old empire.” (Myers, **General History for Colleges**, pp. 348, 316) emphasis supplied

“St. Thomas . . . says that **the Roman Empire has not ceased**, but is **changed** from the temporal into the spiritual. . . It was, then, the Apostolic Church, which, spreading throughout the nations, already combined together by the power of the heathen empire of Rome, quickened them with a new life. . . the temporal power in the old heathen empire of Rome, and the spiritual power in the supernatural kingdom of God met together. . . these two powers were **blended and fused**

together; they became one authority, the emperor ruling from his throne within the sphere of his earthly jurisdiction, and the Supreme Pontiff ruling likewise from a throne of a higher sovereignty over the nations. . . the material power which once reigned in Rome [was] consecrated and sanctified by the investiture of the Vicar of Jesus Christ with temporal sovereignty over the city where he dwelt. And now for these twelve hundred years the peace, the perpetuity and faithfulness of the Christian civilization of Europe, has been owing solely in its principle to this consecration of the **power** and **authority** [Revelation 13:2] of **the great empire of Rome**, taken up of old, perpetuated, preserved, as I have said, by the salt which had been sprinkled from heaven, and continued in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, and in that order of Christian civilization of which he has been the creator.” (Cardinal Manning, **The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ**, pp. 123-128) emphasis supplied

“If we extend our view over the ruins of the Western Empire, such is the spectacle that meets us on every side. . . the Pax Romana has ceased; it is universal confusion. But wherever a bishop holds his court, religion protects all that is left of the ancient order. **A new Rome ascends slowly above the horizon**. It is the **heir of the religion** which it has overthrown; it assumes the outward splendors of the Caesars. . . . The emperor is no more. . . . But the **Pontifex Maximus** abides; he is now the Vicar of Christ, offering the old civilization to the tribes of the north. He converts them to his creed, and they serve him as their Father and Judge supreme. This is the Papal Monarchy, which in its power and its decline overshadows the history of Europe for a thousand years.” (W. F. Barry, **The Papal Monarchy**, pp. 45, 46) emphasis supplied

“As Rome’s role in **pagan history** came to an end, she was destined to play another, a sacred one, in **Christian history**. . . . Rome’s part in ecclesiastical history had begun. . . Thus a Christian Rome, destined, like its pagan predecessor on the Palatine, to conquer a large part of the earth, gradually arose on Vatican Hill. . . . While today the Palatine [the hill of the Roman Emperors’ palaces] is in ruins, St. Peter’s still draws worshipers from all parts of the world.” (Walter Woodburn Hyde, **Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire**, pp. 6-7) emphasis supplied

Notice the following amazing declaration by Cardinal Manning:

“Now the abandonment of Rome was the **liberation** of the pontiffs. Whatsoever claims to obedience the emperors may have made, and whatsoever compliance the Pontiff may have yielded, the whole previous relation, anomalous, and annulled again and again by the vices and outrages of the emperors, was finally dissolved by a higher power. The providence of God permitted a succession of **irruptions**, Gothic, Lombard, and Hungarian, to desolate Italy, and to **efface from it every remnant of the empire** [remember this fact of history. Later on in this paper we will see that Protestant futurists rewrite history and deny that the Roman Empire was ever divided]. The pontiffs found themselves alone, the sole fountains of order, peace, law, and safety. And from the hour of this providential **liberation**, when, by a divine intervention, the **chains fell off** from the hands of the successor of St. Peter, as once before from his own, no sovereign has ever reigned in Rome except the Vicar of Jesus Christ.” Henry Edward Manning, **The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ**, Preface, pp. xxviii, xxix. London: Burns and Lambert, 1862. Emphasis supplied

This might well be the time to speak of the mysterious ‘restrainer’ that the Apostle Paul refers to in II Thessalonians 2. The early church Fathers were practically unanimous in the opinion that the ‘restrainer’ was a reference to the Roman Empire in general and the emperors in particular. Paul indicates that the Church at Thessalonica knew who the restrainer was. And yet Paul speaks in veiled language. And why would this be? Paul could not speak openly about the Empire which was governing in his day. If he had publicly stated that the Roman Empire was going to be taken out of the way, the emperors would have had grounds to accuse Paul of sedition. So Paul had to be cautious in his comments. If the restrainer was the Holy Spirit, as many futurists believe, then why was Paul so cautious? It is clear that Paul could not define the ‘restrainer’ openly. It was not necessary to do so because the Thessalonians knew what he was talking about.

You will notice in the comment by Manning that the fall of the Roman Empire led to the ‘liberation’ of the Roman Pontiff. You will also notice that the fall of the Roman Empire is described as chains falling off the hands of the successor of St. Peter. The inevitable conclusion we reach from Manning’s words is that the fall of the empire removed the restraint placed upon the Bishop of Rome. But now let us turn to the writings of the early church Fathers. Let us start with **Tertullian** (160-240 AD):

*“For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now hinders must hinder, until he be taken out of the way.’ What obstacle is there but the Roman state, the falling away of which, by being scattered into ten kingdoms, shall introduce Antichrist upon (its own ruins)? ‘And then shall be revealed the wicked one.’ ‘On the Resurrection of the Flesh,’ chapter 24; **Ante-Nicene Fathers**, vol. III, p. 563 [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1908]*

In yet another comment, **Tertullian** states:

*“The very end of all things threatening dreadful woes is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empire.” ‘Apology,’ chapter 32; **Ante-Nicene Fathers**, Vol. III, p. 43)*

Now notice the words of **Lactantius** (early fourth century):

*“The subject itself declares that the fall and ruin of the world will shortly take place; except that while the city of Rome remains, it appears that nothing of this kind is to be feared. But when that capital of the world shall have fallen, and shall have begun to be a street, which the Sibyls say shall come to pass, who can doubt that the end has now arrived to the affairs of men and the whole world? It is that city, that only, which still sustains all things.” ‘The Divine Institutes,’ book 7, chapter 25; **Ante-Nicene Fathers**, vol. VII, p. 220*

Let’s listen to **Cyril of Jerusalem** (318-386 AD):

“But this aforesaid Antichrist is to come when the times of the Roman Empire shall have been fulfilled, and the end of the world is drawing near. There shall rise up together ten kings of the Romans, reigning in different parts perhaps, but all **about the same time**; and after those an eleventh, the Antichrist, who by his magical craft shall seize upon the Roman power; and of the kings who reigned before him, ‘three he shall humble,’ and the remaining seven he shall keep in

subjection to himself.” (*Catechetical Lectures*,’ section 15, on II Thessalonians 2:4; **Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers**, vol. VII, p. 108 [New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1895])

Next we present the testimony of **Ambrose** (died in 398):

“After the falling or decay of the Roman Empire, Antichrist shall appear.” (Quoted in, Bishop Thomas Newton, **Dissertations on the Prophecies**, p. 463 [London: B. Blake, 1840])

Next in line is **Chrysostom** (died in 407):

“When the Roman Empire is taken out of the way, then he [the Antichrist] shall come. And naturally. For as long as the fear of this empire lasts, no one will willingly exalt himself, but when that is dissolved, he will attack the anarchy, and endeavor to seize upon the government both of man and of God.” ‘Homily IV on 2 Thessalonians 2:6-9,’ **Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers**, vol. XIII, p. 389 [New York: Charles Scribner’s and Sons, 1905]

Finally we will quote from **Jerome** (died 420):

“He that letteth is taken out of the way, and yet we do not realize that Antichrist is near.” (Letter to Ageruchia, written about 409 A. D. Letter 123, section 16; **Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers**, vol. VI, p. 236 [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912]).

Ellen G. White has some interesting statements regarding the restrainer both in history and in prophecy:

“The spirit of compromise and conformity [of the early Christian church] was **restrained** for a time by the fierce persecutions which the church endured under paganism. But as persecution ceased, and Christianity entered the courts and palaces of kings, she laid aside the humble simplicity of Christ and His apostles for the pomp and pride of pagan priests and rulers; and in place of the requirements of God, she substituted human theories and traditions.” Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 49. Emphasis supplied

“Let the **restraints** now imposed by **secular governments** be **removed** and Rome be reinstated in her former power, and there would speedily be a revival of her tyranny and persecution.” Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 564. Emphasis supplied

“The vast empire of Rome crumbled to pieces, and **from its ruins** rose that mighty power, the Roman Catholic Church. This church boasts of her infallibility and her hereditary religion.” (**Manuscript Releases**, Volume 1, p. 50)

Characteristic #2: The Roman Catholic Church did arise among the ten kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was divided. Notice the following two quotations:

“Even the Romanists themselves admit that the Roman Empire was, by means of the incursions of the northern nations, dismembered into ten kingdoms (Calmet on Revelation 13:1; and he refers likewise to Berangaud, Bossuet, and DuPin. See Newton, p. 209); and Machiavelli (*History of Florence*,’ 1.i) with no design of furnishing an illustration of this prophecy, and probably with

no recollection of it, has mentioned these names: 1. The **Ostrogoths** in Moesia; 2. The **Visigoths** in Pannonia; 3. The **Sueves** and **Alans** in Gascoign and Spain; 4. The **Vandals** in Africa; 5. The **Franks** in France; 6. The **Burgundians** in Burgundy; 7. The **Heruli** and **Turingi** in Italy; 8. The **Saxons and Angles** in Britain; 9. The **Huns** in Hungary; 10. The **Lombards** at first upon the Danube, afterwards in Italy.”(Albert Barnes, Notes on the Book of Daniel, p. 322)

“Antichrist, then (as the Fathers delight to call him), or the little horn, is to be sought among the ten kingdoms of the Western Roman Empire. I say of the western Roman Empire, because that was properly the body of the fourth beast; Greece, and the countries which lay eastward of Italy belonged to the third beast; for the former beasts were still subsisting, though their dominion was taken away. ‘As concerning the rest of the beasts,’ saith Daniel, ‘they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time.’ Daniel 7:12. ‘And therefore,’ as Sir Isaac Newton rightly infers, ‘all four beasts are still alive, though the dominion of the three first be taken away.’

The nations of Chaldea and Assyria are still the first beast. Those of Media and Persia are still the second beast. Those of Macedon, Greece and Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, are still the third. And those of Europe, on this side of Greece, are still the fourth. Seeing therefore the body of the third beast is confined to the nations on this side the river Euphrates, and the body of the fourth beast is confined to the nations on this side of Greece; we are to look for all the four heads of the third beast among the nations on this side the river Euphrates; and for all the eleven horns of the fourth beast, among the nations on this side of Greece.” (Thomas Newton, Dissertations on the Prophecies, pp. 239, 240) emphasis supplied

Characteristic #3:

The Roman Catholic Papacy did arise to **supremacy** after the year 476 A. D. The Papal power could not exercise absolute sovereignty until the ten kingdoms were subjected to its control. When Odoacer, king of the Heruli, deposed Romulus Augustulus in 476 A. D. the fragmentation of the Roman Empire was complete. Yet even though the ten divisions of the Roman Empire were complete by 476 A. D., there were three who were rebellious and refused to submit to the Bishop of Rome (the Vandals, the Heruli and the Ostrogoths). These had to be removed in order for the papacy to exercise absolute control.

Characteristic #4:

The little horn did uproot three of the ten kingdoms. The story goes like this: Seven of the ten Barbarian kingdoms were converted to Christianity and submitted to the authority of the Bishop of Rome. However, three of the kingdoms converted to Christianity but embraced the heretical teachings of Arius. Arius (who was presbyter in Alexandria around the year 320 A. D.) taught that ‘Christ was created out of nothing as the first and greatest of all creatures’ (Lorraine Boettner, Baker’s Dictionary of Theology, pp. 64-65).

The teachings of Arius were condemned in two great church councils, Nicaea (325 AD) and Constantinople (381 AD). These three Arian kingdoms were a threat to the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome [later called the Pope]. To make a long story short, these three kingdoms

eventually were uprooted by the imperial power acting under the influence of the Bishop of Rome. The Ostrogoths (originally from Yugoslavia), by order of the emperor, dealt the heretical Heruli a devastating defeat in 493.

It happened like this: The Pope requested the emperor to do something about the unorthodox Heruli. In response, the emperor sent Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths to do battle with Odoacer, king of the Heruli. Odoacer was slain by Theodoric and the Heruli disappeared from history. Then the Vandals were crushed (in 534 AD) by Belisarius, general of emperor Justinian's armies.

But there was one remaining horn which needed to be uprooted, and it was the most formidable of all: the Ostrogoths. After the Ostrogoths conquered the Heruli, they became extremely powerful. They were also Arians, so the Bishop of Rome [the Pope] implored Justinian to uproot the Ostrogoths. Justinian, in turn, implored the Franks to help him in his holy enterprise:

*"When Justinian first meditated the conquest of Italy, he sent ambassadors to the kings of the Franks, and adjured them, by the common ties of alliance and **religion**, to join in the **holy enterprise against the Arians.**" Edward Gibbon, **The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire**, volume 4 [chapter 41, paragraph 32] (New York: Harper & Brothers), p. 175 *emphasis supplied**

There were several battles between Belisarius and the Ostrogoths. The decisive battle, however, was in February (remember the month because we will come back to it later) of the year 538. The armies of Justinian, as well as the ravages of disease, decimated the armies of the Ostrogoths, they were expelled from Rome and in short order, disappeared from the historical scene in Europe. The third horn had been uprooted once and for all!

It is of great significance that in 533 AD Justinian proclaimed a decree which recognized the Pope's headship over all the churches of east and west. This decree was actually a letter written by Justinian to Pope John. The letter was included in *The Code of Justinian* which is a collection of Justinian's laws. It must be remembered that this letter had the force of law. In effect, the *Code of Justinian* was the standard law of all Europe for over one thousand years until it was replaced in the late 1700's by the *Code of Napoleon*. Part of Justinian's decree reads as follows:

*"Therefore, **we have exerted ourselves** to unite all the priests of the East and **subject them** to the See of Your Holiness, and hence the questions which have at present arisen, although they are manifest and free from doubt, and, according to the doctrine of Your Apostolic See, are constantly firmly observed and preached by all priests. . . because you are the head of all the Holy Churches, for **We shall exert Ourselves in every way** (as has already been stated), to increase the honor and authority of your See. . ." (S. P. Scott, **The Civil Law**, vol. 12, pp. 11-13)*

The significance of this decree is that the Roman Emperor was legitimizing the spiritual authority of the Pope. The state was using its clout to proclaim that only the Pope was the authentic spokesman for orthodox Christianity. Though this decree was given in 533 AD, it was not fully implemented until the rebel Ostrogoths were devastated in 538 AD.

On the devastating defeat of the Ostrogoths in 538 A. D., Thomas Hodgkin remarks:

*“Some of them [the retreating Goths] must have suspected the melancholy truth that they had dug one grave deeper and wider than all, the grave of the Gothic monarchy in Italy.” (Thomas Hodgkin, **Italy and Her Invaders**, book 5, chap. 9, last par. [vol. 4, p. 285]).*

Most historians agree that the decimation of the Ostrogoths in Italy marked the beginning of the middle Ages. Notice the comment by George Finlay:

*“With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defense against Witiges [538 AD], commences the history of the Middle Ages.” (George Finlay, **Greece Under the Romans**, p. 295)*

It is important to remember also that historians mark 538 AD as the transition between old Imperial Rome and the Rome of the Middle Ages. Notice the words of C. F. Young:

*“It was the last time [when Belisarius entered in 536] that Imperial Rome—the old imperial Rome of Italy as distinguished from the new imperial Rome by the Bosphorus, the Rome created by Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Vespasian, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus, Severus, and Caracalla—was to be seen by mankind. . . Rome when it was entered by Belisarius was the Rome that mankind had known for centuries. . . But this Rome was to be seen no more. When eighteen years later the Gothic war was ended, a battered ruin was all that remained; classical Rome had passed away forever, to be succeeded after a time by the squalid and miserable city which is the Rome of the middle Ages.” (C. F. Young, **East and West Through Fifteen Centuries**, Vol. II, p. 222)*

The Ostrogoths did not disappear in 538 AD, but the decisive battle had been won, the handwriting was on the wall. In 540 AD Witiges (king of the Ostrogoths) was dealt a further blow by Belisarius at Ravenna. And in 550 AD what was left of the Ostrogoths was totally wiped out and the Ostrogoths were swept into the dust heap of history. It is of great significance that today no trace can be found of the Heruli anywhere in Europe. There is no memory of the Vandals in North Africa. And all that remains of the Ostrogoths is King Theodoric’s Mausoleum (built in the early 6th century) in Ravenna. Theodoric was buried in this mausoleum in 526 AD but today his body is gone. When Belisarius conquered Ravenna in 540 AD, Theodoric’s body was removed from the casket and discarded. So it is literally true that the three horns were uprooted!!

Characteristic #5:

The Roman Catholic Papacy does claim to have the right and authority to exercise the prerogatives and power of God. The Bible is clear that the Antichrist will sit in the Temple of God, ‘showing himself that he is God (II Thessalonians 2:3-4). Notice the following evidence which incriminates the Roman Catholic Papacy:

First, Roman Catholic Church historians and theologians have made some rather audacious statements regarding the dignity and power of the Pope. Let's notice a few of them:

In an oration offered to the Pope in the fourth session of the Fifth Lateran Council (1512) **Christopher Marcellus** stated:

*"For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the director, thou art the husbandman; finally, thou art **another God on earth.**" (Labbe and Cossart, History of the Councils, Vol. XIV, col. 109) emphasis supplied*

The Catechism of the Council of Trent states the following:

*"Bishops and priests, being, as they are, God's interpreters and ambassadors, empowered in His name to teach mankind the divine law and the rules of conduct, and holding, as they do, **His place on earth**, it is evident that no nobler function than theirs can be imagined. Justly, therefore, are they called not only Angels, but even **gods**, because of the fact that they exercise in our midst **the power and prerogatives of the immortal God.**" (John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan, Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, p. 318) emphasis supplied*

Notice the following words of **Cardinal Robert Bellarmine**:

"All names which in the Scriptures are applied to Christ, by virtue of which it is established that he is over the church, all the same names are applied to the Pope." (Robert Bellarmine, Disputationes de Controversiis, Tom. 2, 'Controversia Prima', Book 2 ('De Conciliorum Auctoritate' [On the Authority of Councils]), chap. 17 (1628 ed., Vol. 1, p. 266), translated

The New York Catechism states:

*"The pope **takes the place** of Jesus Christ on earth. . . . By divine right the pope has supreme and full power in faith and morals over each and every pastor and his flock. He is the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the entire church, the father and teacher of all Christians. He is the **infallible ruler**, the founder of dogmas, the author of and the judge of councils; the universal ruler of truth, the arbiter of the world, the supreme judge of heaven and earth, the judge of all, being judged by no one, **God himself on earth.**" (Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, Roman Catholicism, p. 127) emphasis supplied*

Notice the following words in the journal, **La Civiltà Cattolica**,

*"The pope is the supreme judge of the law of the land. . . . He is the **vice-regent of Christ**, who is not only a Priest forever, but also King of kings and Lord of lords." (La Civiltà Cattolica, March 18, 1871, quoted in Leonard Woolsey Bacon, An Inside View of the Vatican Council (American Tract Society ed.), p. 229, n. emphasis supplied*

Pope Gregory IX adds his testimony:

"For not man, but God separates those whom the Roman Pontiff (who exercises the functions, not of mere man, but of the true God), having weighed the necessity or benefit of the churches,

dissolves, not by human but rather by **divine authority.**" (*The Decretals of Gregory IX*, Book I, title 7, chap. 3, in *Corpus Juris Canonici* (1555-56 ed.), Volume 2, col. 203, translated) emphasis supplied

John XXIII at his inauguration address said:

"Into this fold of Jesus Christ no one can enter if not under the guidance of the Sovereign Pontiff; and men can securely reach salvation only when they are united with him, since the **Roman Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ** and **represents His person** on this earth." Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*, p. 408

Pope Leo XIII stated in an Encyclical Letter dated June 20, 1894:

"We hold upon this earth **the place of God Almighty.**" (*The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*, p. 304)

Notice the following statement by a Roman Catholic scholar:

"The priest is the man of God, the minister of God, the portion of God, the man called of God, consecrated to God, wholly occupied with the interests of God; he that despiseth him despiseth God; he that hears him hears God: he remits sins as God, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored as God by himself and by the congregation. . ." (A. Nampon, *Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent*, pp. 543, 544)

Another Roman Catholic scholar states:

"The Pope is the Vicar of Christ, or the visible head of the church on earth. The claims of the Pope are the same as the claims of Christ. Christ wanted all souls saved. So does the Pope. Christ can forgive all sin. So can the Pope. The Pope is the only man who claims the **vicarage of Christ**. His claim is not seriously opposed, and this establishes his authority.

The powers given the Pope by Christ were given him not as a mere man, but as the **representative of Christ**. The Pope is more than the representative of Christ, for he is the fruit of his divinity and of the divine institution of the church." (Extract of a sermon by Rev. Jeremiah Predegast, S. J., preached in the Church of St. John the Baptist, Syracuse, New York, on Wednesday evening, March 13, 1912, as reported in the *Syracuse Post Standard*, March 14, 1912) emphasis supplied.

The following words, in a recognized Roman Catholic encyclopedia, illustrate the blasphemous claims of the Papacy:

"The Pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man, but **as it were God, and the vicar of God**. The Pope is of such lofty and supreme dignity that, properly speaking, he has not been established in any rank of dignity, but rather has been placed upon the very summit of all ranks of dignities. The Pope is called **most holy** because he is rightfully presumed to be such. Nor can emperors and kings be called most holy; for although in civil laws the term 'most sacred' seems sometimes to have been usurped by emperors, yet never that of 'most

holy.’ The Pope alone is deservedly called by the name ‘most holy’, because he alone is the **Vicar of Christ**, who is the fountain and source and fullness of all holiness.

The Pope by reason of the excellence of his supreme dignity is called bishop of bishops. He is also called ordinary of ordinaries. He is likewise bishop of the universal church. He is likewise the divine monarch and supreme emperor, and king of kings. Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions.

“Moreover the superiority and the power of the Roman Pontiff by no means pertain only to the heavenly things, to the earthly things, and to the things under the earth, but are even over angels, than whom he is greater. So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be **judged and excommunicated by the Pope**. For he is of so great dignity and power that he forms one and the same tribunal with Christ. So that whatever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as according to most doctors, etc.

The Pope is as it were **God on earth**, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief king of kings, having plenitude of power, to whom has been entrusted by the omnipotent God direction not only of the earthly but also of the heavenly kingdom.

“The Pope is of so great authority and power that he can **modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws**. [In proof of this last proposition various quotations are made, among them these:] The Pope can modify divine law, since his power is **not of man but of God**, and he acts as **vice-regent of God** upon earth with most ample power of binding and loosing his sheep. Whatever the Lord God himself, and the Redeemer, is said to do, that his vicar does, provided that he does nothing contrary to the faith.” (Lucius Ferraris, **Prompta Bibliotheca Canonica, Juridica, Moralis, Theologica nec non Ascetica, Polemica, Rubricistica, Historica**, article, ‘Papa’) This encyclopedia is not some offshoot production. The **Catholic Encyclopedia**, volume VI, p. 48 in its article, ‘Ferraris’ lauds the virtues of this encyclopedia with the following glowing words: It is ‘a veritable encyclopedia of religious knowledge’ and ‘a precious mine of information.’

Once again, **Pope Leo XIII** stated:

“But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, **complete submission and obedience** of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, **as to God Himself**.” (Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter, ‘On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens’, dated January 10, 1890, trans. in **The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII**, p. 193 emphasis supplied.

Pope Nicholas I, who ruled from 858 to 867 A. D. pronounced the following awesome words:

“It is evident that the popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the apostle [Peter], if he should return upon the earth; since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs **held the place of God upon earth, divinity not being able to be judged by any living man**. We are, then, infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not

accountable for them but to ourselves.” (Cormenin, *History of the Popes*, p. 243, as cited in R. W. Thompson, *The Papacy and the Civil Power*, p. 248) *emphasis supplied*

Many other quotations could be added to prove that the Papacy claims to have the powers and prerogatives of God.

Not only do we have statements from Roman Catholic sources to the effect that the Papacy has the power of God, but the Pope also claims the right to be called ‘Holy Father’. Jesus warned the Jewish leaders of His day: ‘And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven’ (Matthew 23:9). In the light of this clear statement of Jesus, How can the Pope demand that he be called ‘Holy Father’? The name, Pope comes from the Italian, ‘Papa’ which is an abbreviation of *pater patrum* which means ‘father of fathers’ or ‘principal father’ (See, Malachi Martin, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church*, p. 19).

Second, the Pope allows people to approach him and bow before him and kiss his ring. In fact, Gregory VII, in his famous *Dictatus Papae* (Dictates of Hildebrand), article #9 states: ‘That all princes should kiss his [the Pope’s] feet only.’ (Cesare Baronius, *Annales*, year 1076, sections 31-33, volume 17 (1869 ed.), pp. 405, 406, translated)

Third, Acts 10:25-26 explains that Peter refused to allow Cornelius to bow before him. And supposedly, Peter was the first Pope! Even the angel Gabriel refused to allow John the Apostle to bow before him (see Revelation 19:10; 22:8-9). Jesus said to Satan on the Mount of Temptation, ‘Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve’. How unlike Jesus is the Pope. Jesus washed the feet of His disciples but the Pope has encouraged people to bow before him and kiss his feet!!

Fourth, the Papacy claims to possess the power to forgive sins. According to the Bible, only God can forgive sins (see Mark 2:7). If only God can forgive sins and the Pope claims to have power to forgive them, then the Pope must claim to be God! Not only does the Papacy claim that the Pope can forgive sins, but it also claims that its priesthood can forgive them. St. Alphonsus de Liguori wrote a book titled, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva*. Liguori lived in the mid 1700's. What makes his book especially significant is that it is a compendium of the Roman Catholic ‘wisdom’ of the previous 1500 years. Thus it presents with clarity, the official position of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of the power and duties of the priesthood.

Before we look at several blasphemous statements from this book, it is important to understand the Roman Catholic view of the Mass. In their view,

- The priest has the power to change or **transubstantiate** the bread into the real flesh of Jesus and the wine into His real blood.
- Christ is contained **in his totality** (known as ‘ubiquity’) in each host that is distributed by the priest.
- Because Christ is totally present in each host, **the host is worshiped** by the priest and the faithful.

- Obviously, for these concepts to be true, the priest would have to exercise the powers of Almighty God. And this is just what the Roman Catholic Church believes.

Let's listen to the words of St. Alphonsus de Liguori:

“With regard to the power of the priests over the real body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration the Incarnate Word has obliged himself to obey and to come into their hands under the sacramental species. We are struck with wonder when we hear that God obeyed the voice of Josue—the Lord obeying the voice of man—and made the sun stand when he said move not, O sun, towards Gabaon. . . and the sun stood still.

*But our wonder should be far greater when we find that in obedience to the words of his priests—HOC EST CORPUS MEUM—GOD himself descends on the altar, that he comes wherever they call him, and as often as they call him, and places himself in their hands, even though they should be his enemies. And after having come, he remains, entirely at their disposal; they move him as they please, from one place to another; they may, if they wish, shut him up in the tabernacle, or expose him on the altar, or carry him outside the church; they may, if they choose, eat his flesh, and give him for the food of others.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, **Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva**, pp. 26-27*

*“With regard to the mystic body of Christ, that is, all the faithful, the priest has the power of the keys, or the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of paradise, and of changing them from the slaves of Satan into the children of God. And God himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of his priests, and either not to pardon or to pardon, according as they refuse or give absolution provided the penitent is capable of it. ‘Such is,’ says St. Maximus of Turin, ‘this judiciary power ascribed to Peter that its decision carries with it the decision of God.’ ‘The sentence of the priest precedes, and God subscribes to it,’ writes St. Peter Damian.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, **Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva**, pp. 27-28*

*“Were the Redeemer to descend into a church, and sit in a confessional to administer the sacrament of penance, and a priest to sit in another confessional, Jesus would say over each penitent, ‘Ego te absolvo,’ the priest would likewise say over each of his penitents, ‘Ego te absolvo,’ and the penitents of each would be equally absolved.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, **Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva**, p. 28*

*“Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called **the creator of his Creator**, since by saying the words of consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving him a sacramental existence, and produces him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father. As in creating the world it was sufficient for God to have said, Let it be made, and it was created—He spoke, and they were made—so it is sufficient for the priest to say, ‘Hoc est corpus meum,’ and behold the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Jesus Christ. ‘The power of the priest,’ says St. Bernardine of Sienna, ‘is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires **as much power as the creation of the world.**’” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, **Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva**, pp. 33-34 emphasis supplied*

*“When he ascended into heaven, Jesus Christ left his priests after him to hold on earth his place of mediator between God and men, particularly on the altar. . . The Priest holds **the place of the Savior himself**, when, by saying ‘Ego te absolvo,’ he absolves from sin.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori, **Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva**, p. 34*

Notice also the blasphemous words of the Baltimore Catechism:

*“The priest does not have to ask God to forgive your sins. The priest himself has the power to do so in Christ’s name. Your sins are forgiven by the priest the same as if you knelt before Jesus Christ and told them to Christ Himself.” Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, **Roman Catholicism**, p. 197*

The Council of Trent described the power of priest with the following words:

*“The priest is the man of God, the minister of God. . . He that despiseth the priest despiseth God; he that hears him hears God. The priest remits sins as God and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored as God by himself and by the congregation. . . It is clear that their function is such that none greater can be conceived. Wherefore they are justly called not only angels, but also God, holding as they do among us the power and authority of the immortal God” A. Nampon, **Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent**, pp. 543,544*

Fifth, the Roman Catholic Papacy claims to have changed the law of God. Not even God can change the law He wrote with His own finger (see, Exodus 31:18). It is as eternal as He is. This means that the Papacy not only claims powers that are equal to God’s but actually claims a power which is greater than God’s. This is blasphemy in its most odious form. Notice the following words from the **Catholic Encyclopedia**, vol. XII, art. ‘Pope,’ p. 265:

“Peter and his successors have power to impose laws both preceptive and prohibitive, power likewise to grant dispensation from these laws, and, when, needful, to annul them. It is theirs to judge offenses against the laws, to impose and to remit penalties. This judicial authority will even include the power to forgive sin. For sin is a breach of the laws of the supernatural kingdom, and falls under the cognizance of its constituted judges.”

In characteristic # 8 below, we will show how the Papacy claims to have changed God’s law. Roman Catholic catechisms ignore the second commandment and split the tenth commandment into two. They also claim to have changed the fourth commandment.

Sixth, the Papacy claims that it has **infallibility in faith and morals**. The Bible teaches clearly that only God is infallible and does not change (James 1:17; Malachi 3:6; Hebrews 13:8)). If the Pope, speaking *ex-cathedra*, claims to be infallible, then he must also be claiming to be God!! Notice the following evidence:

Gregory VII, in his famous *Dictatus Papae*, makes twenty seven propositions among which is: ‘*That the Roman Church never erred, nor will it, according to the Scriptures, ever err.*’ (Cesare Baronius, **Annales**, year 1076, sections. 31-33, volume 17 (1869 ed.), pp. 405, 406, translated)

The Roman Catholic Papacy has put itself on the record on this point by proclaiming, in 1870, the famous *Dogma of Papal Infallibility*. The events surrounding this event are described by Norskov Olsen:

“Viva Pio Nono Papa infallibile!’ These words echoed and re-echoed in the basilica of St. Peter in Rome on the eventful July 18, 1870 when the great crowd, having heard the message of papal infallibility, jubilantly expressed their applause. In the midst of one of the fiercest storms ever known to break across the city, accompanied by thunder and lightning, while rain poured in through the broken glass of the roof close to the spot where the Pope was standing, Pius IX read in the darkness, by the aid of a candle, the momentous affirmation of his own infallibility.

“The fierce storm and dense darkness, the thunder and lightning that accompanied the reading of this document, caused adherents of the papacy to compare the event to the lawgiving at Mount Sinai; on the other hand, opponents saw in the wrath of the elements a sign of God’s anger. By both friend and critic the declaration of papal absolutism was considered to be the most momentous event in the long history of the papacy.

*“On that day the document entitled Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith was decreed. It contains three fundamental concepts which were made into dogma: the supremacy, the universal jurisdiction, and the infallibility of the pope.” V. Norskov Olsen, **Papal Supremacy and American Democracy**, p. 2*

The key portion of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith* stated the following:

*“We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this, our definition: let him be anathema.” Philip Schaff, **Creeds of Christendom**, vol. 2, chapter 4, pp. 270-271*

The Roman Catholic theologian, Fritz Leist, comments on this dogma:

*“The infallibility of the pope is the infallibility of Jesus Christ Himself. . . whenever the pope thinks, it is **God Himself**, who is thinking in him.” Fritz Leist, **Der Gefangene des Vatikanus**, p. 344. Quoted in **Symposium on Revelation**, pp. 340-341 emphasis supplied*

The proclamation of this Papal Dogma was the most controversial in the history of the Roman Catholic Church. A significant number of the clergy who attended the Vatican Council I, were ardently opposed to this dogma and yet in spite of protests, it was passed. If you would like to read more about how this controversial dogma was passed, despite the opposition, read the opening pages of V. Norskov Olsen’s book, **Papal Supremacy and American Democracy**.

The renowned Bible commentator, Adam Clarke, remarks:

*“They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. And they go beyond God in pretending to loose whole nations from their oath of allegiance to their kings, when such kings do not please them. And they go against God, when they give indulgences for sin. This is the worst of all blasphemies.” Adam Clarke, **Commentary**, on Daniel 7:25*

This dogma has created numerous problems for the Papacy in recent years. For example, Hans Kung, a leading theologian of the Catholic Church was defrocked from his chair at the University of Tübingen for writing a book titled ***Infallible? An Inquiry***. In this book, Kung shows that Pope Paul VI’s encyclical, *Humane Vitae*, is not only based of bad history but also on bad science. This book provides a plethora of examples which show that popes have made gargantuan mistakes even when they speak *ex-cathedra* on faith and morals. So much for the Dogma of Papal Infallibility!!

Seventh, according to the Bible, it is the prerogative of God alone to place kings on the throne and to depose them (Daniel 2:21) and yet the Papacy, throughout its history has boastfully claimed the right to install kings and depose them. The examples are numerous (under point # 10 we will furnish several of these) but for now, let us examine statements by Popes and theologians to this effect:

In the famous ***Dictatus Papae*** of Pope Gregory VII, article 12 states: “That it is lawful for him [the Pope] to depose emperors.” Article 27 reads: “That he [the Pope] can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers.”

In the second sentence of excommunication which Gregory VII passed upon Henry the Fourth are these words:

*“Come now, I beseech you, O most holy and blessed fathers and princes, Peter and Paul, that all the world may understand and know that if ye are able to bind and to loose in heaven, ye are likewise able on earth, according to the merits of each man, to give and to take away empires, kingdoms, principedoms, marquisates, duchies, countships, and the possessions of all men. For if ye judge spiritual things, what must we believe to be your power over worldly things? And if ye judge the angels who rule over all the proud princes, what can ye do to their slaves?” James Bryce, ***The Holy Roman Empire***, p. 161.*

The arrogance of the Papacy over the secular power is illustrated in the famous *Decree of Gratian*. Even though this Decree is a forgery, it does show the boastful claims of the papacy:

*“It is shown with sufficient clearness that by the secular power the Pope cannot in any way be bound or loosed, who it is certain was called God by the pious leader Constantine, and it is clear that God cannot be judged by man.” ***Decree of Gratian***, part 1, div. 96, chap. 7*

Notice the words of the papal bull of Pius V deposing Queen Elizabeth of England in 1570:

“He that reigneth on high, to whom all power in heaven and earth is given, has with all fullness of power delivered the rule of the one holy catholic and apostolic church, outside of which there is no salvation, to one sole [ruler] upon earth, to wit, Peter, the prince of the apostles, and to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter. Him alone he hath set as prince over all nations and all kingdoms, to pull up, to destroy, to overthrow, and to break down, to plant, and to build, that he may keep the people faithful, bound with the bond of mutual love, and in the unity of the Spirit, and present them unhurt and safe to his Savior.”

Pope Pius, in articles 4 and 5 of this Bull, states the following:

*“**Article 4:** Moreover she herself is deprived of her pretended right to the aforesaid kingdom, and also of all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever. **Article 5:** And so we absolve the nobles, subjects, and peoples of the said kingdom, and all others who have taken any oath to her, from the obligation of their oath and besides from all duty of dominion, fidelity and obedience: and we deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended right to the kingdom and of all other things as is aforesaid: and we charge and order all and every the nobles, subjects, and peoples, and others aforesaid, not to venture to obey her monitions, commands, and laws. And we attach the like sentence of anathema to those who shall act otherwise. . . Given at St. Peter’s in Rome on the 25th of February of 1570, in the fifth year of our pontificate” Charles Stuteville, **Our Brief Against Rome**, p. 268*

Eight, the Bible makes it clear that God the Father has given Jesus Christ the right to judge because He is the Son of Man (John 5:22, 27). In fact, the Father has given Jesus ALL JUDGMENT!! But the Papacy claims that it has been given the right to serve as judge of mankind. In this way, the Papacy, once again, claims to possess the right to exercise the role which belongs to God alone. Notice the following evidence:

In Gregory VII’s *Dictatus Papae*, article 18 reads:

“That his [the Pope’s] sentence is not to be reviewed by any one; while he alone can review the decisions of all others.”

Article 19 states:

“That he [the Pope] can be judged by no one”

Augustinus de Ancona, in a document preserved in the British Museum, states the following:

“Therefore the decision of the Pope and the decision of God constitute one [i. e., the same] decision, just as the opinion of the Pope and of his disciple are the same. Since, therefore, an appeal is always taken from an inferior judge to a superior, as no one is greater than himself, so no appeal holds when made from the Pope to God, because there is one consistory of the Pope himself and of God himself, of which consistory the Pope himself is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper. Therefore no one can appeal from the Pope to God, as no one can enter into the consistory of God without the mediation of the Pope, who is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper of the consistory of eternal life; and as no one can appeal to himself, so no one can appeal from

the Pope to God, because there is one decision and one court [curia] of God and the Pope.” (From the writings of Augustinus de Ancona (R. C.), printed without title page or pagination, commencing, ‘incipit summa Catholici doctoris Augustini de Ancona potestate ecclesiastica’, Questio VI, ‘De Papalis Sententiae Appellatione’ (On an Appeal from a Decision of the Pope).

We are also reminded of the words of Lucius Ferraris:

*“So that if it were possible that the angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope. For he is of so great dignity and power that he forms one and the same tribunal with Christ.” Lucius Ferraris, **Prompta Bibliotheca**, article, ‘Papa’, II, vol. 6, pp. 26-29*

Characteristic #6:

The Roman Catholic Church has been an ardent persecutor of dissenters throughout its history. It has a history stained in blood. The record is there for everyone who wishes to examine it. We will first make a few remarks about the Biblical view of freedom of conscience and then we will trace the historical record of how Roman Catholicism has trampled on this fundamental freedom.

Roman Catholic authors frequently employ two passages to defend the view that it has a right to use the sword to preserve the integrity of the faith: Matthew 10:34-37 and Matthew 16:16-18. In the first passage Jesus says He has not ‘come to bring peace but a sword’. Many Catholic authors employ this to justify their church’s use of the sword to punish dissenters. But a careful reading of this text shows that the sword is not used by believers against unbelievers but rather by unbelievers against believers. The keys in the second passage are interpreted as the right to exercise spiritual power and temporal power. In other words, the church not only has the right to rule in spiritual matters but also in civil affairs. According to Roman Catholic theology, this gives the church the right to employ the civil power to punish those who dissent from its theology and practice.

A close examination of the Bible indicates that Jesus intended the civil and religious powers to be separate. God is not a God of coercion but of persuasion. God does not violate the conscience of man. This means that God gives every man the right to believe according to the dictates of his own conscience when matters of religion are in play. In this realm, God even gives man the right to be wrong!! A few biblical texts will suffice to prove the above view:

Matthew 22:21 unequivocally states that we are to render unto Caesar that which is Caesar’s and unto God that which belongs to God. A close examination of the text in the light of the totality of Scripture indicates that the realm of Caesar is in civil matters (the second table of the Ten Commandments) and the realm of God is in spiritual matters (the first table of the Ten Commandments).

When Jesus was dragged before Pilate He was asked if He was a king. Jesus assured Pilate that His kingdom was not of this world (John 19:36). He even told Pilate that if His kingdom were of this world, His disciples would fight to deliver Him from the Jews. This clearly shows that Jesus

had no intention of establishing an earthly kingdom by employing force. The kingdom could only be established by implanting the Holy Spirit in the heart of His disciples.

It is a sobering fact that the trial and crucifixion of Jesus followed the same pattern as was later used by the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Notice the following points: 1) Jesus was arrested because He refused to accept the traditions and authority of the apostate church of His day, 2) Jesus was taken before a religious tribunal and interrogated 3) Jesus was then delivered to the secular power of Rome to be killed.

This is the precise method which was used by the Inquisition. Those who did not agree with the hierarchy of the church and refused to accept tradition above Scripture were brought before the inquisitor and grilled mercilessly. Then they were delivered to the civil power to be punished (later in this study we will review some of the specific methods which were used by the Inquisition). It is significant that Satan offered Jesus the kingdoms of this world and Jesus refused them. But Satan offered the Bishop of Rome these same kingdoms and he accepted them. This makes the Bishop of Rome the vice-regent of Satan. If Jesus had accepted, he would have become the vice-regent of Satan.

When the mob came to arrest Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, Peter took out a sword and tried to defend the cause of Jesus by force. The words of Jesus are very telling: 'Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword' (Matthew 26:51-52).

In Luke 9:51-56 we are told the story of James and John who wanted to incinerate those who lived in certain Samaritan villages because they refused to accept Jesus. The words of Jesus to the 'sons of thunder' are very telling: 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' Clearly Jesus refused to employ force to advance the cause of His kingdom.

The prophecies of Daniel and Revelation clearly reveal that God's people are always the **persecuted** not the **persecutors**. During the 1260 years the true church was in exile in the desert (see Revelation 12:6, 14). During this period the true church was **persecuted, it did not persecute**. But history reveals, indelibly, that the Roman Catholic Church during this period was the **persecutor**. This makes it crystal clear that the Roman Catholic system was performing the work of the little horn in making war against and wearing out the saints of the Most High (Daniel 7:21, 25)

What is remarkable is that Daniel 7:21 states that this apostate power would actually prevail against the saints during this period and this is exactly what happened!! We have already seen in another context that the mixture of iron and clay in the feet of the image of Daniel 2 represents the mixture of church and state after the division of the Roman Empire. Revelation 17 reveals a time when the church (the harlot) and the state (the kings of the earth) will once again form an alliance to persecute dissenters.

Let's examine the Roman Catholic view of persecution. It was St. Augustine who laid the foundation for the persecutions of the middle ages. In his own words:

*“Originally my opinion was that no one should be coerced into the unity of Christ that we must act only by words, fight only by arguments, and prevail by force of reason, lest we should have those whom we knew as avowed heretics feigning themselves to be Catholics. **But this opinion of mine was overcome** not by the words of those who controverted it, but by the conclusive instances to which they could point. For, in the first place, there was set over against my opinion my own town [Hippo], which, although it was once wholly on the side of Donatus [a heretic who was leader of a group known as the Donatists], was brought over to the Catholic unity **by fear of the imperial edicts.**” St. Augustine, **Letter 93** (to Vincentius), chapter 5, section 17, translated in **Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers**, first series, volume I, p. 388 emphasis supplied*

In short, Augustine’s monumental work ***The City of God***, presented a radically unbiblical view of the kingdom. For him, the kingdom of God would be established when the church conquered the whole world for Christ. In other words, the kingdom would be established from within history rather than from without. Concerning this concept, Merrill C. Tenney remarks:

*“In his famous work, *The City of God*, he [Augustine] advanced the doctrine that the city or commonwealth of the world was doomed to perish, whereas the ‘city of God,’ the church, was continuing and taking its place. He taught that the ‘city of God’ was identical with the church and that as the latter grew in power and influence it would gradually bring all men under its sway and would introduce the reign of righteousness.*

*“This doctrine of Augustine became the basis for the temporal claims of the Roman church. If the kingdom was to grow irresistibly until it dominated the earth, and if the visible church was identical with the kingdom, then the visible church could rightfully assume political power, and **could make its conquests by force.**” Merrill C. Tenney, ***Interpreting Revelation*** (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdman’s, 1957), pp. 147, 148, emphasis supplied*

But Daniel 2 makes it clear that the kingdom will be established supernaturally by God from **without** human history, **not from within!!** This view of St. Augustine provided the church with the excuse to persecute everyone who refused to become a member of this earthly spiritual kingdom.

Now we move to the sixth century. Notice the words of Emperor Justinian (the same Justinian who implemented the decree which began the 1260 years):

*“**We declare** forever infamous, and deprived of their rights, and condemned to exile, all heretics of either sex, whatever be their name; their property shall be confiscated without hope of restoration, or of being transmitted to their children by hereditary succession, because crimes which attack the majesty of God are infinitely more grievous than those which attack the majesty of earthly princes. With regard to those who are strongly suspected of heresy, if, after having been ordered **by the church**, they do not demonstrate their innocence by suitable testimony, they also shall be declared infamous, and condemned to exile.”* (Codex Justinianus, lib. 1, tit. 5, n. 19; cited in ‘Library of Translations: The Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages,’ M. Gosselin (R. C.), Vol. I, pp. 83, 84 London: C. Dolman, 1853

Someone might object that it was the emperor who made this decree and not the church. However, a careful reading reveals that the emperor made this declaration because the church wished to extirpate heresy. The particular heresy which the church asked Justinian to extirpate was Arianism. The statement clearly reveals a cooperation of church and state to punish heretics!

We now move on to the pontificate of Pope Nicholas I (858-867). The attitude of the Roman Church is now much bolder! Pope Nicholas encouraged the King of Bulgaria, a new convert to 'Christianity', to force the religion of his new church upon his subjects. Notice the words of Pope Nicholas:

*"I glorify you for having maintained your authority by **putting to death** those wandering sheep who refuse to enter the fold; and . . . congratulate you upon having opened the kingdom of heaven to the people submitted to your rule. A king need not fear to command massacres, when these will retain his subjects in obedience, or **cause them** to submit to the faith of Christ; and God will reward him in this world, and in eternal life, for these **murders**."* (Quoted in, R.W. Thompson, *The Papacy and the Civil Power*, p. 244)

We must now examine the origin and mechanism of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. The origins of this organism can be clearly traced to 1227-1233 A. D., during the pontificate of Gregory IX. In 1229 the church council of Toulouse condemned the Albigenses in France and gave orders to exterminate them. In 1231 Gregory IX in his bull, *Excommunicamus*, condemned all heretics and proclaimed specific laws on how to deal with them. Among the provisions were the following:

- 1) Delivery of heretics to the civil power.
- 2) Excommunication of all heretics as well as their defenders, followers, friends, and even those who failed to turn them in.
- 3) Life imprisonment for all impenitent heretics.
- 4) Heretics were denied the right to appeal their sentence.
- 5) Those suspected of heresy had no right to be defended by counsel.
- 6) Children of heretics were disqualified from holding a church office until the second generation.
- 7) Heretics who had died without being punished were to be exhumed and their bodies burned.
- 8) The homes of convicted heretics were to be demolished. (See, G. Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy*, London, 1968, edited by Thames and Hudson, p. 128; and R. I Moore, 'The Origins of Medieval Heresy', in *History*, vol. 55 (1970), pp. 21-36)

In *The Decretals of Gregory IX* we find the following:

*"Temporal princes shall be reminded and exhorted, and if need be, compelled by spiritual censures, to discharge every one of their functions; and that, as they desire to be reckoned and held faithful, so, for the defense of the faith, let them publicly make oath that they will endeavor, bona fide with all their might, to extirpate from their territories all heretics **marked by the church**; so that when any one is about to assume any authority, whether **spiritual** or **temporal**, he shall be held bound to confirm his title by this oath. And if a **temporal prince**,*

*being required and admonished **by the church**, shall neglect to purge his kingdom from this heretical [de]pravity, the metropolitan and other provincial bishops shall bind him in fetters of excommunication; and if he obstinately refuse to make satisfaction this shall be notified within a year to the Supreme Pontiff, that then he may declare his subjects absolved from their allegiance, and leave their lands to be occupied by Catholics, who, the heretics **being exterminated**, may possess them unchallenged, and preserve them in the purity of the faith.”* (*The Decretals of Gregory IX*, book 5, title 7, chapter 13).

During the pontificate of Innocent IV (1241-1253), the mechanism of the Inquisition was further developed. In the papal bull *Ad Extirpanda* (1252), the following provisions were given the force of law:

- 1) Torture must be applied to heretics so as to secure confessions.
- 2) Those found guilty must be burned at the stake.
- 3) A police force must be established to serve the needs of the Inquisition.
- 4) A proclamation of a crusade against all heretics in Italy. Those participating in this crusade were to be extended the same privileges and indulgences as those who went on crusades to the Holy Land.
- 5) The heirs of heretics were to have their goods confiscated as well.

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* explains:

*“In the Bull ‘Ad Extirpanda’ (1252) Innocent IV says: ‘When those adjudged guilty of heresy have been given up to the civil power by the bishop or his representative, or the Inquisition, the podesta or chief magistrate of the city shall take them at once, and shall, within five days at the most, execute the laws made against them’. . . Nor could any doubt remain as to what civil regulations were meant, for the passages which ordered the burning of the impenitent heretics were inserted in the papal decretals from the imperial constitutions *Commissis nobis* and *Inconsutibilem tunicam*. The aforesaid Bull ‘Ad Extirpanda’ remained thenceforth a fundamental document of the Inquisition, renewed or re-enforced by several popes, Alexander IV (1254-61), Clement IV (1265-68), Nicholas IV (1288-92), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others. The **civil authorities**, therefore, were **enjoined by the popes**, under pain of excommunication to execute the legal sentences that condemned impenitent heretics to the stake”* (Joseph Blotzer, article, ‘Inquisition’, volume VIII, p. 34)

The savagery of Innocent the IV has led the Roman Catholic historian, Peter de Rosa, to state:

*“In [Pope] Innocent’s view, it was more wicked for Albigenses to call him the antichrist than for him **to prove it** by burning them—men, women, and children by the thousands.”* (Peter de Rosa, *Vicars of Christ*, p. 225)

Further, de Rosa makes this telling comment:

“Of eighty popes in a line from the thirteenth century on, not one of them disapproved of the theology and apparatus of the Inquisition. On the contrary, one after another added his own

cruel touches to the workings of this deadly machine.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ, pp. 175-176)

It was during this same period that one of the greatest dogmatic theologians in the history of the Roman Catholic Church added his support to the idea of exterminating heretics. Let’s allow St. Thomas Aquinas to speak for himself:

*“With regard to heretics two elements are to be considered, one element on their side, and the other on the part of the church. On their side is the sin whereby they have deserved, not only to be separated from the church by excommunication, but also to be banished from the world by death. For it is a much heavier offense to corrupt the faith, whereby the life of the soul is sustained than to tamper with the coinage, which is an aid to temporal life. Hence if coiners or other malefactors are at once handed over by the secular princes to a just death, much more may heretics, immediately they are convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated, but also **justly done to die.***

*“But on the part of the church is mercy in view of the conversion of them that err; and therefore she does not condemn at once, but ‘after the first and second admonition,’ as the apostle teaches. After that, however, if the man is still found pertinacious, the church, having no hope of his conversion, provides for the safety of others, cutting him off from the church by the sentence of excommunication; and further she leaves him to the secular tribunal to be **exterminated from the world by death.**” Joseph Rickaby, S. J., Aquinas Ethicus; or, The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas, volume. 1, pp. 332, 333 London: Burns and Oates, 1892*

The fourteenth century inquisitor, Bernard Gui explained the purpose of the Inquisition:

“. . . the objective of the Inquisition is to destroy heresy; it is not possible to destroy heresy unless you eradicate the heretics; and it is impossible to eradicate the heretics unless you also eradicate those who hide them, sympathize with them and protect them.” (Salim Japas, Herejia, Colon y la Inquisicion (Siloam Springs, Arkansas: Creation Enterprises, 1992), p. 20; translation is mine)

One of the most corrupt popes in the history of the Roman Catholic Church was John XXII. A Catholic historian describes him as ‘full of avarice, more worldly than a pimp, and with a laugh that crackled with unimprovable malice.’ (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy, p. 212)

According to Peter de Rosa, one of John XXII’s contemporaries stated:

“The blood he shed would have incarnadined the waters of Lake Constance, and the bodies of the slain would have bridged it from shore to shore.” (Peter de Rosa, Vicars of Christ: The Dark Side of the Papacy, p. 212)

Though this is obviously hyperbole, the fact still remains that Pope John XXII was a formidable murderer. Can we imagine Jesus Christ murdering His enemies in cold blood?

Moving on to the fifteenth century, we think of John Wycliffe. The Papacy would have been delighted to burn him at the stake during his life, but divine providence ruled otherwise. Forty years after his death, the Council of Constance (1413) ordered his body exhumed and burned. (See more on this in **Foxe's Book of Martyrs**, pp. 7-8 and the comments in **The Great Controversy**, pp. 95-96)

Notice the words of Pope Martin V (1417-31), written in 1429 to the King of Poland commanding him to exterminate the Hussites:

"Know that the interests of the Holy See, and those of your crown, make it a duty to exterminate the Hussites. Remember that these impious persons dare proclaim principles of equality; they maintain that all Christians are brethren, and that God has not given to privileged men the right of ruling the nations; they hold that Christ came on earth to abolish slavery; they call the people to liberty, that is, to the annihilation of kings and priests.

*While there is still time, then, turn your forces against Bohemia; burn, massacre, make deserts everywhere, for nothing could be more agreeable to God, or more useful to the cause of kings, than the extermination of the Hussites." Quoted in, Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, p. 247). These words were written by Martin V in 1429.*

The story of John Hus is very well known. In 1415 he was burned at the stake even though King Sigismund had guaranteed him safe conduct to defend himself at the Council of Constance (1414-1418). The remarkable fact is that Sigismund was encouraged to break his word by the Roman Catholic religious leaders. For a vivid description of the martyrdom of John Hus, read, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 109-110 and **Foxe's Book of Martyrs**, pp. 19-30.

A year later, Jerome was also burned at the stake. For the fascinating story of how Jerome recanted his faith and then recanted his recantation, see, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 112-115 and **Foxe's Book of Martyrs**, pp. 31-38. In both of these cases, the trial was held in the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Constance. After the trial, Hus and Jerome were delivered to the secular power to be exterminated.

Also in the fifteenth century, Pope Innocent VIII proclaimed a Bull against the Waldenses (1487). The original text of this Bull is found in the library of the University of Cambridge and an English translation can be found in John Dowling's **History of Romanism** (1871 edition), book 6, chapter 5, section 62. Ellen White, in **The Great Controversy**, p. 77 quotes a portion of this bull in the following words:

"Therefore the pope ordered 'that malicious and abominable sect of malignants,' if they 'refuse to abjure, to be crushed like venomous snakes.'"

Another notable martyr of the fifteenth century was Savonarola. He was martyred in the year 1499 for teaching doctrines such as: we are justified by faith in Christ, church members should be given both the bread and the wine, the wicked and filthy cardinals and clergy ought to clean up their act, auricular confession is not necessary, the keys had not been given to Peter alone but to the universal church, the Pope is not the Supreme Pontiff, etc.

It is reported that the bishop in charge of Savonarola's execution, stated:

"I sever you from the church militant and from the church triumphant', to which Savonarola replied: 'Not from the church triumphant because it is not in your power to do so.' (For more information on Savonarola, see, John Foxe, The Book of Martyrs (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, no date), pp. 43-45

In 1492 Columbus discovered America. Shortly after this time, the Inquisition was planted on its shores. The atrocities committed by the Spanish Conquistadors are legendary. Indians were savagely murdered in order to force them to adopt the Roman Catholic religion. Many of these atrocities are well documented in the book by Salim Japas, Heresy, Columbus and the Inquisition.

In 1992, when Latin America was celebrating the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America, many countries refused to participate in the celebration because they remembered the atrocities which the Roman Catholic Church committed in its conquest of the continent.

For example, in 1992 John Paul II visited Santo Domingo to dedicate a monument in remembrance of the discovery of America. The visit was not without turmoil. There were heated protests by the populace and the trip was close to being cancelled. Heightened security was necessary to protect the Pope from the protesting crowds. Amazingly, in spite of the fact that the Dominican Republic is an overwhelmingly Catholic country, the attendance at the event was sparse. I have personally visited Palaces of the Inquisition in Cartagena, Colombia and Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic where thousands were tried, tortured and martyred.

When St. Ignatius of Loyola established the Society of Jesus (more commonly known as 'the Jesuits') in 1534, it was his avowed purpose to lend his services to the pope in order to extirpate Protestantism. Till this day there is a statue in St. Peter's at the Vatican where Loyola is depicted trampling a Protestant under his feet. It is well known that Loyola was steeped in the occult. In fact, his *Spiritual Exercises* were a type of transcendental meditation. It is of more than academic interest to read the 'Extreme Oath' which Jesuits take upon being inducted into the order:

"Now, in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael, the archangel, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul and all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you, my ghostly father, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, in the pontificate of Paul the Third, and continued to the present, do by the womb of the Virgin, the matrix of God, and the rod of Jesus Christ, declare and swear, that his holiness the pope is Christ's Vice-regent and is the true and only Head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his Holiness by my Savior, Jesus Christ, he has power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation and that they may safely be destroyed.

"Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his Holiness' right and custom against all usurpers of the heretical or protestant authority whatever,

especially the Lutheran Church of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the now pretended authority and churches of England and Scotland, and branches of the same, now established in Ireland and on the continent of America and elsewhere; and all adherents in regard that they be usurped or heretical, opposing the sacred Mother church of Rome. I do now renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state named Protestants or Liberals or obedience to any of their laws, magistrates or officers.

“I do further declare that the doctrines of the churches of England and Scotland, of the Calvinists, Huguenotes and others of the name Protestants or Liberals to be damnable, and they themselves damned and to be damned who will not forsake the same.

“I do further declare, that I will help, assist and advise all or any of his Holiness’ agents in any place wherever I shall be, in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, England, Ireland or America, or in any other kingdom or territory I shall come to, and do my uttermost to extirpate the heretical Protestants or Liberals’ doctrines and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise.

“I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with, to assume any religion heretical for the propagating of the Mother Church’s interest to keep secret and private all her agents’ counsels from time to time, as they may entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatever; but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or by any of this sacred covenant.

“I do further promise and declare that I will have no opinion or will of my own, or any mental reservation whatever, even as a corpse or cadaver (perinde al cadaver) but will unhesitatingly obey each and every command that I receive from my superiors in the Militia of the Pope and of Jesus Christ.

“That I will go to any part of the world withersoever I may be sent, to the frozen regions of the North, the burning sand of the desert of Africa, or the jungles of India, to the centres of civilizations of Europe, without murmuring or repining, and will be submissive in all things whatsoever communicated to me.

“I furthermore promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed to do, to extirpate and exterminate them from the face of the whole earth; and that I will spare neither age, sex or condition; and that I will hang, burn, waste, boil, flay, strangle and bury alive these infamous heretics, rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women and crush their infants’ heads against the walls, in order to annihilate forever their execrable race. That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisoned cup, the strangulating cord, the steel of the poinard, or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity, or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at anytime may be directed so to do by any agent of the Pope or superior of the Brotherhood of the Holy Faith, of the Society of Jesus.”

“In confirmation of which, I hereby dedicate my life, my soul and all my corporeal powers, and with this dagger which I now receive, I will subscribe my name written in my own blood, in testimony thereof; and should I prove false or weaken in my determination, may my brethren and fellow soldiers of the Militia of the Pope cut off my hands and my feet, and my throat from ear to ear, my belly opened and sulphur burned therein, with all the punishment that can be inflicted upon me on earth and my soul be tortured by demons in an eternal hell forever!”

“All of which I, M_____ N_____, do swear by the blessed Trinity and blessed Sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions to keep this my oath.”

“In testimony thereof I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist and witness the same further, with my name written with the point of this dagger dipped in my own blood and sealed in the face of this holy covenant.” [He receives the wafer from the superior and writes his name with the point of his dagger dipped in his own blood taken from over his heart].”

(It was not easy to find this information. I personally researched this material in the rare books division of the Library of Congress. Because no photocopying is allowed, I transcribed this quotation by hand. It comes from the following source: Edwin Allen Sherman [a 32 degree Free Mason], ***The Engineer Corps of Hell***, San Francisco, 1883, pp. 119-122. The book bears the following bibliographical information: Library of Congress copyright, Nov. 23, 1883, rare book collection, card # 13653-01 (Bx1765.556). The book reads on the front cover: ‘Sold by private subscription only, and under stipulated conditions.’

Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), of Counter-Reformation fame, wrote the following about punishment due heretics:

“The only effective means against heretics is to convey them to that place provided for them as quickly as possible. In this way one is only doing them a favor as the longer they are allowed to live, the more heresies they will devise, and thus the more believers they will seduce, aggravating their own damnation.” Quoted in, ***Symposium on Revelation***, volume 2, p. 345. The story of the martyrdom of William Tyndale is worthy of note. He was convicted of the ‘crime’ of translating and distributing the Bible in the English language. For a description of his life, work and death, read ***The Great Controversy***, pp. 245-247 and also, ***Foxe’s Book of Martyrs***, pp. 108-116.

One of the most infamous acts in the history of Roman Catholicism was the St. Bartholomew Massacre. It took place on August 24, 1572 with the gleeful approval of Pope Gregory XIII and the priesthood. Ellen White calls this the ‘blackest in the black catalog of crime, most horrible among the fiendish deeds of all the dreadful centuries’ (***The Great Controversy***, p. 272). At the tolling of a bell, Protestants [they were called Huguenots] were slaughtered without mercy, not only in Paris but also throughout the rest of France. In the course of two months, over 70,000 men, women and children perished. The Huguenots were the ‘professionals’ of the day. They were the ‘cream’ of France. At the news of the massacre, Pope Gregory XIII, attended by his

cardinals and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, went in a long procession to the church of St. Louis, where the cardinal of Lorraine chanted a *Te Deum* [an anthem of praise to God]. A medal was struck to commemorate the massacre. On one side of the medal was the face of Gregory XIII and on the other is the image of the destroying angel. (For more on this savage event, read, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 272-273)

How could one forget the Piedmont Massacre of the year 1655? On January 25 of this year, the Duke of Savoy gave an edict that the Waldenses must convert to the Catholic faith or leave the valleys and have their properties confiscated within a few days. If they did not leave, they were subject to a death decree. The edict was proclaimed in the middle of the winter. On April seventeenth, 15,000 soldiers invaded the valleys of the Piedmont. Thousands of Waldenses were murdered, tortured and enslaved. Hundreds who were able to escape to the most rugged areas of the mountains were caught and thrown off the jagged cliff of Mount Catelluzo near Torre Pellice. Salim Japas, **Herejia, Colon y la Inquisicion** (Siloam Springs, Arkansas: Creation Enterprises, 1992), pp. 62-63.

Jean Antoine Llorente was Secretary to the Spanish Inquisition from the year 1790 to 1792. Regarding this monstrous mechanism, Llorente says:

“I was secretary of the Inquisition in the court of Madrid in the years 1789, 1790 and 1791. I knew the establishment well enough to refute it. [It was] vicious in its origin, constitution and laws in spite of the apologies which have been written in its favor.” Jean Antoine Llorente, **Historia Critica de la Inquisicion en España**, Madrid, 1822, pp. 6-7

Llorente adds:

“The horrid conduct of this Holy Office [Inquisition] weakened the power and diminished the population of Spain by arresting the progress of the arts, sciences, industry and commerce, and by compelling multitudes of families to abandon the kingdom; by instigating the expulsion of the Jews and Moors, and by immolating on its flaming shambles more than three hundred thousand victims” Quoted in, Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, p. 244

Llorente was not some Protestant enemy of the Roman Catholic Church. He was an insider being privy to the inner workings and statistics of the Inquisition in Spain. According to Llorente, of the 300,000 who were killed by the Inquisition in Spain, 31,912 were burned at the stake (Llorente, p. 583).

In Pius IX's **Encyclical and Syllabus** (December 8, 1864) we find the following words:

“Cursed be they who assert liberty of conscience and of worship, and such as maintain the church should not employ force. The State has not the right to leave every man free to embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.”

Or again, listen to the words of Leo XIII in his encyclical, *Libertas Humanam*:

“From what has been said, it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many

rights given by nature to man." Quoted in, Seventh-day Adventist Bible Students' Source Book, 'Church and State,' Paragraph 496 (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1962), p. 273

Notice the words of the Roman Catholic historian J. H. Ignaz Von Dollinger:

"Through the influence of Gratian. . . and unwearied activity of the Popes and their legates since 1183, the view of the Church had been. . . [that] every departure from the teaching of the Church, and every important opposition to any ecclesiastical ordinances, must be punished with death, and with the most cruel of deaths, by fire. . .

"Innocent III declared 'the mere refusal to swear, and the opinion that oaths were unlawful, a heresy worthy of death, and directed that whoever differed in any respect from the common way of life of the multitude should be treated as a heretic.'

"Both the initiation and carrying out of this new principle must be ascribed to the Popes alone... It was the Popes who compelled bishops and priests to condemn the heterodox to torture, confiscation of their goods, imprisonment, and death, and to enforce the execution of this sentence on the civil authorities, under pain of excommunication.

"From 1200 to 1500 the long series of Papal ordinances on the Inquisition, ever increasing in severity and cruelty, and their whole policy towards heresy, runs on without break. It is a rigidly consistent system of legislation; every Pope confirms and improves upon the devices of his predecessor. All is directed to the one end, of completely uprooting every difference of belief. . .

*"It was only the absolute dictation of the Popes, and the notion of their infallibility in all questions of Evangelical morality, that made the Christian world. . . . [permit] the Inquisition, which contradicted the simplest principles of Christian justice and love to our neighbor, and would have been rejected with universal horror in the ancient Church." (J. H. Ignaz Von Dollinger, **The Pope and the Council**, pp. 190-192)*

Notice the words of Dr. Marianus de Luca, a Jesuit and former professor of Canon Law at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome:

*"The Catholic Church has the right and duty to kill heretics because it is by fire and sword that heresy can be extirpated. Mass excommunication is derided by heretics. If they are imprisoned or exiled they corrupt others. The only recourse is to put them to death. Repentance cannot be allowed to save civil criminals; for the highest good of the church is the duty of the faith, and this cannot be preserved unless heretics are put to death" (Quoted in Lorraine Boettner, **Roman Catholicism**, p. 426).*

Dr. de Luca further remarked:

"Heretics despise excommunication and say that that bolt is powerless; if you threaten them with a pecuniary fine, they neither fear God nor respect men, knowing that they will find fools enough to believe them and support them. If you imprison them or send them into exile, they

corrupt those near them with their words and those at a distance with their books. So THE ONLY REMEDY IS TO SEND THEM SOON TO THEIR OWN PLACE [capitals are the author's]."

And what does de Luca mean with the expression 'send them soon to their own place'? He answers by approvingly quoting Tanner:

*"The civil magistrate, by the command and commission of the Church, ought to punish the heretic with the penalty of death. . ." (Marianus de Luca, **Institutes of Public Ecclesiastical Law**, (1901) vol. I, pp. 143, 261)*

It is worth noting that de Luca's book contains a warm letter of commendation from Pope Leo XIII as well as the *Imprimatur* of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic professor, Alfred Baudrillart makes the following comment about the role of the Church in the incitation of violence during the 1260 years:

*"She [the Church] has, and she loudly proclaims that she has, a 'horror of blood'. Nevertheless when confronted by heresy she does not content herself with persuasion; arguments of an intellectual and moral order appear to her insufficient and she has recourse to force, to corporeal punishment, to torture. She creates tribunals like those of the Inquisition, she calls the laws of the State to her aid, if necessary she encourages a crusade, or a religious war and all her 'horror of blood' practically culminates into **urging the secular power to shed it**, which proceeding is almost more odious—for it is less frank—than shedding it herself.*

*"Especially did she act thus in the sixteenth century with regard to Protestants. Not content to reform morally, to preach by example, to convert people by eloquent and holy missionaries, she lit in Italy, in the Low Countries, and above all in Spain the funeral piles of the Inquisition. In France under Francis I, and Henry II., in England under Mary Tudor, she tortured heretics, whilst both in France and Germany during the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century if she did not actually begin at any rate she encouraged and actively aided the religious wars." (Alfred Baudrillart, **The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism**, translated by Mrs. Philip Gibbs [London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1908], pp. 182, 183*

Now notice the words of Alexis M. Lepicier, professor of sacred theology in the Pontifical Urban College of the Propaganda in Rome:

*"He who publicly avows a heresy and tries to pervert others by word or example, speaking absolutely, can not only be excommunicated but even justly put to death, lest he ruin others by pestilential contagion; for a bad man is worse than a wild beast, and does more harm, as Aristotle says. Hence, as it is not wrong to kill a wild beast which does great harm, so it must be right to deprive of his harmful life a heretic who withdraws from divine truth and plots against the salvation of others." (Fr. Alexis M. Lepicier, **De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis**, [printed at the official printing office in Rome in 1910], p. 194.*

The following words from *The Tablet*, the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, New York are very telling:

“Heresy is an awful crime against God, and those who start a heresy are more guilty than they who are traitors to the civil government. If the State has the right to punish treason with death, the principle is the same which concedes to the spiritual authority the power of capital punishment over the arch-traitor to truth and divine revelation. . . A perfect society has the right to its existence . . . and the power of capital punishment is acknowledged for a perfect society. Now . . . the Roman Catholic Church is a perfect society, and as such has the right and power to take means to safeguard its existence.” **The Tablet**, November 5, 1938

Louis Veuillot expressed the Roman Catholic view of freedom with the following words:

“Be we Catholics in the minority, we will then demand freedom on the basis of your principles; be we Catholics in the majority, we will then refuse it on the basis of our principles.” Quoted in **Symposium on Revelation**, volume 2, p. 347)

The **Catholic Encyclopedia** admits:

“. . . judged by contemporary standards, the Inquisition, especially as it developed in Spain toward the close of the Middle Ages, can be classified only as one of the darker chapters in the history of the Church.”

The same encyclopedia acknowledges the killing of 2000 Protestants within 50 years in the Netherlands and admits the death of perhaps 3000 to 4000 French Huguenots in the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew, which commenced on the night of August 23, 1572. Quoted from the **New Catholic Encyclopedia** by C. Mervyn Maxwell, **God Cares**, volume I (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1981), p. 132

An article in the Roman Catholic journal **The Rambler**, gives us a picture of what would happen if the Roman Catholic Church were in the majority in England:

“You ask, if he [the Roman Catholic] were lord in the land, and you were in the minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon the circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you: if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly even hang you. But be assured of one thing: he would never tolerate you for the sake of the ‘glorious principles of civil and religious liberty’ . . .

“Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself, for it is truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equaled by its absurdity. . . .

“A Catholic temporal government would be guided in its treatment of Protestants and other recusants solely by the rules of expediency, adopting precisely that line of conduct which would tend best to their conversion, and to prevent the dissemination of their errors.” ‘Civil and Religious Liberty’, **The Rambler**, 8 (September, 1851), pp. 174, 178

We must now make a few remarks about the recent apology of Pope John Paul II. In a remarkable moment at St. Peter's Basilica on the first Sunday of Lent, March 12, 2000, the Pope, in a carefully choreographed mass, leaning against the crucifix and with agonizing voice, seemed to apologize for the sins which the church has committed against Protestants, Jews, non-Christians, immigrants, ethnic minorities, women, abused children and the unborn. We quote the key portion of his homily:

*"We forgive and we ask forgiveness! . . . We cannot not recognize the betrayals of the Gospel committed by **some of our brothers**, especially during the **second millennium**. We ask forgiveness for the divisions between Christians, for the use of violence that **some** have resorted to in the service of truth and for the acts of dissidence and of hostility **sometimes** taken towards followers of other religions." (As quoted in, **The New York Times**, 'Pope Asks Forgiveness for Errors of the Church Over 2,000 Years', Monday, March 13, 2000, Section A, pp. 1, 10; emphasis supplied)*

Several remarks must be made at this juncture. First, this was a general, sweeping apology. No specific persons are mentioned as culprits. No specific events are brought to light. For example, the Crusades are not mentioned. The Inquisition is not mentioned. The forced conversions of the natives in Africa and the Americas are not mentioned. The Bible teaches that sincere and true repentance and confession must be specific and complete. The Pope's apology misses the mark in this regard.

Furthermore, and more importantly, the apology never blames *the church* for these sins. It will be noticed that the Pope's paragraph quoted above is carefully worded. It blames '*some of our brothers*', but never blames the Church as such. In other words, in the Pope's mind, the Church was not to blame but rather certain individuals in the church. Regarding this, Thomas Reeves, editor of the Jesuit magazine **America**, remarks:

*"The document should have put it in bold print that 'children of the church' includes popes, cardinals and clergy, and not just people in the pews. . . The pope had a great idea that some in the Vatican are obscuring with a fog machine." Quoted in the **New York Times** article referred to above, Section 'A', p. 10*

It is significant that the Pope mentions the betrayal of the Gospel '*especially during the second millennium*'. This was the millennium during which the Roman Catholic Church was guilty of the Crusades, the Inquisition and the forced conversions of the natives in the Americas and Africa. Thus, though the Pope is nebulous about specific persons and events, he does admit that many wrongs were committed.

It is interesting that the Pope refers to 'the violence [he does admit there was violence] that some [notice the unspecific 'some'] have resorted to in the service of truth'. It is clear that the Pope is saying that those who committed these crimes were right in their cause (the service of truth) but were wrong in their method (violence). However, when you defend the truth with violence, are you really defending the truth? Are you not rather smearing the truth? And then there is the question as to whether the truth which was being defended was really the truth at all!!

Also worthy of note is that this apology was not a spontaneous gesture. In fact, it was the culmination of a long, drawn out process. The apology was written and re-written, edited and re-edited, worded and re-worded, debated and analyzed for years before the Pope presented it on March 12. Regarding this, the aforementioned article in [The New York Times](#) gives us a little history:

“The need for Catholics to examine their collective conscience is something that this pope has been thinking about for years, and he laid out his rationale for it in a 1994 apostolic letter called, ‘The Coming of the Third Millennium.’ He also raised the subject privately in meetings with key cardinals, and his proposal was sufficiently ground-breaking that they requested that the theological and historical implications first be studied in depth.

*“The result was a dense 31-page treatise by the International Theological Commission which, with Vatican oversight, **ground out** the theological precedents and also the **limits** to the apology.*

“Written by a committee and released earlier this month, the document addresses concerns that the apology will be misunderstood or misused by those ‘hostile to the church’. It also reflects other worries of theologians, who had to grapple with such complex issues as how a church that considers itself holy can admit mistakes, and whether it is fair for today’s church to condemn acts by previous generations made in good if misguided faith.” Emphasis supplied

The Bible teaches that confession should be spontaneous, complete, unconditional and without measuring the consequences. It is obvious that the process which was followed had the intention of preserving the self-image of the Church and at the same time, giving the impression that the church was sorry for the sins of the past! This leads us to one final consideration. Why did the apology come at this particular moment in history? Why didn’t any of the previous popes in the history of the Roman Catholic Church offer this apology? Why now?

The simple explanation is that we live in an ecumenical age. The Roman Catholic Church enjoys more popularity today than at any previous moment in the last 200 years. This apology gives the impression that the Roman Church is docile and repentant. It enhances its image among Protestants and other non-Catholics. In the same [New York Times](#) article, Alessandra Stanley remarks that the Pope ‘has said repeatedly that the new evangelization he is calling for in the third millennium can take place only after what he has described as a church-wide purification of memory.’”

By the expression, ‘new evangelization’ the Pope simply means, the conversion of the world to the Roman Catholic Church. Rev. Lorenzo Albacete, who teaches theology at St. Joseph’s Seminary in Yonkers, New York stated:

“Because it reflects this pope’s desire to reconcile with other Christians and other religions, people are tempted to view it as a tactic, but its immense spiritual importance to this pope lies

in the fact that it did not come within diplomatic or theological agreement, but in the liturgy of the Mass during Lent and the Holy Year.” Quoted in the same article above

Though Albacete and others deny that the Pope’s apology is a ‘tactic,’ Bible prophecy makes it very clear that it is just that!! The real reason why the Pope chose St. Peter’s Basilica as the place and the Mass of the first day of Lent as the occasion to offer the apology is that he knew that the media would come out *en masse* to hear the apology. A pastoral letter, an encyclical or a theological proclamation would never have had the same impact!!

Notice the chilling prophetic words of Ellen G. White in the 1911 edition of **The Great Controversy**, p. 571:

*“The Roman Church now presents a **fair front** to the world, **covering** with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in **Christlike garments**; but she is unchanged. Every principle of the papacy that existed in past ages exists today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are still held. Let none deceive themselves. The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honor is the same that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up, at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty and slew the saints of the Most High.”*

She further affirms:

*“The papacy is just what prophecy declared that she would be, the apostasy of the latter times. (2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4) It is part of her policy to **assume the character** which will best accomplish her purpose; but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent.”*

As an addendum to this section, I would like to underline that almost two weeks after the Pope’s apology he visited the *Yad Vashem* [Holocaust Memorial] in Jerusalem. Once again he expressed regret over the Holocaust but he never affirmed that the church was to blame nor did he deplore the silence of Pope Pius XII while 6 million Jews were being slaughtered!! An article in the **Los Angeles Times** (March 24, 2000, section A, pages 1 and 10) bears the title: *John Paul Laments the Horrors of Holocaust*. The subtitle of this article is very telling. It reads: *“Israeli premier hails visit as ‘historic journey of healing’ between Christians and Jews. Pontiff’s message at memorial, however, falls short of apology for Vatican’s wartime silence”*. According to this article, the Pope said:

“No one can forget or ignore what happened; no one can diminish its scale. We wish to remember. But we wish to remember for a purpose—namely, to ensure that never again will evil prevail.”

Nothing is said here about the sinful silence of the Church during the Holocaust nor is there any ascription of blame to Pius XII. The article furthermore continues:

*“His categorical and at times poetic message **fell short of the apology** that some Jewish leaders had demanded for the failure of his World War II-era predecessor, Pius XII, to speak out during the extermination of 6 million European Jews.*

*“Instead, John Paul uttered a **sweeping lament** ‘as bishop of Rome,’ assuring the Jewish people that his church ‘is deeply saddened by the hatred, acts of persecution and displays of anti-Semitism directed against the Jews by Christians at **any time** and in **any place.**” Emphasis supplied*

Once again, one marvels at how John Paul can make such generalized statements in such a specific place!! Incidentally, neither Hitler, nor Mussolini nor Himmler nor any other key player in the Holocaust was ever excommunicated by the Roman Catholic Church. Silence certainly speaks louder than words in this case!!

Characteristic #7:

Daniel 7:25 tells us that the little horn would also **think** to change the **times**. We must now ask the question: What are these ‘times’ and how did the little horn attempt to change them? These questions have been fully answered in Pastor Stephen P. Bohr’s book: **Futurism’s Incredible Journey.**

Characteristic #8:

We must now move on to the eighth characteristic of the little horn. Daniel 7:25 also tells us that the little horn thought he could change the law. It is clear in Daniel seven that the little horn is guilty primarily of transgression of the law. We offer the following examples: The little horn slays the saints [sixth commandment], blasphemes the name of God [third commandment], thinks he can change the law [fourth commandment], and proclaims himself God [first commandment]. Revelation 13 adds the fact that this power demands worship to the image he has raised up [second commandment] and Revelation 17 adds that this power fornicates with the kings of the earth [seventh commandment]. In II Thessalonians 2, the Apostle Paul informs us that this power performs lying wonders [ninth commandment]. It is obvious that this little horn stands accused of trampling upon God’s law, primarily the first table.

The question might legitimately be asked: How can the little horn be judged by the Ten Commandments starting in 1844 if the law was nailed to the cross when Jesus died? Daniel 7 gives us indisputable proof that the law was still binding in 1844!

A careful examination of church history reveals that the Roman Catholic Church has attempted to change God’s holy Law. And how did this happen?

In 1993 I was holding an evangelistic series in Albuquerque, New Mexico and I decided to visit Garsten’s Catholic Book Store at San Mateo and I-40. The purpose of my visit was to examine as many Roman Catholic catechisms as possible in order to determine how the Roman Catholic Church teaches the Ten Commandments. I examined at least 20 different catechisms and discovered some very interesting information. None of these catechisms contained the second

commandment. The absence of this commandment in the catechisms is understandable. It forbids the worship of idols and the Roman Catholic churches are filled with idols.

By deleting the second commandment, the Roman Catholic Church ends up with only nine, but the Bible makes it clear that there are ten! So the catechisms divide the tenth commandment into two parts. Number 9 is 'Do not covet your neighbor's wife', and number 10 is 'Do not covet your neighbor's goods'. By thus dividing commandment # 10 the Roman Catholic Church ends up once again with the 'Ten Commandments.' The recent *Catechism of the Catholic Church* has tried to soften this change by saying that the first and second commandments are really one and the tenth is really two. However, the undeniable fact remains that the catechisms rarely, if ever, discuss the second commandment.

But the Roman Catholic catechisms go even further. Invariably, they encourage the faithful to attend mass and rest on **Sunday** in fulfillment of the third commandment!! First of all, it is the fourth commandment which commands us to rest. But this same commandment also commands us to worship on the 7th day Sabbath, and not on Sunday, the first day of the week! How can the Roman Catholic Church blatantly command the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, when, **in its own Bibles** command us to worship on Sabbath, the 7th day of the week? The answer is simple. The Roman Catholic Church claims that Christ gave it the authority to change the day from Sabbath to Sunday (more on this when we speak about the 11th characteristic of the little horn). In this way, the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of attempting to change the Law of God.

Before we examine Roman Catholic publications on the change of the Sabbath, we must make a few remarks about the manner in which the change took place. The shift from Sabbath to Sunday did not happen overnight. It was a slow, though relentless process. Regarding this, Ellen White remarks:

"The archdeceiver had not completed his work. He was resolved to gather the **Christian world** under his banner and to exercise his power through his vice-regent, the proud pontiff who claimed to be the representative of Christ. Through half-converted pagans, ambitious prelates, and world-loving churchmen he accomplished his purpose. Vast councils were held from time to time, in which the dignitaries of the church were convened from all the world. **In nearly every council the Sabbath which God instituted was pressed down a little lower, while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted.** Thus the **pagan festival** came finally to be honored as a divine institution, while the Bible Sabbath was pronounced **a relic of Judaism**, and its observers were declared to be accursed." Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 53. Emphasis supplied

Ellen G. White has provided three significant insights in this quotation which have been irrefutably corroborated by the exhaustive research of Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi in his books, *From Sabbath to Sunday* and *Anti-Judaism and the Origin of Sunday*. The first is that Sunday was bequeathed to the Christian Church by **paganism**. Secondly, Sunday was adopted because of strong feelings **against the Jews**, and third, the process of the change **was slow** but steady.

Space will not allow me to amplify points one and two but we must dedicate some time to point #3.

Even though some Early Church Fathers (not the Apostolic Fathers!) admittedly advocated the observance of Sunday in honor of the resurrection, not one of them ever provided any Biblical justification for the practice. They simply stated that because Jesus resurrected the first day of the week, it should be the day to honor Him.

Emperor Constantine's famous Sunday law is well known. It was given on March 7, AD 321:

*"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture, because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by heaven. Given the seventh day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls, each of them for the second time." Corpus Juris Civilis 2.127, quoted in, Henry Bettenson, ed., **Documents of the Christian Church**, 2nd edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1963).*

It must be remembered that this decree was proclaimed by the civil power. It was not a decree given by the church. However, the church would soon put itself officially on the record as a strong supporter of this decree.

This decree of Constantine is preserved with some slight modifications in the *Code of Justinian*:

*"All judges and city people and the craftsmen shall rest upon the venerable Day of the Sun. Country people, however, may freely attend to the cultivation of the fields, because it frequently happens that no other days are better adapted for planting grain in the furrows or the vines in trenches. So that the advantage given by heavenly providence may not for the occasion of a short time perish." Code of Justinian, b. 3, title 12,3; translated in Ayer's **Source Book for Ancient Church History**, item 59 (g)*

It will be noticed that this decree did not forbid Sabbath worship. That was still to come.

It was at the Council of Laodicea [celebrated sometime between 343 and 381 AD], that the Church put itself on the record as enjoining Sunday worship and forbidding Sabbath worship. Canon 29 of this Council reads as follows:

*"Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Greek sabbaton, the Sabbath] but shall work on that day, but the Lord's Day [Sunday] they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ." (Translated in, Charles Joseph Hefele, **A History of the Christian Councils**, vol. 2, translated and edited by H. N. Oxenham [Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, 1896], p. 316)*

As the centuries passed, the Sabbath was pressed lower and lower and the Sunday was exalted higher and higher. We next present a statement by St. Thomas Aquinas, a theologian unparalleled in the history of the Roman Catholic Church:

*“In the New Law the keeping of the Sunday **supplants** that of the Sabbath, not in virtue of the precept of the law, but through determination by the **church** and the **custom** of the Christian people.”* (*Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas, quoted in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*, pp. 205-206) *Emphasis supplied*

Around the year 1400 AD, Petrus de Anchorano offered the following justification for the modification of God’s Law:

“. . . the pope can modify divine law, since his power is not of man, but of God, and he acts in the place of God upon earth, with the fullest power of binding and loosing his sheep.” Lucius Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, 8 volumes, vol. 2, article ‘Papa’. *The power of binding and loosing is discussed under point # 11.*

When Martin Luther debated John Eck, Luther brought forth the weapons of Scripture whereas Eck brought forth the weapons of tradition. As long as Luther stood on the solid rock of *Sola Scriptura*, his arguments were unanswerable. However, there was one area where Eck took Luther’s own weapon and turned it against him:

*“The Scripture teaches ‘Remember that you sanctify the day of the Sabbath; six days shall you labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God.’ etc. But the **Church** has **changed** the Sabbath into the Lord’s [day] by its own authority, concerning which you have no scripture. . . The Sabbath is commanded many times by God; neither in the Gospels nor in Paul is it declared that the Sabbath has ceased; nevertheless the **Church** has instituted the Lord’s Day through the **tradition** of the apostles without Scripture.”* (Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium . . . Adversus Lutheranos [Handbook of Common Places against the Lutherans]*. Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Fratres de Sabio, 1533, fols. 4v, 5r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank Yost. [FRS No. 127])

This quotation can be found in the *Seventh-day Adventist Source Book*, paragraph # 1445. Bold is mine.

Also from Dr. Eck we find the following:

*“If, however, the church has had power to **change** the Sabbath of the Bible into Sunday and to command Sunday keeping, why should it not have also this power concerning other days, many of which are based on the Scriptures—such as Christmas, circumcision of the heart, three kings, etc. If you omit the latter, and turn from the church to the Scriptures alone, then you must keep the Sabbath with the Jews, which has been kept from the beginning of the world.”* Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium. . . Adversus Lutheranos*, pp. 78, 79. [Quoted in Andrews and Conradi, *History of the Sabbath*, 1912 edition, p. 587]

Chalk one up for Doctor Eck! His argument is irrefutable. Luther, however, tried to get off the hook by claiming that the specific day was ceremonial while the principle of rest on one day in seven was still binding. This unbiblical argument has been picked up by Protestants, but the fact still remains that it is based on human reasoning and not upon the Word of God!!

We now turn to the longest church council in the history of the Roman Catholic Church (1545-1563). It was the avowed purpose of the Council of Trent to stem the phenomenal growth of Protestantism. On January 18, 1562, Gaspare de Fosso, archbishop of Reggio spoke the following words:

*“The authority of the church is illustrated most clearly by the Scriptures for while on the one hand she [the church] recommends them, declares them to be divine, [and] offers them to us to be read, . . . on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority [the church]. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been **changed** into the Lord’s Day. . . These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of Christ’s teaching (for He says He has come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it), but they have been **changed** by the authority of the **church**.” (Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum, 33:529-530)*

We will now quote a great number of Roman Catholic publications which explain why Sunday is kept instead of the Sabbath. Please pay careful attention to the number of times these publications claim that the **Church** has made the **change**, **transfer** or **substitution** of Sunday in place of the Sabbath. The bold is mine unless otherwise indicated.

“Question: Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?”

*“Answer: Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her,—she could not have **substituted** the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a **change** for which there is no Scriptural authority.” Stephen Keenan, **A Doctrinal Catechism**, approved by the Most Reverend John Hughes, D. D., Archbishop of New York (New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother, 1851), p. 174*

*“Question: By whom was it [the Sabbath] **changed**?”*

“Answer: By the governors of the church, the apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day (which was Sunday). Apoc. 1:10.”

*“Question: How prove you that **the church** hath power to command feasts and holy days?”*

*“Answer: By the very act of **changing** the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same **church**.”*

“Question: How prove you that?”

*“Answer: Because by keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the **church’s** power to ordain feasts, and to command them under sin; and by not keeping the rest [of the feasts] by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power. Reverend Henry Tuberville, D. D. (New York: Edward Dunigan and Brothers, **An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine**, approved in 1833), p. 58.*

*“The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day: ‘God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it’ (Gen. 2:3). This precept was confirmed by God in the Ten Commandments: ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God’ (Exodus 20). On the other hand, Christ declares that He is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17). He Himself observed the Sabbath: ‘and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day’ (Luke 4:16). His disciples likewise observed it after His death: ‘They rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment’ (Luke 23:56). Yet with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath, or seventh day, holy, Protestants of all denominations make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None, whatever, except the **unwritten word**, or **tradition** of the **Catholic Church** which declares that the apostles made the change in honor of Christ’s resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.” John Milner, **End of Religious Controversy**, (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 89*

“This observance of the Sabbath [here the author refers to Sunday as the Sabbath] in which, after all, the only Protestant worship consists—not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday.

*“It was the **Catholic Church** which, by the authority of Jesus Christ, has **transferred** this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by Protestants is an **homage** they pay, in spite of themselves, to the **authority of the Church**. Monsignor Segur, **Plain Talk About the Protestantism of Today** (Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co., 1868), p. 213*

“Question: Is the observance of Sunday as the day of rest a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

*“Answer: It is certainly not; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation [in this, Keenan is clearly overstating his case. Most Protestants believe no such thing]. To say we observe the Sunday because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture; and we might as well say that we should rest on Thursday, because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.” Stephen Keenan, **The Controversial Catechism**, (London: Burns & Oates, 1896), p. 160.*

“Question: Which is the Sabbath day?

“Answer: Saturday is the Sabbath day.

“Question: Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

*“Answer: We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the **Catholic Church**, in the Council of Laodicea (336 AD), **transferred** the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.” Rev. Peter Geiermann, **The Convert’s Catechism of Catholic Doctrine**, (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1957 edition), p. 50. It is to be noted that this book received the ‘apostolic blessing’ of Pope Pius X on January 25, 1910.*

*“Protestants often deride the authority of **Church tradition**, and claim to be directed by the Bible only; yet they, too, have been guided by the customs of the ancient Church, which find no warrant in the Bible, but rest on **Church tradition only!** A striking instance of this is the following: The first positive command in the Decalogue is to ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy’, and this precept was enforced by the Jews for thousands of years. But the Sabbath day, the observance of which God commanded, was our Saturday. Yet who among either Catholics or Protestants, except a sect or two, like the ‘Seventh Day Baptists’, ever keep that commandment now? None. Why is this? The Bible which Protestants claim to obey exclusively, gives no authorization for the **substitution** of the first day of the week for the seventh. On what authority, therefore, have they done so? Plainly on the authority of that very **Catholic Church** which they abandoned and whose traditions they condemn.” John L. Stoddard, **Rebuilding a Lost Faith** (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1922), p. 80*

*“What Bible authority is there for **changing** the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week? Who gave the Pope authority to **change** a command of God? If the Bible is the only guide for the Christian, then the Seventh-day Adventist is right in observing the Saturday with the Jew. But Catholics learn what to believe and do from the divine, infallible authority established by Jesus Christ, the **Catholic Church**, which in Apostolic times made Sunday the day of rest to honor our Lord’s resurrection on that day and to mark off clearly the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin Martyr (Apol., c. 67) speaks of the early Christians meeting for the holy sacrifice of the Mass on Sunday.*

*“Is it not strange that those who make the Bible their only teacher should inconsistently follow in this matter the **tradition of the Church?**” Bertrand L. Conway, **The Question Box Answers**, (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 254, 255. This book has a preface by James Cardinal Gibbons.*

*“Because the origin of our faith is not the Bible alone, but the **Church** which gives us both the written and the unwritten word.*

*“So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures, although wholly in accord with them, because of the infallible witness of **the Church** as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look **outside the Bible to the voice of tradition**, which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, infallible witness of the **Catholic Church.**” Bertrand Conway, **The Question Box Answers** (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76*

*“The Jews’ Sabbath Day was Saturday; we Christians keep Sunday holy. The **Church**, by the power our Lord gave her, **changed** the observance of the Saturday to the Sunday.*

*“A word about Sunday. God said: ‘Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day!’ The Sabbath was Saturday, not Sunday; why, then, do we keep Sunday holy instead of Saturday? The **Church altered** the observance of the Sabbath to the observance of Sunday. . . Protestants who say that they go by the Bible and the Bible only, and that they do not believe anything that is not in the Bible, must be rather puzzled by the keeping of Sunday when God distinctly said,*

'Keep holy the Sabbath day.' The word Sunday does not come anywhere in the Bible so, without knowing it, they are **obeying the authority of the Catholic Church.**" H. Canon Cafferata, **The Catechism Simply Explained** (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1938), p. 89.

"One practice we have, which Protestants observe, and there is not a word about it in the Bible—that is the keeping of Sunday holy.

*"The Bible tells us to keep Saturday holy. The **change** was made by Christian **tradition** dating back to the time of the Apostles. But not one of them said a single word about making the **change**, when writing the New Testament."* W. Frean 'Majellan' Office, (Ballarat, Victoria [Australia]: Redemptorist Fathers, 1959), p. 88. This book comes with a foreword by His Eminence, Cardinal Gilroy.

*"You will tell me that Saturday was the Jewish Sabbath, but that the Christian Sabbath has been **changed** to Sunday. **Changed!** But by whom? Who has authority to **change** an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken, and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.*

"You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the Ten Commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered." **Library of Christian Doctrine: Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath Day?** (London: Burns and Oates), pp. 3, 4

*"In the year A. D. 321, the Roman Emperor Constantine decreed that the first day of the week, Sunday, was to be observed as a civic day of rest from ordinary work and business. That did not impose any obligations of religious observance upon Christians. But in A. D. 336 the **Catholic Church**, at the Council of Laodicea, made the ecclesiastical law obliging the faithful to attend mass and to abstain from servile work on Sundays."* Dr. Leslie Rumble, Tract titled: **Seventh-day Adventists**, pp. 23, 24

"Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we [Catholics] never sanctify." James Cardinal Gibbons, **The Faith of Our Fathers** (Baltimore: James Murphy Company, 110th edition revised and enlarged) p. 80

“The word Sabbath means rest, and is Saturday, the seventh day of the week.

*“Why then do Christians observe Sunday instead of the day mentioned in the Bible? In order to make clear to the Jews that they are no longer under the Old Law of Moses, with its requirements of circumcision, abstinence from certain meat and the scrupulous observance of the Jewish sacrifice in the Sabbath; but under the New Law of Christ, the **infant Church changed** the day to be kept holy from Saturday to Sunday. . .*

*“The **Church** received the authority to make such a **change** from her Founder, Jesus Christ. He solemnly conferred upon His Church the power to legislate, govern and administer. . . the power of the keys [we will deal more with this concept when we make our comments on characteristic #11 of the little horn]. It is to be noted that the Church **did not change the divine law** obliging men to worship, but **merely changed the day** in which such public worship was to be offered; thus the law involved was merely a ceremonial law.*

*“But since Saturday, not Sunday, is specified in the Bible, isn’t it curious that non-Catholics who profess to take their religion directly from the Bible and not from the Church, observe Sunday instead of Saturday? Yes, of course, it is inconsistent; but this **change** was made about fifteen centuries before Protestantism was born, and by that time the custom was universally observed. They have continued the custom, even though it rests upon the **authority of the Catholic Church** and not upon an explicit text in the Bible. That observance remains as a reminder of the **Mother Church** from which the non-Catholic sects broke away—like a boy running away from home but still carrying in his pocket a picture of his mother or a lock of her hair.” John O’Brien, **The Faith of Millions** (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1974) p. 400, 401*

*“Why did the Church **change** the Lord’s day from the Sabbath to Sunday? The **Church**, using the power of binding and loosing which Christ gave to the Pope, **changed** the Lord’s day to Sunday.” Killgallen and Weber, **Life in Christ: Instructions in the Catholic Faith**, p. 243*

*“It was the **Holy Catholic Church** that **changed** the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, the first day of the week. And it not only compelled all to keep Sunday, but urged all persons to labor on the seventh day under pain of anathema. Protestants . . . profess great reverence for the Bible, and yet by their solumn act of keeping Sunday, they acknowledge the power of the Catholic Church. The Bible says, ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.’ But the **Catholic Church says**, ‘NO: Keep the first day of the week’ and lo, the entire civilized world **bows down in reverent obedience** to the command of the holy Catholic church.” Words of Father Enright, longtime President of Redemptorist College in America, quoted in, Joe Crews, **The Beast, the Dragon and the Woman** (Frederick, Maryland: Amazing Facts, Inc., thirteenth edition, June 1991), p. 33.*

*“Nothing is said in the Bible about the **change** of the Lord’s day from Saturday to Sunday. We know of the **change** only from the tradition of the **Church**—a fact handed down to us from the earliest times by the living voice of the **Church**. That is why we find so illogical the attitude of many non-Catholics, who say that they will believe nothing unless they can find it in the Bible and yet will continue to keep Sunday as the Lord’s day on the **sayBso of the Catholic Church**.”*

Rev. Leo J. Trese and John J. Castletot, S. S., *Salvation History and the Commandments* (1963 edition), p. 294

*“Ten precepts. . . . embodying the revealed expression of the Creator’s will in relation to man’s whole duty to God and to his fellow creatures. . . . Christ resumed these Commandments in the double precept of charity—love of God and of the neighbor; He proclaimed them as binding under the New Law in Matthew 19 and in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5) The **Church**, on the other hand, after **changing** the day of rest from the Jewish Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, to the first, made the third commandment refer to Sunday as the day to be kept holy as the Lord’s Day.” *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, article, ‘The Commandments of God’.*

“Q. What day was the Sabbath?

“A. The seventh day, our Saturday

“Q. Do you keep the Sabbath?

“A. No: we keep the Lord’s Day.

“Q. Which is that?

“A. The first day: Sunday.

“Q. Who changed it?

*“A. The Catholic Church” James Bellord, *A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, pp. 86, 87.*

*“Q. Has the [Roman Catholic] Church a power to make any **alterations** in the commandments of God?*

*A . . . **Instead** of the seventh day, and other festivals appointed by the old law, **the Church** has prescribed the Sundays and holidays to be set apart for God’s worship: and these we are now obliged to keep in consequence of God’s commandment, **instead of** the ancient Sabbath.” Richard Challoner, *The Catholic Christian Instructed*, p. 211*

*“There is not a word in the Gospels about **changing** the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday. Up to the time of the establishment of the Church of Christ, the day of worship was Saturday which in Hebrew is Sabbath. The Christian day of worship is Sunday, not Saturday. We call Sunday the Sabbath sometimes, because that was the established name for the day of worship in the Old Testament. To **change** the day of worship was a momentous thing for the new **Church to do**. Unless it was by the authority of God it would not and could not have been done. Yet, there is no special authorization for this **change** in Scripture. Those who affirm that the Bible is the sole rule of Faith, should leave off Sunday church-going and worship on the Sabbath, as the Jews do to this day, and as the Old Testament ordains.*

*“None but God could authorize the **abolition** of an ordination made by God Himself. It was God who commanded: ‘Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day’ (Exodus 20:8). The **Church** of Christ **abolished Sabbath worship** because she received authorization from Him who proclaimed the Ten Commandments. Christ said of His Church: ‘He that heareth you heareth Me’ (Luke 10:16). That was a tremendous power for the Creator to delegate to a creature. But in*

giving the power Christ had also promised the dwelling of the Holy Ghost with His Church, which was to make it **immune to error**.

“Not only did **the Church institute Sunday** as the day of special public worship, but she also abolished many other rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Old Testament.” Martin J. Scott, S. J., **Christ’s Own Church**, pp. 44, 45.

“The **Catholic Church** for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, **changed** the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her divine mission, because he who called himself the ‘Lord of the Sabbath,’ endowed her with his own power to teach, ‘he that heareth you, heareth me;’ commanded all who believe in him to hear her under penalty of being placed with the ‘heathen and publican;’ and promised to be with her to the end of the world. She holds her charter as teacher from him—a charter as infallible as perpetual. The Protestant world at its birth [in the Reformation of the sixteenth century] found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the **church’s right to change the day**, for over three hundred years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day, the acknowledged **offspring of the Catholic Church** as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.” **The Catholic Mirror** (Baltimore, September 23, 1893) The *Mirror* was the official organ of Cardinal Gibbons and the article from which this is taken was one of a series of four, printed September 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1893, under the general heading: ‘The Christian Sabbath: the Genuine Offspring of the Union of the Holy Spirit and the Catholic Church His Spouse. The Claims of Protestantism to Any Part Therein Proved to be Groundless, Self-contradictory, and Suicidal.’ These articles were subsequently printed by the **Mirror** as a tract. The *Mirror* was discontinued in 1908, and five years later was succeeded by the **Catholic Review**, which is now the organ of the archdiocese of Baltimore.

“By what authority did the **Church change** the observance of the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday?”

“The **Church changed** the observance of the Sabbath to Sunday by right of the divine, infallible authority given to her by her Founder, Jesus Christ. The Protestant, claiming the Bible to be the only guide of faith, has no warrant for observing Sunday. In this matter the Seventh-day Adventist is the only consistent Protestant. Sunday as the day of rest to honor our Lord’s resurrection dates to Apostolic times and was so established among other reasons, to mark off the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin the Martyr speaks of it in his Apologies.” **The Catholic Universe Bulletin**, ‘The Question Box,’ (Volume 69, August 14, 1942), p. 4.

“Q. (a) The Bible says ‘The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,’ and we read in your literature that it is the only Bible Sabbath there is. Will you please explain how the Sunday observance originated? (b) Do you think the Seventh Day Adventists keep the right day?”

“A. (a) If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord. In keeping Sunday, non-Catholics are simply following the practice of the **Catholic Church**

for 1800 years, a **tradition**, and **not a Bible ordinance**. What we would like to know is: Since they deny the authority of the Church, on what grounds can they base their faith of keeping Sunday. Those who keep Saturday, like the Seventh Day Adventists, unquestionably have them by the hip in this practice. And they cannot give them any sufficient answer which would satisfy an unprejudiced mind. With the Catholics there is no difficulty about the matter. For, since we **deny that the Bible is the sole rule of faith**, we can fall back upon the constant practice and **tradition of the Church** which, long before the reign of Constantine, even in the very days of the apostles themselves, were accustomed to keep the first day of the week instead of the last." F. G. Lentz, **The Question Box** (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), pp. 98, 99

"All of us believe many things in regard to religion that we do not find in the Bible. For example, nowhere in the Bible do we find that Christ or the Apostles ordered that the Sabbath be **changed** from Saturday to Sunday. We have the commandment of God given to Moses to keep holy the Sabbath Day, that is the 7th day of the week, Saturday. Today most Christians keep Sunday because it has been revealed to us by **the Church outside the Bible.**" **The Catholic Virginian**, 'To Tell You the Truth,' volume 22 (October 3, 1947)

"I am going to propose a very plain and serious question, to which I would entreat all who profess to follow 'the Bible and the Bible only' to give their most earnest attention. It is this: Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath day?

"You will tell me that Saturday was the Jewish Sabbath, but that the Christian Sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

"You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the Ten Commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or at least from which you may confidently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made." **The Clifton Tracts**, 'Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath Day?' (New York: T. W. Strong, volume 4, 1869), pp. 3-15)

"The fact, however, that Christ until His death, and His Apostles at least for a time after Christ's Ascension, observed the Sabbath is evidence enough that our Lord Himself did not substitute the Lord's Day for the Sabbath, during His lifetime on earth. Instead, as most agree, He simply gave His **Church** the power to determine the days to be set aside for the special worship of God. . . It is easy to surmise that this preference of Christ for the first day of the week greatly influenced

the Apostles and the early Christians to keep that day holy, and eventually moved them to make a complete **substitution** of the Sabbath for Sunday. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that the Apostles made this change of days by a definite decree.” Vincent J. Kelly, **Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations**, copyright 1943, pp. 19, 20

“Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine tradition contain the word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, tradition is to us more clear and safe.” Joseph Faa di Bruno, **Catholic Belief**, p. 45.

“But the **Church of God** has thought it well to **transfer** the celebration and observance of the Sabbath to Sunday, or, as on that day light first shone on the world, so by the Resurrection of our Redeemer on the same day, by whom was thrown open to us the gate to eternal life, we were called out of darkness into light; and hence the Apostles would have it called *the Lord’s day*.

“We also learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the first day of the week was held sacred because on that day the work of creation commenced and on that day the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles.” Translation by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), **Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests**, (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1934), pp. 402, 403

“Sunday . . . is purely a creation of the **Catholic Church**. . . .

“For ages all Christian nations looked to the **Catholic Church**, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath.” John Gilmary Shea, ‘The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for its Enforcement,’ in, **The American Catholic Quarterly Review**, volume 8 (January 1893), pp. 139, 152

A. The Third Commandment

Q. What does the word ‘Sabbath’ mean?

A. It means the day of rest

Q. When did the Sabbath begin to be kept?

A. From the very creation of the world; for then ‘God blessed the seventh day, and rested on it from all His work.’ Gen. 2:2, 3

Q. When was this Commandment renewed?

A. In the Old Law, when God gave the commandments to Moses on Mount Sinai, written with His own finger on two tables of stone. Exodus 20

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath **changed** into Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born on a Sunday, arose from the dead on a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday—works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it **changed**?

A. *By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the spirit on the Lord's day (which was Sunday) Apoc. 1:10*

Q. *How do you prove that the Church has power to command Feasts and Holy-days?*

A. *By this very act of **changing** the Sabbath into Sunday, which is admitted by Protestants, and therefore contradict themselves by keeping Sunday so strictly, and breaking most other Feasts commanded by the same Church.*

Q. *How do you prove that?*

A. *Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the power of the Church to ordain Feasts and to command them under sin, and by not keeping the remainder, equally commanded by her, they deny in fact the same power." Daniel Ferris, **Manual of Christian Doctrine: or, Catholic Belief and Practice** (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1916), pp. 67, 68*

Let us now examine two statements from church historians on the change of the Sabbath:

*"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday." Augustus Neander, **The History of the Christian Religion and Church**, translated by Henry John Rose, p. 186*

*"Thus do we see upon what grounds the Lord's day stands; on custom first, and voluntary consecration of it to religious meetings: that custom countenanced by the authority of the church of God, which tacitly approved the same; and finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes throughout their empires." Peter Heylyn, **The History of the Sabbath**, part 2, chapter 3, section 12.*

Though we are dealing with Roman Catholic statements on the change of the Sabbath, perhaps it would be good to offer a few representative statements from the pen of Protestant expositors as well. We will begin with Isaac Williams:

*"Where are we told in Scripture that we are to keep the first day at all? We are commanded to keep the seventh; but we are nowhere commanded to keep the first day. . . . The reason why we keep the first day of the week holy instead of the seventh is for the same reason that we observe many other things, not because of the Bible, but because **the church**, has enjoined it." Isaac Williams, **Plain Sermons on the Catechism**, volume I, pp. 334-336*

*"The day called Sabbath by both Jewish and Christian writers is not Sunday, but the day previous—that is, Saturday. There is no indication whatever that the apostles in any sense substituted the Christian Sunday [a misnomer and oxymoron to be sure] for the Jewish Sabbath; no trace of any such transference is to be found in history. And there is nothing in Holy Scripture or in early Christian history to identify Sunday with the Sabbath, or to make the fourth commandment a mere precept for the observance of Sunday." Vernon Staley, **The Seasons, Fasts and Festivals of the Christian Year**, p. 54*

*“The reason why we observe the first day instead of the seventh is based on no positive command. One will search the Scriptures in vain for authority for changing from the seventh day to the first.” Clovis G. Chappell, **The Rules for Living**, p. 61*

*“The Sabbath was founded on a specific divine command. We can plead no such command for the obligation to observe Sunday.” R. W. Dale, **The Ten Commandments**, p. 100*

“Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; thus showing his authority as Lord even of the Sabbath. (Mathew. xii, 8) Not to abrogate or break it, but to preside over and modify, or give new form to it, so as to have it commemorate his resurrection, when he ceased from his redeeming work as God did from his creation work. Hebrews 4:10”

*“When Jesus gave instructions for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to is kingdom. (Acts 1:3) **This is probably one of the many unrecorded things which Jesus did.** (John 20:30; 21:25)” Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, **Theological Compend** (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902), p. 171.*

Does such a statement from an avowed Protestant really merit a reply? Where is the Biblical proof for his statement?

Notice the following astounding statement by Dr. Edward T. Hiscox, author of the **Baptist Manual**:

“There was and is a commandment to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will be said, however, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I studied for many years, I ask: Where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament, absolutely not. There is no Scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week.

“I wish to say that this Sabbath question, in this aspect of it, is the gravest and most perplexing question connected with Christian institutions which at present claims attention from Christian people; and the only reason that it is not a more disturbing element in Christian thought and in religious discussions, is because the Christian world has settled down content on the conviction that somehow a transference has taken place at the beginning of Christian history. . . .

“To me it seems unaccountable that Jesus, during three years’ intercourse with his disciples, often conversing with them upon the Sabbath question, discussing it in some of its various aspects, freeing it from its false glosses, never alluded to any transference of the day; also, that during forty days of his resurrection life, no such thing was intimated. Nor, so far as we know, did the Spirit, which was given to bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever that he had said unto them, deal with this question. Nor yet did the inspired apostles, in preaching the gospel, founding churches, counseling and instructing those founded, discuss or approach this subject.”

*“Of course, I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian Fathers and other sources. But what a pity that it comes branded with the **mark of paganism**, and christened with the name of the **sun-god**, when adopted and sanctioned by the **papal apostasy**, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism.”* From a speech given before the New York Ministers’ Conference, November 13, 1893

Philipp Melanchthon, the close colleague of Martin Luther, seems to have been the first to directly connect the change of the Law in Daniel 7:25 with the work of the Papacy:

“He changeth the times and laws that any of the six work days commanded of God will make them unholy and idle days when he list, or of their own holy days abolished make work days again, or when they changed the Saturday into Sunday. . . They have changed God’s laws and turned them into their own traditions to be kept above God’s precepts.” Quoted by George Joye, in **Exposition of Daniel the Prophet**, 1545, p. 110

Reputable church historians recognize the connection between the Sunday which Christians observe and the ancient pagan day of the Sun. Let’s quote a few:

“Sunday (dies solis . . . ‘day of the sun,’ because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The ‘sun’ of Latin adoration they interpreted as the ‘Sun of Righteousness.’ . . . No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.” **The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge**, (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, volume 4, article, ‘Sunday,’ third edition, 1891), p. 2259

“The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week, with its numbered week days, but by the close of the third century A. D. this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism. . . . During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worship, especially that of Mithra, in the Roman world, had already led to the substitution by pagans of dies solis for dies Saturni, as the first day of the planetary week. . . . Thus gradually a pagan institution was ingrafted on Christianity.” Hutton Webster, Ph. D., **Rest Days** (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1916), pp. 220, 221.

“It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints; . . . holy water; asylums; holy days and seasons, use of calendars, processions . . . are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the church.” John Henry Cardinal Newman, **The Development of Christian Doctrine** (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 373

“The first day of the week, named after the sun, and therefore an evident relic of sun worship. In French it is Dimanche, in Italian Dominica, both from Dominus, ‘the Lord.’ Christians, with the exception of Seventh-day Adventists, have substituted it as a day of rest and prayer in lieu of the

Jewish Sabbath.” William S. Walsh, Curiosities of Popular Customs, article, ‘Sunday,’ (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1898), p. 901

“The Gentiles were an idolatrous people who worshiped the sun, and Sunday was their most sacred day. Now, in order to reach the people in this new field, it seems but natural, as well as necessary, to make Sunday the rest day of the Church. At this time it was necessary for the Church to either adopt the Gentiles’ day or else have the Gentiles change their day. To change the Gentiles’ day would have been an offense and stumbling block to them. The Church could naturally reach them better by keeping their day.” Dr. William Frederick, Sunday and the Christian Sabbath, pp. 169, 170

“The Church made a sacred day of Sunday . . . largely because it was the weekly festival of the sun; for it was a definite Christian policy to take over the pagan festivals endeared to the people by tradition, and to give them a Christian significance.” Arthur Weigall, The Paganism in Our Christianity (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, copyright in 1928), p. 145

Notice the following fourth century challenge written by the pagan, Faustus, to the Christian, St. Augustine:

“You celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calendars and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alterations. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them.” Cited in John William Draper, History of the Intellectual Development of Europe, volume I, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), p. 310

Recently, Pope John Paul II has made a valiant attempt to justify the observance of Sunday on Biblical grounds. In this ecumenical age, when John Paul has called upon Protestants to become one with the Roman Catholic Church, it would not be popular to accuse Protestants of keeping Sunday in honor of the Papacy. For this reason, John Paul tones down the ‘tradition rhetoric’ and **does his best** to provide Biblical evidence for the change. However, a careful reading of his pastoral letter, *Dies Domini*, betrays his dependence on oral tradition as the main justification for the observance of Sunday. In the letter, he quotes church tradition and theologians 212 times! Without going into a full analysis of this pastoral letter, I would like to submit five places where John Paul clearly betrays this dependence on tradition:

Paragraph 6 John Paul II clearly states that Sunday is the Church’s precept:

*“Given this array of new situations and the questions which they prompt, it seems more necessary than ever to recover the deep doctrinal foundations underlying the **Church’s precept**, so that the abiding value of Sunday in the Christian life will be clear to all the faithful.”*

In Paragraph 18 John Paul attributes the change to Christians:

*“Because the Third Commandment depends upon the remembrance of God’s saving works and because **Christians** saw the definitive time inaugurated by Christ as a new beginning, **they made***

the first day after the Sabbath a festive day, for that was the day on which the Lord rose from the dead.”

Paragraph 27: John Paul attributes Sunday observance as resulting from Christian reflection and pastoral practice and wise pastoral intuition.

*“This Christocentric vision sheds light upon another symbolism which **Christian reflection and pastoral practice** ascribed to the Lord’s Day. **Wise pastoral intuition** suggested to the Church the christianization of the notion of Sunday as ‘the day of the sun’. . . .”*

Paragraph 63: John Paul once again attributes the change to Christians, not to Christ!!

*“This is why **Christians**, called as they are to proclaim the liberation won by the blood of Christ, felt that **they had the authority to transfer** the meaning of the Sabbath to the day of the Resurrection.”*

Paragraph 81: In this statement John Paul, without apology or qualification, attributes the ‘riches’ of Sunday observance to tradition:

*“The spiritual and pastoral riches of Sunday as it has been **handed down** to us by **tradition**, are truly great.”*

In short, these five statements clearly show that the change was made by the church and not by Christ or the Apostles!

I would like to provide two statements from Roman Catholic sources, where the claim is made that Sunday is a sign or mark of the authority of the Church:

*“The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the **authority of the Church** from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, . . . is one of the most patent **signs** that we are a Christian people.” James Cardinal Gibbons, as quoted in, John Gilmary Shea and others, **The Cross and the Flag**, ‘The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic,’ (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25*

In 1895, J. F. Snyder, of Bloomington, Illinois, wrote to Cardinal Gibbons asking the following question:

“Does the Roman Catholic Church claim the act of changing the observance of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week as a mark of her power?”

Cardinal Gibbons answered through his Chancellor, H. F. Thomas:

*“Of course the Catholic Church claims that the **change** was **her act**. It could not have been otherwise, as none in those days would have dreamed of doing anything in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical and religious without her. And the act is a **mark** of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters.” Signed by Chancellor H. F. Thomas, November 11, 1895*

It is of more than passing interest that the Roman Catholic Church has a special fascination with the sun. It probably would be better to call it an obsession. As one visits Roman Catholic Cathedrals in various countries of the world one is struck by the frequent icons, statues and paintings with sun-bursts. In St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, there is a huge sun-burst in the front which 'jumps out' at the observer the moment one walks in. In the Vatican Museum there are literally thousands of sun-bursts everywhere one looks.

Most Roman Catholic believers are probably not aware that the round wafer used in the Eucharist is a solar symbol. When the Roman Catholic faithful worship the host [wafer], they think they are worshiping Christ when in reality they are worshiping the sun!! The round tonsure on the head of the Roman Catholic priests is also a representation of the fact that they are priests of the sun-god. Roman Catholic altars are constantly adorned with a sun-burst on the front side. The place where the host is kept is invariably adorned with the sun. This obsession with the sun can be traced directly to ancient Roman paganism. In fact, as Bacchiocchi has irrefutably shown, the observance of the Sunday came into the Christian Church from paganism.

One final confirmatory statement from the pen of Ellen G. White:

*"The special characteristic of the beast, and therefore of his image, is the breaking of God's commandments. Says Daniel, of the little horn, the papacy: 'He shall think to change the times and the law.' Dan. 7:25, Revised Version. And Paul styled the same power the 'man of sin' who was to exalt himself above God. One prophecy is a complement of the other. Only by changing God's law could the papacy exalt itself above God. And whoever should understandingly keep the law as thus changed would be giving supreme honor to that power by which the change was made. Such an act of obedience to papal laws would be a mark of allegiance to the pope in the place of God." **The Great Controversy**, p. 446*

Characteristic #9:

We shall now see that the Roman Catholic Church is a different power than the kingdoms which came before her. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that the Papacy is an amalgamation of church and state.

We will begin with a quotation from the pen of Malachi Martin, Jesuit theologian, who describes the relationship between Constantine and Pope Sylvester after the Edict of Milan in 313:

*"All anti-church laws will be revoked. Constantine abolishes crucifixion as the supreme capital punishment—no criminal should die in the same way as Jesus the Christ died for men's sins. Sunday will be a public holiday in honor of Jesus' resurrection. Throughout the West, Constantine decides, he will use the bishops of the church just as former Roman emperors used the pontiffs of the old Roman College of Pontiffs, with the pope being supreme pontiff. All local bishops will have **civil jurisdiction**. Pope Sylvester and his successors will have **supreme civil jurisdiction** over all localities in the western half of the Roman Empire. . . .These two men, the*

pope and the emperor, have now set the stage for the next 1,600 years. **The Church of Rome will always be allied with some temporal power.** At one stage, it will even claim to be the source of all worldly power—political, civil, military, diplomatic, financial, cultural. And it will make that claim stick for quite some time. But what a price it will pay!” (Malachi Martin, **The Decline and Fall of the Roman Church**, p. 37)

Martin is not alone in his assessment. Other church historians have clearly written about this church/state alliance which began in the days of Constantine. Notice the words of James Conroy:

“Long ages ago, when Rome through the neglect of the Western emperors was left to the mercy of the barbarous hordes, the Romans turned to one figure for aid and protection, and asked him to rule them; and thus, in this simple manner, the best title of all to kingly right, commenced the temporal sovereignty of the popes. And meekly stepping to the throne of Caesar, the vicar of Christ took up the scepter to which the emperors and kings of Europe were to bow in reverence through so many ages.” James P. Conroy, **American Quarterly Catholic Quarterly Review**, April, 1911.

Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, writing about the papacy’s emancipation from the power of the state in the days of Constantine, states:

“But from the hour when Constantine, in the language of the Roman law, *Deo jubente*, by the command of God, translated the seat of the empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance. From that hour God Himself **liberated** His Church. It was from the first involved in the principles of the supernatural sovereignty of the Church on earth, that it should be one day **free** from all temporal allegiance, though as yet its **liberation** was not accomplished. . . . It [the papacy] waited until such a time as God should break its bonds asunder, and **should liberate it from subjection to civil powers** [in the words of the apostle Paul, the ‘restrainer’ was ‘taken out of the way’], and **enthroned it in the possession of a temporal sovereignty of its own.**” Henry Edward Manning, **The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ** (London: Burns & Lambert, second edition, 1862), pp. 11-13. *Emphasis supplied*

Alexander Clarence Flick echoes the same idea in the following quotation:

“The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330 left the Western Church, practically **free from imperial power**, to develop its own form of organization. The Bishop of Rome, **in the seat of the Caesars** was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the **political as well as the spiritual head**. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favored the evolution of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. **Civil as well as religious disputes** were referred to the successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually **assume military leadership**. Eastern Emperors frequently recognized the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand how, under these responsibilities,

*the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasized and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan].” Alexander Clarence Flick, **The Rise of the Mediaeval Church** (New York: Reprinted by Burt Franklin, 1959), pp. 168, 169 Emphasis supplied*

And Carl Conrad Eckhardt has stated:

*“Under the Roman Empire the popes had **no temporal powers** [the dragon stage]. But when the Roman Empire had **disintegrated** [the ten horns stage] and its **place had been taken** by a number of rude, barbarous kingdoms, the Roman Catholic church [the little horn stage] not only became independent of the states in **religious affairs** but dominated **secular affairs** as well. At times, under such rulers as Charlemagne (768-814), Otto the Great (936-73), and Henry III (1039-56), the civil power controlled the church to some extent; but in general, under the weak political system of feudalism, the well-organized, unified, and centralized church, with the pope as its head, was not only independent in **ecclesiastical affairs** but also controlled the **civil affairs**. The church **interfered in secular affairs** on the basis of its theory of the relation of church and state, which was formulated in substance by Augustine (354-430) and given wider and more definite application by such popes as Gregory VII (1073-85), Innocent III (1198-1216), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others.” Carl Conrad Eckhardt, **The Papacy and World Affairs** (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 1, emphasis supplied*

This early view eventually morphed into the blasphemous claims of later popes. For example, here are the words of Pope Nicholas I who ruled from 858 through 867:

*“It is evident that the popes can neither be bound nor unbound by any earthly power, nor even by that of the apostle [Peter], if he should return upon the earth; since Constantine the Great has recognized that the pontiffs held the place of God upon earth, the divinity not being able to be judged by any living man. We are, then, infallible, and whatever may be our acts, we are not accountable for them but to ourselves.” (Quoted in, R. W. Thompson, **The Papacy and the Civil Power** (New York, 1876), p. 248.*

And once again, Nicholas blasphemously boasted:

*“Fear, then, our wrath and the thunders of our vengeance; for Jesus Christ has appointed us [the popes] with his own mouth absolute judges of all men; and kings themselves are submitted to our authority.” (Quoted in, Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, p. 228)*

The controversy between Henry IV, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (technically he was king of Germany though he claimed to be Holy Roman Emperor), and Pope Gregory VII is legendary. Gregory VII decided to enforce strict laws forbidding simony (buying and selling church offices) and marriage of the clergy. This meant that clergy with wives were required to put them away and the children had to be disowned. Henry rebelled against Gregory and wrote him the following stinging words:

“Henry, King not by usurpation, but through holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, at present not Pope but false monk. This is the salutation you deserve, for you have never held any office in the Church without making it a source of confusion and a curse to Christian men, instead of an honor and a blessing.”

The letter ended with the following stinging words:

*“I, Henry, King by the grace of God, do say unto thee: ‘Come down, come down, and be damned through all the ages.’” (Quoted in, Louis L. Snyder, ed., **Documents of German History** (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 31-33*

This challenge could not go unanswered so Gregory VII promptly excommunicated Henry and placed his realm under interdict [basically, in the view of the day, this doomed the whole population to eternal condemnation in hell because churches were closed and the sacraments could not be received]. Gregory’s letter in the form of a prayer addressed to the apostle Peter invokes the curse of the apostle upon the rebellious king. The letter stated in part:

*“St. Peter, prince of the apostles, incline thine ear unto me, I beseech thee, and hear me, thy servant, whom thou hast nourished from mine infancy and hast delivered from mine enemies that hate me for my fidelity to thee. Thou art my witness, as are also my mistress, the mother of God, and St. Paul thy brother and all the other saints, that thy holy Roman church called me to its government against my own will, and that I did not gain thy throne with violence; that I would rather have ended my days in exile than have obtained thy place by fraud or for worldly ambition. It is not by my efforts, but by thy grace, that I am set to rule over the Christian world which was especially intrusted to thee by Christ. It is by thy grace and as thy representative that God has given me the power to bind and to loose in heaven and in earth. Confident of my integrity and authority, I now declare in the name of omnipotent God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that Henry, son of the emperor Henry, is deprived of his kingdom of Germany and Italy; I do this by thy authority and in defense of the honor of thy church, because he has rebelled against it. He who attempts to destroy the honor of the church should be deprived of such honor as he may have held. He has refused to obey as a Christian should, he has not returned to God from whom he had wandered, he has had dealings with excommunicated persons, he has done many iniquities, he has despised the warnings which, as thou art witness, I sent to him for his salvation, he has cut himself off from thy church, and has attempted to rend it asunder; therefore, by thy authority, I place him under the curse. It is in thy name that I curse him that all people may know that thou art Peter, and upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. . . .” Quoted in, Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., **A Source Book for Mediaeval History** (New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1905), pp. 146, 155-159)*

Henry already had many enemies among the nobility in Germany. These were envious of his position and resented his power so they took advantage of this opportunity to turn the people against Henry. The clamor of the people and the opposition of the nobles soon became unbearable. Henry heard that Gregory VII was on his way to Germany. Fearing that he would be permanently deposed if the pope came to Germany and sat with his rebellious subjects in judgment on him, Henry agreed to go to Canossa, Italy and beg for Gregory’s forgiveness. Henry arrived in Canossa in January of 1077. Though it was the dead of winter, Gregory forced Henry to stand in the freezing cold for three days and three nights barefoot and clad only in wretched woolen garments. Remarks one historian:

*“The spectacle of the mightiest king in Christendom humbling himself in this sensational fashion was one to amaze the whole Christian world—king, lord, and peasant alike.” (Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., **A Source Book for Mediaeval History** (New York: Scribner’s and Sons, 1905), pp. 146, 155-159.*

After the three days, Gregory absolved Henry, removed the interdict and wrote a letter to the nobles of Germany:

“Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the archbishops, bishops, dukes, counts, and other princes of the German kingdom, defenders of the Christian faith, greeting and apostolic benediction.

“Since you have made common cause with us and shared our perils in the recent controversy, we have thought it only right that you should be informed of the recent course of events, how King Henry came to Italy to do penance, and how we were led to grant him absolution.

*“According to the agreement made with your representatives we had come to Lombardy and were there awaiting those whom you were to send to escort us into your land. But after the time set was already passed, we received word that it was at that time impossible to send an escort, because of many obstacles that stood in the way, and we were greatly exercised at this and in grave doubt as to what we ought to do. In the meantime we learned that the king was approaching. Now before he entered Italy he had sent to us and had offered to make complete satisfaction for his fault, promising to reform and henceforth **to obey us in all things**, provided we would give him our absolution and blessing. We hesitated for some time, taking occasion in the course of the negotiations to reprove him sharply for his former sins. Finally he came in person to Canossa, here we were staying, bringing with him only a small retinue and manifesting no hostile intentions. Once arrived, he presented himself at the gate of the castle, barefoot and clad only in wretched woolen garments, beseeching us with tears to grant him absolution and forgiveness. This he continued to do for three days, until all those about us were moved to compassion at his plight and interceded for him with tears and prayers. Indeed, they marveled at our hardness of heart, some even complaining that our action savored rather of heartless tyranny than of chastening severity. At length his persistent declarations of repentance and supplications of all who were there with us overcame our reluctance, and we removed the excommunication from him and received him again into the bosom of the holy mother church.” (Quoted in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., **A Source Book for Mediaeval History** (New York: Scribner’s and Sons, 1905), pp. 155-159.*

Besides begging forgiveness of Gregory, Henry agreed to submit to the authority of Gregory VII in all things. He also called upon his subjects to submit to the pope’s authority and rescinded the edicts whereby he had deposed Gregory. This whole episode is remarkable. By crossing the Alps in the dead of winter and standing outside the castle at Canossa in the cold for three days waiting for an audience with Gregory VII, Henry was admitting that the Pope was the lord of kings. Even though Henry was king of Germany, the whole of Europe was really under his control because he was Holy Roman Emperor. By humbling himself, Henry was thus admitting that the pope was sovereign over all the kings of Europe.

Pope Alexander III (1159-81) also wielded enormous power over Frederick I, Holy Roman Emperor and king of Germany and Italy. Frederick's attempt to chastise the pope backfired when his armies were defeated by the papal forces. For his rebellion, Frederick was promptly excommunicated and deposed by the pope. In penitence and humiliation, the emperor had to travel to Venice to beg for Alexander's forgiveness and absolution. The scene is described by Roman Catholic historian, Fortunatus Ulmas:

*"When the emperor arrived in the presence of the pope, he laid aside his imperial mantle, and knelt on both knees, with his breast on the earth. Alexander advanced and placed his foot on his neck, while the cardinals thundered forth in loud tones, 'Thou shalt tread upon the cockatrice, and crush the lion and the dragon. . . ' The next day Frederick Barbarossa. . . kissed the feet of Alexander, and, on foot, led his horse by the bridle as he returned from solemn mass, to the pontifical palace. . . . The papacy had now risen to a height of grandeur and power which it had never reached before. **The sword of Peter had conquered the sword of Caesar!**" Quoted in Dave Hunt, ***A Woman Rides the Beast***, pp. 29-30). Emphasis supplied*

Another pope who wielded gigantic power over kings and princes was Innocent III (1198-1216). Notice the analogy Innocent provided to justify the dominion of the church over the state:

*"The Creator of the universe set up two great luminaries in the firmament of heaven; the greater light to rule the day, the lesser light to rule the night. In the same way for the firmament of the universal Church, which is spoken of as heaven, he appointed two great dignitaries; the greater to bear rule over souls . . . the lesser to bear rule over bodies. . . These dignitaries are the pontifical authority and the royal power. Furthermore, the moon derives her light from the sun, and is in truth inferior to the sun in both size and quality, in position as well as effect. In the same way, the royal power derives its dignity from the pontifical authority." Henry Bettenson, ***Documents of the Christian Church***, p. 158)*

In the year 1302 pope Boniface VIII proclaimed a very significant bull (personal letter) bearing the name, *Unam Sanctam*. In it, Boniface refined the idea of the two swords which had originally been proposed by St. Bernard. We will quote only the portions of the bull which are apropos to the subject we are dealing with:

*"In this Church and in its power are two swords, to wit, a **spiritual** and a **temporal**. . . . Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used **for** the Church, the former **by** the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but **by the will and sufferance of the priest**. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should be under the other, and the **temporal authority subject to the spiritual power**. . . . It behooves us, therefore, the more freely to confess that the spiritual power excels in dignity and nobility any form whatsoever of earthly power, as spiritual interests exceed the temporal in importance. . . . For the truth bearing witness, **it is for the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and judge it**, if it be not good. . . . Therefore, if the earthly power shall err, it shall be **judged by the spiritual power**; if the lesser spiritual power err, it shall be judged by the higher. But if the supreme power err, it can be judged by God alone and not by man, the apostles bearing witness saying, the spiritual man judges all things but he himself is*

judged by no one. Hence this power, although given to man and exercised by man, is **not human, but rather a divine power**, given by the divine lips to Peter, and founded on a rock for Him and his successors in Him [Christ] whom he confessed, the Lord saying to Peter himself, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind,' etc. Whoever, therefore, shall resist this power, ordained by God, resists the ordination of God. . . . We moreover, proclaim, declare and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human being to be **subject to the Roman Pontiff.**" (Pope Boniface VIII, Bull Unam Sanctam, 1302 in Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, volume 3 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 189-), Number 6, pp. 20-23. The original Latin text can be found in Mury, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, volume 46, pp. 255, 256, based on the facsimile from the Papal Regesta. Emphasis supplied

Clarence Alexander Flick offers the following comment about the same pope:

"The papal theory . . . made the Pope alone God's representative on earth and maintained that the Emperor received his right to rule from St. Peter's successor. . . . It was upheld by Nicholas I, Hildebrand, Alexander III, Innocent III, and culminated with Boniface VIII at the jubilee of 1300 when, seated on the throne of Constantine, girded with the imperial sword, wearing a crown, and waving a scepter, he shouted to the throng of loyal pilgrims: 'I am Caesar—I am Emperor.'" (Clarence Alexander Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church (reprint: New York: Burt Franklin, 1959), p. 413)

And Flick comments further about the power of the popes during the thirteenth century:

"During this period the organization of the papal hierarchy was perfected. At the head stood the all-powerful and absolute Pope as God's agent on earth; hence, at least in theory and claim, he was the ruler of the whole world in **temporal and spiritual affairs**. He was the defender of Christianity, the Church, and the clergy in all respects. He was the supreme censor of morals in Christendom and the head of a great spiritual despotism. He was the source of all earthly justice and the final court of appeal in all cases." (Clarence Alexander Flick, The Rise of the Mediaeval Church (reprint: New York: Burt Franklin, 1959), pp. 575, 576. Emphasis supplied

Historian John N. Figgis adds this testimony about the medieval power of the Church:

"[In] the middle Ages the Church was not a State, **it was the State**; the State, or rather the **civil authority** (for a separate society was not recognized), **was merely the police department** of the Church. . . . [The Church] took over **from the Roman Empire** its theory of the absolute and universal jurisdiction of the supreme authority, and developed it into the doctrine of the plenitudo potestatis of the Pope." John N. Figgis, From Gerson to Grotius, p. 4. Emphasis supplied

R. W. Southern makes this statement:

"During the whole medieval period there was in Rome a **single spiritual and temporal authority** [the papacy] exercising powers which in the end exceeded those that had ever lain within the

grasp of a Roman emperor.” R. W. Southern, **Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages**, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970), pp. 24-25.

Lucius Ferraris, in his acclaimed work, **Prompta Bibliotheca**, makes the following remarks:

*“The common opinion teaches that the Pope has power over two swords, namely, the **spiritual and the temporal**, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself gave to Peter and his successors (Matthew 16:19), saying, ‘I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,’ concerning which the doctors remark that he did not say ‘key’ but ‘keys,’ including both the **temporal and the spiritual power**.*

“This opinion is most widely confirmed by the authority of the holy Fathers, by the teaching of the canon and civil law, and by the apostolic constitutions.

*“It is not to be wondered at if to the Roman Pontiff, as to the vicar of Him whose is the earth and the fullness thereof, the world and all who dwell therein, etc., there have been granted, when just cause demands, the most complete authority and power of transferring kingdoms, of dashing in pieces scepters, of taking away crowns, not only unsheathing the **spiritual** but also the **material** sword. Which power in its fullness, not once but frequently, the Roman pontiffs have used, as occasion required, by girding the sword upon the thigh most effectively, as is perfectly well known; and to this not only do theologians give most complete testimony, but also the professors of pontifical and imperial law, and many historians of undoubted credibility, both profane and sacred, both Greek and Latin.” Lucius Ferraris, **Prompta Bibliotheca**, article, ‘Papa’ emphasis supplied*

And the Roman Catholic writer, Henry Edward, gives this testimony:

*“The authority of princes and the allegiance of subjects in the civil state of nature is of divine ordinance; and therefore, so long as princes and their laws are in conformity to the law of God, the church has no power of jurisdiction against them, nor over them. If princes and their laws deviate from the law of God, the church has authority from God to judge of that deviation, and to oblige to its correction.” (Henry Edward, **The Vatican Decrees** (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1875), p. 54*

The Roman Catholic papacy, which terrorized kings during the 1260 years, received a deadly blow from the state in 1798, when pope Pius VI was taken prisoner at the very climax of the French Revolution. At this point temporal power was removed from the papacy though it still continued to exist as a church. John Adolphus described this significant event only five years after it occurred:

“Berthier advanced to the city by forced marches; summoned the castle of St. Angelo [Feb. 10th.], allowing only four hours for its evacuation by the papal troops; the convicts were set at liberty; the gates of the city secured by the French; the pope, all the cardinals except three, and the whole people of Rome, made prisoners at discretion. . . .

“Shortly afterwards [Feb. 15th], Berthier made his triumphal entry into Rome; and a tree of liberty being planted on the capitol . . . a proclamation was issued, declaring. . . a free and independent republic, under the special protection of the French army. A provisional government was acknowledged, as established by the sovereign people; and every other temporal authority emanating from the pope was suppressed, nor was he any longer to exercise any function . . . The territory of the Roman republic was declared to comprehend all that remained under the temporal authority of the pope after the treaty of Campo Formio.

“As a refinement in the art of insult, the day selected for planting the tree of liberty and deposing the pontiff was the anniversary of his accession to the sovereignty; and while he was, according to custom, celebrating divine service in the Sistine chapel and receiving the congratulations of the cardinals, Haller, the commissary-general of the French army, and Cervoni, abruptly rushed in, and announced the termination of his authority. The pope had scarcely recovered from the shock of this intelligence, when Cervoni offered him a national cockade, which he rejected with dignity; and he heard with fortitude that his Swiss guards were dismissed, and republican soldiers placed in their stead. Pursuing the same style of mockery, the invaders compelled the cardinals to perform a grand mass and Te Deum, to thank God for events which they could not fail most severely to deplore; public preachers were employed to reconcile the people to the change, and to argue from Scripture that, as the disciples of reason and votaries of religion, they were bound to submit to whatever form of government it had pleased Providence to set over them. . .

*Whether retained by force, deluded by promises, or rendered inert by age, the pope remained, after the abrogation of his authority, a prisoner in his own palace. The French first seized on it as barracks, and in less than a week confined him to his own rooms, putting the seal of confiscation on all his effects. Even the furniture of his apartments was at length contemplated with a greedy eye, and the unfortunate pontiff was removed from Rome to Sienna [Feb. 20th to 25th], where he was received with consolatory sympathy by the Augustine monks, and lodged him in their convent. [Note: He was removed, according to the caprice or policy of his persecutors, at all hours in the night and day, to many cities in Italy, where he was exhibited in chains, and at length confined in a fortress at the top of the Alps, where, under the old French government, it was sometimes customary to send regiments by way of punishment. In the course of the ensuing year it was deemed necessary to remove him to Valence, where he terminated his days amid the horrors of neglect and insult. . . .” (John Adolphus, **The History of France**, volume 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 364-369*

Other historians describe this event in similar terms. Notice the following examples:

“The object of the French directory was the destruction of the pontifical government, as the irreconcilable enemy of the republic. . . . The aged pope [Pius VI] was summoned to surrender the temporal government; on his refusal, he was dragged from the altar. . . . His rings were torn from his fingers, and finally, after declaring the temporal power abolished, the victors carried the pope prisoner into Tuscany, whence he never returned (1798).

*“The Papal States, converted into the Roman Republic, were declared to be in perpetual alliance with France, but the French general was the real master at Rome. . . . The territorial possessions of the clergy and monks were declared national property, and their former owners cast into prison. **The papacy was extinct; not a vestige of its existence remained;** and among all the Roman Catholic powers not a finger was stirred in its defense. The Eternal City had no longer prince or pontiff; its bishop was a dying captive in foreign lands; and the decree was already announced that no successor would be allowed in its place.”* (George Trevor, **Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire** (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1868), pp. 439, 440 emphasis supplied)

*“When, in 1797, Pope Pius VI fell grievously ill, Napoleon gave orders that in the event of his death no successor should be elected to his office, and that the **Papacy should be discontinued.** “But the Pope recovered; the peace was soon broken; Berthier entered Rome on 10th February 1798, and proclaimed a Republic. The aged Pontiff refused to violate his oath by recognizing it, and was hurried from prison to prison into France. Broken with fatigue and sorrows, he died. . . . [in] August 1799, in the French fortress of Valence, aged 82 years. No wonder that half of Europe thought Napoleon’s veto would be obeyed, and that with the Pope **the Papacy was dead.**”* (Joseph Rickaby, **Lectures on the History of Religion**, ‘The Modern Papacy,’ volume 3, [lecture 24], p. 1) emphasis supplied

“The tricolored flag floated on the top of the Castle of St. Angelo. The successor of St. Peter was carried away captive by the unbelievers. He died a prisoner in their hands; and even the honors of sepulture were long withheld from his remains.

*“It is not strange that, in the year 1799, even sagacious observers should have thought that, at length, the hour of the Church of Rome was come. An infidel power ascendant, the Pope dying in captivity, the most illustrious prelates of France living in a foreign country on Protestant alms, the noblest edifices which the munificence of former ages had consecrated to the worship of God turned into temples of Victory, or into banqueting-houses for political societies, or into Theophilanthropic chapels, such signs might well be supposed to indicate **the approaching end of that long domination.***

*“But the end was not yet. Again **doomed to death,** the milk-white hind was still fated not to die. Even before the funeral rites had been performed over the ashes of Pius the Sixth, a great reaction had commenced, which, after the lapse of more than forty years, appears to be still [in 1840] in progress.”* (Thomas B. Macauley, ‘*Ranke’s History of the Popes*’ (first published 1840), in his **Critical and Historical Essays**, volume 2 (London: Longmans, 1865), pp. 147, 148. Bold is mine.

*“One of the first measures of the new government was to dispatch an order to Joseph Bonaparte at Rome, to promote, by all the means in his power, the approaching revolution in the papal states; and, above all things, to take care that, at the pope’s death [he was ill, 1797], **no successor should be elected** to the chair of St. Peter.”* (Archibald Alison, **History of Europe**, volume 1, chapter 26 (New York: Harper, 1852), pp. 543, 544) emphasis supplied

“That the head of the church might be made to feel with more poignancy his humiliating situation, the day chosen for planting the tree of liberty on the capitol was the anniversary of his

election to the sovereignty [Feb. 15]. Whilst he was, according to custom, in the Sistine chapel, celebrating his accession to the papal chair, and receiving the congratulations of the Cardinals, Citizen Haller, the commissary-general, and Cervoni, who then commanded the French troops within the city, gratified themselves in a peculiar triumph over this unfortunate potentate. During that ceremony they both entered the chapel, and Haller announced to the sovereign Pontiff on his throne, that his reign was at an end.

“The poor old man seemed shocked at the abruptness of this unexpected notice, but soon recovered himself with becoming fortitude; and when General Cervoni, adding ridicule to oppression, presented him the national cockade, he rejected it with a dignity that shewed he was still superior to his misfortunes. At the same time that his Holiness received this notice of the dissolution of his power, his Swiss guards were dismissed, and Republican soldiers put in their place.” (Richard Duppa, **A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government**, second edition (London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1799), pp. 46, 47)

“The time, however, was arrived, when it became more desirable to send him [the Pope] out of the way, in order that his effects might be disposed of with a better grace. . . .

“It was decreed that he should go; and on the morning of the 20th of February, about seven o’clock, he left Rome, accompanied by three coaches of his own suite, and a body of French cavalry, to escort him safe into Tuscany; and on the 25th arrived in Siena, where he was requested to remain till further orders. Here he was received into the monastery of S. Barbara of the order of S. Augustin, whose members sorrowfully welcomed him at the gate, and offered all that their Convent could bestow, to console him under his misfortunes.

“An earthquake having taken place at Siena in the month of May, the Pope was removed to a Carthusian Convent within two miles of Florence. . . .

“He was suffered to remain in the Carthusian Convent until the 27th of March, 1799. He was then removed to Parma; from whence he was conducted to Briancon in France, and afterward to Valence, where he died on the 29th of August of the same year.” (Richard Duppa, **A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798**, third edition (London: John Murray, 1807), pp. 50-52, 54)

“Multitudes imagined that the papacy was **at the point of death** and asked, would Pius VI be the last pontiff, and if the close of the eighteenth century would be signalized by the fall of the papal dynasty.”(T. H. Gill, **The Papal Drama**, book 10). Emphasis supplied

According to historian M. Weitlauff, when Pius VI died in Valence in 1799, ‘the Papacy had suffered its deepest humiliation. . . . [and] appeared to be annihilated. . . . The Revolution also dealt it the wound which, it seemed did not want to heal until far into the twentieth century.’ (Quoted in, Frank B. Holbrook, editor., **Symposium on Revelation**, volume 2 (Hagerstown, Maryland: Review and Herald, 1992), p. 337)

Historians from this period describe Pius VI as ‘the last pope’ and refer to 1798 as ‘the end of an era.’ Bible expositors also understood that 1798 marked the end of the 1260 years of papal dominion. But prophecy foretold that the papacy would regain its lost dominion once again.

At this point it might be well to explain what is meant by the ‘deadly wound.’ It does **not** mean that the Roman Catholic Church would cease to exist as a religious institution. This simply did not happen in 1798; the papacy continued to exist as a church. What it does mean is that the papacy would no longer be able to exert dominion over the state. In other words, its political power would be arrested. The healing of the deadly wound means that the papacy, at some point after 1798, will once again be able to employ the power of the state to accomplish her purposes.

Has the deadly wound been completely healed yet? The answer is no. The healing is to be understood as a process rather than as one particular event. The process began as early as 1801 when Napoleon returned the Papal States and gave pope Pius VII temporal power. In the words of Arthur Robert Pennington:

“Many of the men in those days [1798] imagined that the dominion of the Pope had come to an end, and that the knell of the temporal power was then sounding among the nations. This supposition, however, proved to be erroneous. The French republicans were very anxious that Rome should not have another Pope. But as the reverses of the revolutionary armies had left southern Italy to its ancient masters, the cardinals were able to proceed to an election at Venice. They elected, on March 14th, 1800, Barnabas Chiaramonti, who assumed the name of Pius VII.

“The first transaction of this Pope was a negotiation with the government of France, of which Napoleon Buonaparte was the First Consul. . . .

*“He [Napoleon] felt that, as the large majority of the inhabitants of France knew no other form of faith than Romanism, it must become the **established religion of the country**. Accordingly we find that he now began negotiations with the Pope, which issued in a Concordat in July, 1801, whereby the Roman Catholic religion was once more **established** in France. He also left Pius in **possession of his Italian principality**.” (Arthur Robert Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1881), pp. 450, 452) emphasis supplied*

*“Even though the papacy had the Vatican and its principality once again, it exerted very little political power between 1801 and 1870. Very few nations wished to have any relations whatsoever with a wounded and humiliated papacy. In 1870, the papacy suffered a further blow when Victor Emmanuel confiscated the Papal States, including Vatican City, and formed the unified kingdom of Italy. The pope, in protest, declared himself under house arrest and no pope left Vatican City for the next 59 years. But on February 11, 1929 a historic event took place. A treaty was signed by Mussolini and Gasparri which restored full political control of Vatican City to the papacy. In part the treaty provides for . . . the de iure and de facto **international sovereignty** of the Holy See with its **absolute and sole jurisdiction** over a **state** called the City of the Vatican and guarantees its freedom and independence. . . the person of the pope is inviolable and sacred, and cardinals enjoy the honors of **princes** of royal blood, and wherever*

*resident in Rome are Vatican citizens; certain other ecclesiastics residing outside the City are given **immunities**; the Vatican and Italy have ordinary **diplomatic relations**. . . . the Vatican City is therefore a permanently neutral and inviolable territory. . . .” (Donald Attwater, **A Catholic Dictionary**, third edition, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 282) Emphasis supplied*

The *San Francisco Chronicle*, dated February 12, 1929, included a front page article titled: “**MUSSOLINI AND GASPARRI SIGN HISTORIC ROMAN PACT.**” In part, the article reads:

“The Roman question tonight was a thing of the past and the Vatican was at peace with Italy. The formal accomplishment of this today was the exchange of signatures in the historic Palace of St. John Lateran by two noteworthy plenipotentiaries, Cardinal Gasparri for Pope Pius XI and Premier Mussolini for King Victor Emmanuel III.

*“In affixing the autographs to the memorable document, **healing the wound** which has festered since 1870, extreme cordiality was displayed on both sides.” (The *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 12, 1929, p. 1) emphasis supplied*

It must be underlined that the deadly wound was not fully healed in 1929 but at that time the process began. After 1929 the nations of the world slowly began establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican once again. One after another chose to ignore the lessons of the past when the papacy ruled over kings and princes. But the two superpowers [the United States and the Soviet Union] refused to do so. In 1867 the United States had officially banned diplomatic relations with the Vatican and the Soviet Union, a declared atheistic state, refused to recognize a church with diplomatic status.

A subtle change in mood on the part of the United States government was seen when in 1951 President Harry Truman suggested that it would be a good idea to formalize diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Truman was not prepared for the uproar and backlash from the American people who were still well aware of the antagonism between the principles of Protestantism and Romanism. When Truman nominated General Mark W. Clark to be our ambassador to the Vatican, the public opposition was so strong that General Clark withdrew his name and the nomination was killed before it reached confirmation in the Senate.

In 1970 President Richard Nixon asked Henry Cabot Lodge to make periodic visits to the Vatican for the purpose of exchanging views on international and humanitarian projects but he did so without diplomatic status. But on September 22, 1983 the ban on diplomatic relations came to an end when Ronald Reagan (with barely a whimper from an inclusive and pluralistic American people) appointed William A. Wilson the first United States ambassador, not to the State of Vatican City, but to the Holy See itself.

Now, for the first time, one of the two world superpowers had contributed to the healing of the deadly wound. Just six years later, the other superpower would cave in when in 1989 the Soviet Union also established full diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Though the appointment of William A. Wilson did not awaken the furor which the nomination of General Mark W. Clark had, there was still much discussion in the Senate before his

confirmation. The discussion revolved around the issue of how the United States could send an ambassador to a church and yet not violate the constitutional separation of church and state. Some senators tried to obviate this problem by insisting that the ambassador was being sent to Vatican State rather than to the Holy See. Concerning this crafty argument, Norskov Olsen remarks:

*“While Vatican City is subordinated to the Holy See and ambassadors are accredited not to the former but to the latter, it is acknowledged that the pope could not claim the prerogatives of a temporal ruler without the Vatican City State. Referring to the international juristic personality of the Catholic Church and the Lateral Treaty, Cardinal Hyginus Eugene, apostolic nuncio to Belgium and the European Economic Council, writes that the latter ‘merely once more provided the Pope, who is the spiritual sovereign of the Church, with another title to sovereignty, that of temporal sovereignty, which would immediately cease to exist if the Vatican State became extinct.’” (V Norskov Olsen, **Papal Supremacy and American Democracy** (Riverside, California: Loma Linda University Press, 1987), p. 52*

What Olsen is saying is simply this: It is impossible to say that the ambassador is being sent to Vatican State without at the same time saying that the ambassador is being sent to the Holy See. The reason is simple: Vatican State gives the Pope, as the religious leader of Holy See, a legitimate right to claim temporal power. You cannot any more separate the pope’s secular power from his religious power than you can separate the body from the spirit!

Another controversial issue had to do with how the United States could show preferential treatment to one church above all the others. This problem was simply ignored and was never resolved. Yet in spite of these two problems, the nomination went through with few objections. The United States had prepared the way for the full healing of the deadly wound!

A few words about the Vatican would be in order. Vatican City is the smallest sovereign state in the world and yet its size is disproportionate to its worldwide power and influence. It is a city within a city whose area covers only 108.7 acres. Its total population is approximately one thousand. It has its own ambassadors, flag, language, laws, currency, postal system, army, traffic laws, police, baking system, newspaper [*Osservatore Romano*] and radio station. It is an absolute monarchy and theocracy with the pope, Vicar of Christ, as its absolute sovereign. Notice the following description of the pope’s power as leader of the Vatican church/state:

*“All laws are a sovereign emanation of the will of the pope, who is the ultimate source of all power, even though this is at times delegated to others for practical reasons. The pope alone has the fullness of legislative, executive, and judicial power and represents Vatican City in international relations.” L. Barbarito, ‘Vatican City, State of,’ **New Catholic Encyclopedia**, volume 14, p. 557*

One might ask how such a small city/state can exert so much worldwide clout. The answer lies in its hierarchical organizational system. Ellen White has described it well:

“The Roman Catholic Church, with all its ramifications throughout the world, forms one vast organization under the control, and designed to serve the interests, of the papal see. Its millions

of communicants, in every country of the globe, are instructed to hold themselves as bound in allegiance to the pope. Whatever their nationality or their government, they are to regard the authority of the church as above all other. Though they may take the oath pledging their loyalty to the state, yet back of this lies the vow of obedience to Rome, absolving them from every pledge inimical to her interests.

*“History testifies of her artful and persistent efforts to insinuate herself into the affairs of the nations; and having gained a foothold, to further her own aims, even at the ruin of princes and people.” (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 580)*

Malachi Martin concurs with Ellen White’s assessment when he states that the Roman Catholic Papacy:

*“. . . places at the personal disposal of the Pope a supranational, supracontinental, supra-trade-bloc structure that is so built and oriented that if tomorrow or next week, by a sudden miracle a one-world government were established, the Church would not have to undergo any essential structural change in order to retain its dominant position and to further its global aims.” (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of This Blood**, p. 143)*

We will complete our survey of church/state amalgamation in Roman Catholicism with several quotations from church historians and theologians starting with Pope Leo XIII.

*“The church cannot give countenance or favor to those. . . who make it their aim and purpose to tear asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion with those of the state.” (Pope Leo XIII, **The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII**, ‘On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens,’ third edition (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 198*

*“Nor can we hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority be dissolved. It is clear, that these men, who yearn for a shameless liberty, live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests.” (Pope Leo XIII, **The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII**, ‘The Christian Constitution of States,’ third edition, (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 125*

Henry Edward Cardinal Manning makes the following telling statement:

*“Since the Council of Trent, the revolutions in France, Austria, and Italy have separated the civil powers from the unity of the Church. The nations remain Catholic as before, but many public laws are at variance with the laws of the Church. . . . It is of the highest moment to the civil powers of the world to readjust their relations with the Catholic Church; for so long as the public laws are at variance with its divine rights and liberties, internal peace and fidelity are hardly to be secured.” Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, **Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese** (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), first pastoral letter, pp. 82*

The textbook on public ecclesiastical law used at the Pontifical University in Rome, where the elite of the American clergy are trained, makes the duty of Catholics in the United States very clear:

“Catholics must make all possible efforts to bring about the rejection of this religious indifference of the State and the instauration, as soon as possible, of the wished-for union and concord of State and Church. . . . Whether tolerance of non-Catholic religions is promised under oath by statutory law or not, it can never be admitted.” (James Hastings Nichols, **Democracy and the Churches** (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), p. 266. The quotation which Hastings provides from, is *La Piana*, *Shane Quarterly*, April, 1942, pp. 92ff

“What the papacy aimed at was not simply to be a temporal power by reason of sovereignty over a little Italian state, but to exercise a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns by reason of the spiritual office of the pope, who was to be the master and arbiter of all other temporal authorities.

“The development of that ideal, the partial achievement of it, and some of the reactions against it are what we must now consider. Lest this should seem to the modern reader a threshing over of old straw and a discussion of dead issues, there should perhaps be inserted here a reminder that all the popes of the last six centuries have worn the triple tiara. According to present-day Roman Catholic authorities, its three crowns signify ‘universal episcopate, supremacy of jurisdiction, and universal supremacy.’ In the coronation of all popes—including Pius XII, on March 12, 1939—[and presumably any thereafter] the tiara is placed on the candidate’s head with the words: ‘Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ.’ If this phraseology had not been sanctified by long usage, it would not have been coined in this generation to express the relation of the pope to the political and social order; but it would not have been created in the first place if it had not meant then what it says—‘Ruler of the world.’” (Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, **Twenty Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History**, first edition (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1959), p. 120.

Notice the following chilling words from the official Jesuit journal *La Civiltà Cattolica*:

“The Roman Catholic Church convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword [a declaration which is suspect in the light of Roman Catholic history], but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a de facto existence, without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of dissenting groups, makes the complete application of this principle impossible, then the [Catholic] church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept as a minor evil, the de jure toleration of other forms of worship. In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all,

*resigned at being forced to cohabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to de facto conditions which must be taken into account in practical affairs. Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even de jure toleration, in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in a minority. We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically and practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.” (Quoted in, Robert McAfee Brown, **American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View**, ‘The Issues Which Divide Us,’ edited by Philip Scharper (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1959), pp. 82-86.*

In recent years a very significant book has been written by Malachi Martin, Jesuit priest. This book, **The Keys of this Blood**, discusses the struggle for world dominion among three globalist contenders: Capitalism, Communism and Roman Catholicism. Martin states:

*“There is one great similarity shared by all three of these globalist competitors. Each one has in mind a particular grand design for one world governance. . . . Their geopolitical competition is about which of the three will form, dominate and run the world system that will replace the decaying nation system.” (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of This Blood**, p. 18)*

And Martin makes it clear that this is an all-out, three way war for all the marbles:

*“No holds barred because, once the competition has been decided, the world and all that’s in it—our way of life as individuals and as citizens of the nations; our families and our jobs; our trade and commerce and money; our educational systems and our religions and our cultures; even the badges of our national identity, which most of us have always taken for granted—all will have been powerfully and radically altered forever. No one can be exempted from its effects. No sector of our lives will remain untouched. . . . Nobody who is acquainted with the plans of these three rivals has any doubt but that only one of them can win” (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of This Blood**, p. 16)*

Martin then explains how soon we can expect the winner to take over world control:

*“As to the time factor involved, those of us who are under seventy will see at least the basic structures of the new world government installed. Those of us under forty will surely live under its legislative, executive and judiciary authority and control.” (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, pp. 15-16)*

The question still remains, which of the three contenders is destined to prevail? Martin entertains no doubts that it will be the Roman Catholic Papacy. In fact, the basic thesis of the book is that Roman Catholicism will once again rule the world as she did during the Middle Ages. This result, according to Martin, has been predestined by God and is inevitable because Jesus promised Peter and his successors that not even the gates of hell would be able to

triumph over the Church. Let's examine a few of Martin's astounding statements concerning the Roman Catholic papacy:

*"In all phases of education, in all aspects of moral behavior and in all questions about the ultimate truths undergirding the life and death of every human being, this man [John Paul II] claims for his papal persona the right, the privilege, the duty and the due authority to stand **as judge**. . . . For, in the final analysis, John Paul II as the claimant Vicar of Christ does claim to be the **ultimate court of judgment** on the society of states as a society." (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, pp. 345, 375) Emphasis supplied*

*"The final prerequisite for georeligious capability is authority. The institution, in its organizational structures and undertakings, must have unique authority: an authority that is **centralized**; an authority that is **autonomous**, vis-a-vis all other authority on the supranational plane; an authority that carries with it such **sanctions** as are effective in maintaining the unity and the aims of the institution as it goes about its business of serving the greatest good of the community as a whole and in its every part." (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, p. 138) emphasis supplied*

Martin repeatedly affirms that John Paul II and the Roman Catholic papacy wish to return to the arrangement which existed in the middle Ages where the Church was in control of all spheres of life. Notice the following example:

*"In that world of early Europe, everything (politics, commerce, civil law, legitimate government, art, learning—all depended on the ecclesiastical structure that stretched from the pope to cardinals and bishops, priests and monks, and outward through all the ramifications of life." (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, p. 518)*

Speaking about the christianization of Europe in the fourth century and its aftermath, Martin remarks:

"Out of this new population, the Church diligently formed the matrix from which came the civilization that developed all those higher civil, political, artistic and cultural values treasured today as marks of progress and civilization—justice, compassion, democracy, dignity, the rights of man, even medicine and science. A new Europe now enjoyed a unity and a verve that the ancient Roman Empire, even at its apogee, had never been able to create.

"The centerpiece of it all was the man who sat on the throne of Simon Peter in the Holy See of Rome. Among the major players at the Round Table of international politics, no ruler could take command, no government could govern, no commerce could function, without the spiritual blessing and the imperial nod of the Roman Pope.

*"Moreover, whatever overlordship this man, the Roman Pontiff, exercised—whatever armies or fleets he commanded or could assemble; whatever binding laws he laid down governing civil, political, artistic and personal life throughout Europe—ultimately his right and claim to do so was based on his possession of Peter's Keys of supreme spiritual authority." (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, p. 134)*

Here Martin presents a rosy picture of a peaceful, democratic Europe where science flourished and democracy led to the respect of human rights and dignity. This picture is an aberration of the facts. Europe was really ravaged by disease, illiteracy, poverty and strife. Human rights were violated by horrendous mechanisms such as the Inquisition and wars were the order of the day. The question is: Do modern democratic nations wish to return to this style of government?

And for those who think that the Roman Catholic papacy is an archaic dinosaur system of bygone times, Martin has this ominous warning:

*“Any world leader who discounts the eternal revelations on which papal power claims to be based flirts with problems. But, at the same time, any world leader who takes the Roman Pontiff as possessing only the spiritual weapons of the unseen world and the afterlife with which to deal in practical, this worldly matters is making a strategic error of great proportions.” (Malachi Martin, **The Keys of this Blood**, p. 132)*

Martin makes it clear that the Roman Catholic papacy aims to recover her lost position as the geopolitical and georeligious leader of the world. In other words, she plans to gain both religious and political control of the world. Dave Hunt has discerned this intent in the following comment in his book, **Global Peace**:

*“Why do world leaders want to get into bed with the Vatican? The heads of state in today’s world all recognize that the Pope wields a power which in many ways is even greater than their own. It is not only Catholicism’s 900 million subjects and enormous wealth that causes the world’s most powerful governments to cultivate friendly relations with the Roman Catholic Church; it is because Vatican City’s citizens are found in great numbers in nearly every country. They constitute an international network that reaches into the inside circles of the world’s power centers.” (Dave Hunt, **Global Peace**, p. 116)*

And in remarks which could very well have been written by a Seventh-day Adventist [though Hunt is an Evangelical whose prophetic views are for the most part inimical to Adventism], Dave Hunt makes the following chilling remarks about the whole world wondering after the beast:

*“This indicates that not only Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy will be united, but that Protestants will join together with them, along with all of the world’s religions, including even the Muslims to form one new world religion. . . . It has become quite clear that the world religion under the Antichrist will not be atheism, Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, or even New Age. It will be Christianity, but in a paganized form. Exactly what it became under the leadership of Constantine and his successors, the popes. The coming world religion will have its headquarters in Rome.” (Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, pp. 39, 200)*

The papacy has come a long way since the French Revolution. The states which then withdrew their support from her are now flirting with her once again. Truly those who forget the lessons of history are doomed to repeat its mistakes. Little do the political systems of the world realize the geopolitical and georeligious aspirations of the Papacy. Tragically, prophecy predicts that

they will wake up to realize their colossal mistake only when it is too late to do anything about it. Truly, the papacy is a different power because it is an amalgamation of church and state!

Characteristic #10:

The little horn was to govern for a period expressed as ‘time, times and the dividing of time’ (Daniel 7:25; see also, Revelation 12:14). This period is also described as 1260 days (Revelation 11:3; 12:6) and 42 months (Revelation 11:2; 13:5). Virtually all Bible scholars agree that ‘time’ means one year, ‘times’ is a dual form which means ‘two years’ and ‘the dividing of time’ means one half year. But very few contemporary scholars believe that the year/day principle must be applied to these time periods. Both preterists and futurists take these periods as three and a half literal years. Seventh-day Adventists, on the other hand, apply the year/day principle and with good reason (at this point, study the document by Stephen P. Bohr, ‘*Twenty Reasons to Apply the Year/Day Principle*’).

We have already noted (characteristic # 4), how the Roman Catholic papacy came to power. Through the help of the state, the papacy overthrew the unorthodox Heruli (493) and Vandals (534). But one rival power remained, the Arian Ostrogoths.

As we have previously seen, Justinian gave his famous decree in **533** making the pope the ‘head of all the holy churches’ in the East and in the West and promising to exert all his power to ‘increase the honor and authority’ of the pope’s See. But this official decree of the state could not be fully enforced until the rebel Ostrogoths were uprooted. In **February of 538** (note the date!) the Ostrogoths were dealt a devastating defeat from which they never recovered. At this point the state’s decree could be fully enforced.

It seems more than coincidence that precisely 1260 years after Justinian’s decree, on November 26, **1793**, the French government, through its Legislative Assembly, proclaimed an official decree abolishing religion and forbidding its free exercise. Churches were closed and Bibles were burned in the public plaza. Concerning this, Sir Walter Scott states:

“And as the recognition of the supremacy of the Pope seemed thus to be complete in the year 533, on the part of the emperor [Justinian] who put the power in his hands, so, in like rapid and yet graduated progress, with the same appointed space intervening, the dominion of the Papacy was destroyed and disannulled in that kingdom which had been its chief stay for ages, in the year 1793, the power was wholly taken out of the hands of the Pope, and infidelity, or rather atheism, was proclaimed, and popery was abolished.

*“The churches were in most districts of France closed against priests and worshipers—the bells were broken and cast into canon—and the whole ecclesiastical establishment destroyed.” (Sir Walter Scott, ***Life of Napoleon***, volume 2, p. 306; cited in, Alexander Keith, ***The Signs of the Times***, volume 2 (Edinburgh: William Whyte & Co., 1833), pp. 93, 94)*

W. H. Hutton also comments on the significance of 1793:

*“On November 26, 1793, the Convention, of which seventeen bishops and some clergy were members, decreed the abolition of all religion.” (W. H. Hutton, ***Age of Revolution***, p. 156)*

And, exactly 1260 years after the Ostrogoths had been uprooted by Emperor Justinian General Berthier entered Vatican City, removed Pope Pius VI from his throne and told him that his power was finished. Notably, the date was **February 10, 1798** (for more on the meaning of Berthier's act and documentation from historians, see characteristic # 9).

Thus 538 and 1798 are closely related. In 538 the pope was given universal sovereignty by the implementation of an imperial decree and in 1798 the pope was removed from that sovereignty by an official act of the emperor, Napoleon Bonaparte. And the power was removed exactly 1260 years, to the month, after it was given. Surely this is more than a historical coincidence!! The acid test of historical fulfillment requires that the year/day principle be applied to the 1260 days.

In 1986, Malachi Martin, a Roman Catholic Jesuit priest, made the following remarkable statement about the papacy:

*"[For] **fifteen hundred years** and more, Rome had kept as strong a hand as possible in each local community around the wide world. . . . By and large, and admitting some exceptions, that had been the Roman view until **two hundred years of inactivity** had been **imposed** upon the papacy by the **major secular powers of the world.**"* Quoted in ***Christianity Today*** (November 21, 1986), p. 26.

In this remarkable statement, Martin makes three very important points: 1) Though we would dispute the historical accuracy of the universal dominion of the papacy for **fifteen hundred** years, it is significant that Martin does admit that the papacy had a career of over one thousand years of dominion, 2) for two hundred years the papacy has been inactive (two hundred years before 1986 would place us approximately at the French Revolution). This fits perfectly with Ellen White's statement, previously quoted, where she warns that if secular powers remove their restraint, the papacy will regain its power and 3) this inactivity was imposed by the major secular powers of the world.

Even Dave Hunt, a futurist who believes that the little horn represents a literal person who will sit in a rebuilt Jewish temple for three and a half literal years admits that the papacy had an apostate career which lasted over one millennium. Speaking about the reaction of the church when the Edict of Milan was proclaimed by Constantine, Hunt remarks:

*"Freedom at last from persecution seemed like a gift from God. Unfortunately, it set the stage for an apostasy that would envelop Christendom for **more than a millennium**. Christ's bride had been wedded to paganism."* Dave Hunt, ***A Woman Rides the Beast***, p. 202-203.

Again, Hunt writes:

*"Rome's dominance of Church and world for **more than a thousand years** through excommunication, torture and death had led to corruption of such proportions that even the secular world recoiled in shame and horror. . . . The truth is that Roman Catholicism did not represent Christ and was not His Church. For **at least a thousand years** before the reformation*

*the true church was composed of multitudes of simple Christians who were not part of the Roman **system**.*" (Dave Hunt, **A Woman Rides the Beast**, pp. 190, 254. Emphasis supplied)

It is perplexing indeed that Hunt is not able to see the fulfillment of the little horn in the Roman Catholic papacy. Above, he speaks of more than 1000 years of papal dominion, of the persecution of the saints, of a faithful church during this period, and of a corrupt system which claimed to represent Christ and yet was apostate. Though he apparently doesn't realize it, his description of this period fits perfectly with the depiction in Revelation 12:6, 13-15 and Daniel 7:25. But Hunt fails to see the connection between prophecy and history because he is looking at prophecy through futurist eyeglasses.

Hunt's blindness is all the more amazing when we consider his description of what, in his view, the final individual Antichrist will be like:

*"While the Greek prefix 'anti' generally means 'against' or 'opposed to,' it can also mean 'in the place of' or 'a substitute for.' The Antichrist will embody both meanings. He will oppose Christ while **pretending to be Christ**. . . . When the time has come for his ascension to power—it will be in the midst of an **unprecedented global crisis**—he will be hailed as the world's savior, and so he will appear to be. . . . Instead of a frontal assault against Christianity, the evil one will **pervert the church from within** by posing as its founder. He will cunningly misrepresent Christ while **pretending to be Christ**. And by that process of **substitution** he will undermine and pervert all that Christ truly is. . . . If the Antichrist will indeed pretend to be the Christ, then his **followers must be 'Christians'**! The church of that day will without dissenting voice, hail him as its leader." Dave Hunt, **Global Peace**, pp. 7-8, 45, 200. Emphasis mine and italics his*

The fact is, we do not have to wait until the future for Hunt's description of the Antichrist to be fulfilled. Every single characteristic of Antichrist given by Hunt has already been fulfilled in the Roman Catholic papacy. Someone might question if the institution of the papacy arose in the midst of an unprecedented global crisis. Even a cursory glance at the history of the Roman Empire will reveal that the papacy arose when the Roman Empire was crumbling to pieces. It appeared that the empire was about to disappear from history. But it did not. It found in the papacy a unifying and saving force which kept the empire together. And the papacy governed exactly 1260 years!

What Hunt and other futurists fail to realize is that, according to Bible prophecy, the papacy was to have two periods of existence.. It governed in the past for three and a half prophetic times and then was dealt a deadly wound. But it will also govern in the future when it's deadly wound is healed. The only way the future career of the Antichrist can be understood is by discerning its past history. That is to say, only the method of historicism can provide a full and complete understanding of the Antichrist!

In contrast to Hunt, the historicist J. A. Wylie did see the papacy as the Antichrist. Notice Wylie's words:

"It is clear that Antichrist, as depicted by our Lord and by his apostle John, is to wear a mask, and to profess one thing and act another. He is to enter the church as Judas entered the

garden—professedly to kiss his Master, but in reality to betray him. He is to come with words of peace in his mouth, but war in his heart. He is to be a counterfeit Christ—Christ’s likeness stamped on base metal. He is to be an imitation of Christ—a close, clever, and astute imitation, which will deceive the world **for ages**, those only excepted who, taught by the Holy Spirit, shall be able to see through the disguise and detect the enemy under the mask of the friend.” J. A. Wylie, **The Papacy is the Antichrist** (Edinburgh: George M. Gibbon), pp. 17, 18. Emphasis supplied

Wylie shows that the word Antichrist does not mean primarily ‘against Christ’ but rather, ‘in place of Christ.’ Notice how Wylie connects the word Antichrist with the expression ‘Vicar of Christ’:

*The apostle John . . . speaking of the apostasy, the coming of which he predicts, styles it the ‘Antichrist.’ And we have also said that the Papacy, speaking through its representative and head, calls itself the ‘Vicar of Christ.’ The first, ‘antichrist,’ is a Greek word; the second, ‘vicar,’ is an English word; but the two are in reality one, for both words have the same meaning. Antichrist translated into English is vice-Christ, or Vicar of Christ; and Vicar of Christ, rendered into Greek, is ‘antichrist’—antichristos. If we can establish this—and the ordinary use of the word by those to whom the Greek was a vernacular, is decisive on the point—we shall have no difficulty in showing that this is the meaning of the word ‘Antichrist,’ even a vice-Christ. And if so, then every time the Pope claims to be the Vicar of Christ, he pleads at the bar of the world that he is the Antichrist.” J. A. Wylie, **The Papacy is the Antichrist** (Edinburgh: M. Gibbon), p. 2.*

Wylie is not inventing a new meaning for the word ‘Antichrist.’ It is true that in the Greek the preposition *anti* can mean ‘against.’ But it is equally true that this preposition can mean ‘instead of,’ ‘in place of,’ or ‘a substitute for.’ In classical Greek, for example, the word *antibasileus* means ‘one occupies the place of the king.’ One who fills the place of a consul is called *anthupatos*. In the New Testament the name Herod ‘Antipas’ means that Herod ruled ‘in place of’ his father. The word *antitype* means ‘that which takes the place of the type.’ Christ is spoken of as having given His life a ransom ‘in place of all’ (*antilutron*).

In all honesty we ask: How many powers arose after the fragmentation of the old Roman Empire, ruled for 1260 years and had a leader who claimed to occupy the place of Christ on earth? There is one and only one: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PAPACY!!!

One final statement on the 1260 days from the inspired writings of Ellen White:

*“The forty two months are the same as the ‘time and times and the dividing of time,’ three years and a half, or 1260 days, of Daniel 7—the time during which the papal power was to oppress God’s people. This period, as stated in preceding chapters, began with the supremacy of the papacy, A. D. 538, and terminated in 1798. At that time the pope was made captive by the French army, the papal power received its deadly wound, and the prediction was fulfilled, ‘He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity.’” Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 439*

Characteristic #11: The antichrist will have eyes like a man.

Abominations

There are several views of **antichrist** in the Bible: The abomination of desolation, the king of the north, the harlot, the beast, the man of sin and the little horn (in Daniel 7 and 8)

I want to focus on one characteristic that all of these portrayals of the antichrist have **in common**—his reliance on the **tradition of men** rather than on the **Word of God**

For some **background** let's begin our study in Ezekiel 8.

Abominations in Ezekiel

The book of Ezekiel is describing the spiritual condition of Jerusalem shortly before it was destroyed in the year 586 BC Ezekiel 8 is known as the 'abominations chapter' because it lists the abominations that were being committed in the city by the very ones who claimed to be God's people.

Ezekiel 8:15, 16:

*"Then He said to me, "Have you seen this, O son of man? Turn again, you will see greater **abominations** than these." ¹⁶ So He brought me into the **inner court of the Lord's house**; and there, at the door of the **temple of the Lord**, between the porch and the altar, were about twenty-five men with their **backs toward the temple** of the Lord and their faces toward the east, and they were **worshipping the sun** toward the east."*

Before the **first** destruction of Jerusalem Ezekiel emphasized that these **abominations** would lead to its imminent **desolation (Daniel 9:2, 18)**. Thus we have 'the abomination of desolation.'

In Ezekiel **11:22, 23** the prophet predicted how the Shekinah forsook the temple and lingered for a few moments on the Mount of Olives east of the City:

*"So the cherubim lifted up their wings, with the wheels beside them, and the glory of the God of Israel was high above them. And the glory of the Lord **went up from the midst of the city** and stood on the mountain, which is on the **east side of the city**."*

The Shekinah then left and the city was desolated by King Nebuchadnezzar.

Abomination in Matthew

Matthew 24:15: The word '**Abomination**' is also used in connection with the **second desolation** of Jerusalem by the Romans in the year 70 AD (it would be well to remember also that the apostasy and destruction of Jerusalem will have another fulfillment globally at the end of time. We will come back to this when we look at Revelation 17):

*"Therefore when you see the '**abomination of desolation**,' spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the **holy place**" (whoever reads, let him understand), ¹⁶ "then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains."*

Ellen White explains the nature of the abomination:

“When the idolatrous standards of the Romans [which had an eagle and a golden wreath and the Roman armies worshiped them] should be set up in the holy ground, which extended some furlongs outside the city walls, then the followers of Christ were to find safety in flight. When the warning sign should be seen, those who would escape must make no delay” The Great Controversy p. 26

Abomination during the 1260 Years

Daniel 11:30 affirms that during the 1260 years the king of the north would ‘have intelligence [be in agreement] with them that forsake the covenant’.

Deuteronomy 4:12-13: How would a Jew have understood the expression ‘forsake the covenant’?

“And the Lord spoke to you out of the midst of the fire. You heard the sound of the words, but saw no form; you only heard a voice. ¹³ So He declared to you His covenant which He commanded you to perform, the Ten Commandments; and He wrote them on two tablets of stone.”

Daniel 11:31 explains that during the 1260 years of papal dominion, the abomination of desolation would once again set up:

“And forces shall be mustered by him, and they [king of the north and the forces] shall defile the sanctuary fortress; then they [king of the north and forces] shall take away the daily sacrifices [the word ‘sacrifices’ is not in the original], and place there the abomination of desolation.”

Abomination in Revelation 17

Revelation 17:1, 2, 4: describes the great apostasy that will exist in the religious world in the end time.

“Then one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls came and talked with me, saying to me, “Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot [an apostate church] who sits on many waters [the multitudes], ² with whom the kings of the earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth were made drunk [fermented or corrupted wine] with the wine of her fornication.”... ⁴ The woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold and precious stones and pearls, having in her hand a golden cup full of abominations [the wine is composed of her abominations] and the filthiness of her fornication.”

The wine of Babylon is composed of her abominations. And what is meant by the word ‘abominations’? Scripture uses this word to describe several things: idol worship, teaching that it is not necessary to keep the law, attempting to speak with or to the dead, saying it is alright

to eat unclean foods and teaching that one can be saved by his/her own works. But the greatest of all abominations, as we have seen in Ezekiel, is worshipping the sun.

The Beast has a Human Number

Revelation 13:18: The beast speaks blasphemies, persecutes de saints, tramples on the heavenly sanctuary, has a mark of its authority and rules for 42 months.

"Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man [better: 'the number of man']: His number is 666." [We will come back to this number at the end of this presentation]

The Man of Sin and Lawlessness

2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4, 7: These verses describe the Man of Sin who leads out in the mystery of lawlessness:

"Let no one deceive you by any means; for that Day will not come unless the falling away comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition, ⁴ who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he sits as God in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . ⁷ For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; only He who now restrains will do so until He is taken out of the way."

The Conniving Little Horn of Daniel 8

Daniel 8:23, 25: Describes the same little horn as **Daniel 7**. The little horn is described as a king with a fierce countenance. The picture is one of a leader who is a sly, slithery, cunning and crafty politician who uses crafty human wisdom and knowledge to deceive. Let's notice how various versions translate the key phrases of **Daniel 8:23, 25**:

NKJV:

"And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors have reached their fullness, a king shall arise, having fierce features who understands sinister schemes. . . . ²⁵ through his cunning he shall cause deceit to prosper under his rule."

NIV: ". . . a stern-faced king, a master of intrigue. . . He will cause deceit to prosper"

NASB: ". . . insolent and skilled in intrigue. . . and through his shrewdness he will cause deceit to succeed by his influence."

ESV: ". . . A king of bold face, one who understands riddles . . . by his cunning he shall make deceit prosper."

NET: ". . . a rash and deceitful king . . . by his treachery he will succeed through deceit."

God's Word: “. . . stern-looking king who understands mysterious things. . . He will cleverly use his power to deceive others successfully.”

NRSV: “. . . a king of bold countenance shall arise, skilled in intrigue . . . by his cunning he shall make deceit prosper under his hand.”

LIVING BIBLE: “. . . an angry king shall rise to power with great shrewdness and intelligence . . . he will be a master of deception.”

AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION: “. . . king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences . . . and through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand.”

AMPLIFIED: “. . . a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark trickery and craftiness shall stand up . . . and through his policy he shall cause trickery to prosper in his hand”

Meaning of the Word

The word is used in several places in the Old Testament and it always refers to using crafty intelligence to unlock riddles, mysteries or dark sayings. It is used eight times of Samson's riddles (Judges 14), of the Queen of Sheba who came to test Solomon's wisdom with her hard questions (I Kings 10:1).

Proverbs 1:5-6

“A wise man will hear and increase learning, and a man of understanding will attain wise counsel⁶ to understand a proverb and an enigma, the words of the wise and their riddles.”

But in Daniel 8 we are not dealing with the sanctified use of wisdom and intelligence but rather a corruption of it.

Ezekiel 28:2-5, 12, 17: The word is used of Lucifer who corrupted his wisdom.

“...Because your heart is lifted up, and you say, 'I am a god, I sit in the seat of gods, in the midst of the seas,' yet you are a man, and not a god, though you set your heart as the heart of a god³ (Behold, you are wiser than Daniel! There is no secret that can be hidden from you!⁴ With your wisdom and your understanding you have gained riches for yourself, and gathered gold and silver into your treasuries;⁵ by your great wisdom in trade you have increased your riches, and your heart is lifted up because of your riches). . .¹² You were the seal of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. . .¹⁷ Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor.”

Daniel 7:8

Daniel 7 portrays a sequence of powers. Let's review them:

- Babylon (605-539 BC)
- Medes and Persians (539-331 BC)
- Greece (331-168 BC)
- Rome (168 BC – 476 AD)
- Divisions of Rome (476-538 AD)
- Little horn (538 AD – 1798 AD 'eyes like a man')

But the text that especially interests us in this study is Daniel 7:8 where the little horn is described as having '**eyes** like the **eyes** of a man.'

"I was considering the horns, and there was another horn, a little one, coming up among them, before whom three of the first horns were plucked out by the roots. And there, in this horn, were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking pompous words."

It is important to remember that Daniel 7 contains a symbolic portrayal. The four beasts, the heads, the wings, the sea, the winds, the ten horns, the little horn, the mouth, the actions and the time period of the little horn are all symbolic and therefore the eyes must also represent something beyond the literal.

The **question** is: What do eyes represent, **symbolically speaking**? Let's see.

Symbolic of Wisdom

It is common knowledge that 'eyes' in Scripture are employed to represent '**wisdom**' '**knowledge**' or '**understanding**.'

Many examples of this exist. With relation to God, eyes are employed to depict His **all-encompassing knowledge and understanding**, that is, His omniscience.

Symbolic Meaning of Eyes

Ezekiel 10:12: The four living creatures that are in charge of administrating the universe are full of eyes because they carry on God's work with absolute wisdom.

"And their whole body, with their back, their hands, their wings, and the wheels that the four had, were full of eyes all around."

Revelation 5:6: Seven eyes represent the omniscience of the Holy Spirit.

*“And I looked, and behold, in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as though it had been slain, having seven horns and **seven eyes**, which are the **seven Spirits** of God sent out into all the earth.”*

Zechariah 4:10

*“For who has despised the day of small things? For these **seven** rejoice to see the plumb line in the hand of Zerubbabel. They are the **eyes of the Lord**, which scan to and fro throughout the whole earth.”*

Proverbs 15:3

*“The **eyes** of the Lord are in every place, **keeping watch** on the evil and the good.”*

Hebrews 4:12, 13

*“For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a **discerner** of the thoughts and intents of the heart. ¹³ And there is no creature hidden from His **sight**, but all things are naked and open to the **eyes** of Him to whom we must give account.”*

With respect to **man**, eyes are also employed to represent **discernment, knowing or understanding** but in contrast to God, man’s understanding is **finite**.

Ephesians 1:15-18

*“Therefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and your love for all the saints, ¹⁶ do not cease to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers: ¹⁷ that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give to you the spirit of **wisdom** and revelation in the **knowledge** of Him, ¹⁸ the **eyes of your understanding being enlightened**; that you may know what is the hope of His calling, what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints.”*

Proverbs 3:19-21

*“The Lord by **wisdom** founded the earth; by **understanding** He established the heavens; ²⁰ By His **knowledge** the depths were broken up, and clouds drop down the dew. ²¹ My son, let them not depart from your **eyes**—keep sound **wisdom** and **discretion**.”*

Acts 26:17-18

*“I will deliver you from the Jewish people, as well as from the Gentiles, to whom I now send you, ¹⁸ to **open their eyes**, in order to turn them from **darkness to light**, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith in Me.’*

Even today **the owl** is employed as a symbol of intelligence or understanding because of its **large eyes!** We use the expression: "**wise as an owl**". **Graduation cards** use the owl frequently. The eyes of Owls are fixed but they can turn their necks up to 270 degrees

Now, if 'eyes' represent '**wisdom**' or '**understanding**', then **human** eyes must represent **human** wisdom or knowledge. This must mean that the little horn depends on **human wisdom** or understanding even though it claims to exercise the power and **prerogatives of God!**

And what is its primary objective?

Daniel 7:25:

*"He shall speak pompous words against the Most High, shall persecute the saints of the Most High, and shall intend to **change times and law**. Then the saints shall be given into his hand for a time and times and half a time."*

Numerical Value of the Greek Alphabet

Alpha	α	1
Beta	β	2
Gamma	γ	3
Delta	δ	4
Épsilon	ε	5
Stigma	ζ	6
Zeta	ζ	7
Eta	η	8
Theta	θ	9
Iota	ι	10
Kappa	κ	20
Lamda	λ	30
Mu	μ	40
Nu	ν	50
Xi	ξ	60
Omicron	ο	70
Pi	π	80
Ro	ρ	100
Sigma	σ ς	200
Tau	τ	300
Upsilon	υ	400
Phi	φ	500
Chi	χ	600
Psi	ψ	700
Omega	ω	800

Jesus (Iesous)

Jesus: I (10) E (8) S (200) O (70) U (400) S (200) = 888

Cross (stauros)

Cross: ST (6) A (1) U (400) R (100) O (70) S (200) = 777

Tradition (*Paradosis*)

P (80) A (1) R (100) A (1) D (4) O (70) S (200) I (10) S (200) = 666

Notice the interesting picture of the priest at the voting in the Colombian presidential election:

- The photographer and newspaper are oblivious to the meaning of the number.
- A priest comes to the table.
- His sleeve covers up one of the numbers.
- The photographer is at that particular table at that particular moment.

LESSON #14 – THE JEWISH VIEW OF TRADITION

Introduction

Last time we studied one characteristic of the little horn that rarely is touched upon, the eyes like the eyes of man. We saw that in the Bible eyes represent wisdom so this system must base its teachings on human wisdom.

How can the Roman Catholic Church justify teaching doctrines and commanding observances that are not found in the Bible either explicitly or implicitly? Doctrines such as the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption of Mary, Mary as the mediator, celibacy of the priesthood, the sacrifice of the Mass, Lent, infant baptism, baptism by sprinkling, the Confessional, indulgences, praying to the dead, reciting the Rosary, not eating meat on Fridays, bowing before idols, keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath, etc? The answer is: Because of its concept of tradition.

The Jewish View of Tradition

In order to better comprehend how the Roman Catholic Church can teach these human traditions that have no foundation whatever in the written word of God, we must go back to the times of Christ and examine the Jewish view of divine revelation in the times of Christ, particularly the view of the Scribes and Pharisees. We shall find in our study that the Roman Catholic Church has replicated the Jewish view!

The Jewish view of tradition in the days of Christ was composed of three complimentary elements:

- A deposit of Tradition composed of the writings of Moses and the unwritten traditions given orally to Moses
- A transmitting mechanism to pass on in a trustworthy manner from generation to generation the writings of Moses and the unwritten traditions
- A living teaching office in each generation that could, infallibly, explain, apply, amplify and bring forth from the deposit of Tradition the truths that were found in the writings of Moses and the unwritten traditions
- The key words are ‘tradition’, ‘receive’, ‘pass on’ ‘hold’

The Deposit of Revelation (written and oral): the word Tradition in singular

The Scribes and Pharisees believed that when God spoke to **Moses on Mt. Sinai**, He not only revealed what Moses **actually wrote in the Pentateuch** but He also revealed **many** other **oral traditions** which **Moses did not commit to writing**.

Thus, in their view, there was an **original deposit** [singular] of truth revealed by God which was composed of **two sources**: the [1] **written revelation** and the [2] **unwritten traditions**.

Equal Authority

Though **at first** the **written** revelation was given a **position of higher authority** than the unwritten traditions, in the time of Christ as can be clearly seen in the gospels, the **unwritten traditions** had assumed a **position of higher authority** than what Moses actually wrote.

The **International Standard Bible Encyclopedia** expresses the Jewish concept of tradition in this way:

*“It [tradition] means, in Jewish theology, the Oral teachings of the elders (distinguished ancestors from Moses on) which were revered by the late Jews **equally** with the written teachings of the Old Testament, and were regarded by them as equally authoritative on matters of belief and conduct.”*

A Trustworthy Transmitting Agent

It was necessary to have some mechanism whereby the **written** traditions in the **deposit of tradition** could be **preserved** and **passed on** from generation to generation in a **trustworthy manner**.

Passing on the written word was not a major problem. But **how could** the oral traditions that were passed on by word of mouth from generation to generation be **kept pure**? As is well known, with the **passing of time**, things that are passed on **orally** become **distorted** and are therefore **untrustworthy**.

The scholars came up with the idea that it was necessary to have an **accurate and faithful transmitting agent** that would keep the oral traditions **pure and unadulterated** as they were passed along from **generation to generation**.

And so the **Pharisees** believed and taught that the written and unwritten revelation was reliably **passed on from generation to generation** by an **unbroken succession** of highly educated **spiritual leaders** beginning with Moses and culminating with the **rabbis** in the days of Christ.

The **Interpreter’s Bible Dictionary** captures well this Jewish concept of tradition:

*“The Talmud [a compilation of the oral traditions] which was at first mainly oral, grew out of the conviction that **besides the written Torah** (Law)--the Bible--there had been from the first, from*

the divine communications to Moses at Sinai onward, an oral Torah handed down from generation to generation, which lawgiver and prophets sought to engrave on the hearts of the people. As teacher succeeded teacher in the synagogue and school, their teachings and often conflicting opinions, all based on the Bible, were treasured. Through long practice the power of memorizing had been greatly strengthened, but the accumulated mass of oral traditions and teachings became so unwieldy that the best memory could not be trusted [therefore they were written in the Talmud].” (The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible, volume 4, p. 511)

Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee and who was born in the year 37 A. D. described this transmission process:

‘. . . The Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the law of Moses.’ (Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, 13.10.6, emphasis supplied)

Marcel Simon, in his excellent book, Jewish Sects, offers a helpful explanation of the words of Josephus. After stating that the Pharisees went beyond the written text of the Scriptures and qualified and expanded it, Simon remarks:

“In their eyes [of the Pharisees], the tradition that they invoked in doing this [of going beyond the text], far from opposing the Torah [the five books of Moses], was the natural prolongation and explication of it. This tradition went back to Moses himself, just as did the Torah. An oral law was revealed to Moses along with the written law, and this oral law was faithfully transmitted from generation to generation.” (Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 34-35

Process of Transmission

Simon then quotes the famous words in the Talmud found in *Aboth* [“the Fathers”] 1:1-2:

“[1] Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to [2] Joshua, and Joshua to the [3] elders, and the elders to the [4] Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the [5] Great Synagogue [after the Captivity].”

Simon remarks that after describing this process of transmission in verses 1, 2 the Talmud provides (in verses 2-13) an “. . . enumeration of several pairs of teachers (‘Antigonus of Soko received the Law from Simeon the Just, etc.’) whose historical existence is more or less certain. The list finally ends with Hillel and Shammai, famous leaders of schools [in the days of Christ] (Beth Hillel and Beth Shammai).” (Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), p. 35

It is obvious that the *Talmud* is attempting to prove that oral tradition was transmitted in an unbroken succession of scholars from the time of Moses till the days of the Scribes and Pharisees in the days of Christ.

George Foot Moore, in his monumental work, Judaism, concurs with Simon:

*'The Book of the Law of Moses might be a **final law**, but it was **not a finished law**. Many things which had . . . been generally observed and were regarded as necessary and binding were **not contained in it at all**. Some of these figure in later times as 'traditions of **Moses** from Sinai'; others as ordinances of **Ezra**, or of the **prophets** of his time, or the men of the **Great Synagogue**, or more indefinitely of the **Soferim**, or the Early Elders.'* (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1 (New York: Schocken Books, 1974), p. 30

*"In tracing the **continuous tradition** of the Law from **Moses** to the days of **Shammai and Hillel**—**[1] Moses, [2] Joshua, the [3] elders, the prophets**,--the *Pirke Abot* has, **[4] The prophets transmitted** it to the men of the **[5] Great Synagogue.**' The last in the prophetic **succession** were **Haggai and Zechariah**, who had a leading part in the rebuilding of the temple, and **Malachi**, whom the Jews made a contemporary of the other two. These **were the link** between their predecessors in the prophetic tradition and the **Great Synagogue**. . . . 'Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi **received the tradition** from the prophets; the men of the Great Synagogue received it from Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.'" (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1, p. 31)*

The question is, **how** did the men of the **Great Synagogue pass on** these traditions to the succeeding generations? Moore answers:

*"Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue were believed to have introduced these institutions and regulations by ordinances having the force of law, as their **successors**, the Soferim, and the Rabbis who **succeeded** them did."* (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1, p. 33)

Thus, in the minds of the compilers of the *Talmud*, the process of unbroken transmission was complete: **[1] Moses, [2] Joshua, [3] Elders, Prophets, the men of the Great Synagogue** [of which Ezra was the originator, according to the Jewish interpretation of Ezra 7:11-12], **Soferim or later elders** and finally the **Rabbis**.

Moore underlines the fact that *'to be of any use such a **chain of tradition** must possess **unbroken continuity**.'* (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, p. 35)

A Living Teaching Office

But there was one more element in the view of Tradition that was upheld by the Scribes and the Pharisees. It was not sufficient to have a deposit of tradition and a transmitting agent. It was also necessary, according to the Pharisees, to have a **living voice** or **teaching office** (the word 'rabbi' means 'teacher') **in each generation** to **authoritatively interpret, explain, draw forth** and **apply** the Tradition to contemporary life.

Thus it was not sufficient to have a **[1] deposit of written and oral tradition** and for this tradition to **[2] have been passed on authentically** from generation to generation. Also needed was a **[3] living interpreter** who could define what was a genuine tradition and what was not.

According to **Simon** this idea of the transmission of oral tradition:

“. . . made Pharisaism the **living element** of official Judaism. It was the **tradition** that allowed the Pharisees to justify all the **elaborations** that they introduced regarding the scriptural precepts, on the level of **observances** as well as on the level of **doctrine**.” (Simon, pp. 35-36)
Thus the Scribes and the Pharisees became the authoritative **living interpreter** of both the **written** Torah and the **oral** traditions which had been **handed down** from previous generations.

Oral Tradition More Reliable

Moore also points out that these regulations of oral law came to be **venerated even more than the written** Revelation:

“The **distinction** between the ordinances and decrees of the **Scribes** (Soferim) and the **biblical law** is constantly made in the juristic literature but the authority of the Scribes or the Learned to make such regulations was not questioned, nor was the transgression or neglect of their rules a venial offense. On the contrary, a **more serious matter** is made of the words of the Scribes than of the words of the (written) law.” (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1, pp. 33-34)

The Voice of God

In the same vein, **Dr. Geike** in his excellent work, **Life and Words of Jesus**, states:

“From their pupils the rabbis demanded the most profound **reverence**. ‘The honor,’ says the Talmud, ‘due to a teacher **borders on that due to God** [very similar to Roman Catholicism]’ The common discourse of a rabbi was to be revered **as much as the law**. To dispute with one, or to murmur against him, was a crime **as great** as to do the same toward the **Almighty**. Their WORDS must be received as **WORDS OF THE LIVING GOD**.” (Quoted in, E. J. Hibbard, **The Two Laws: Object Function and Duration of Each** (Mountain View, California, reprinted in 1989 by Leaves of Autumn), p. 46.

The teachings of the rabbis were also reckoned **practically infallible** as we can see from the following quotation also from Dr. Geike:

“It was a principle universally accepted that ‘the sayings of the scribes were **weightier** than those of the law.’ The **transmission** of the as-yet-unwritten opinions of former rabbis--forming an ever-growing **mass of tradition**--was the special aim of the rabbis of each age. . . . Once uttered, a rabbi’s words remained **LAW FOREVER** [unchangeable and infallible], though they might be **explained away** and **virtually ignored** while affected to be followed.” (Quoted in, E. J. Hibbard, **The Two Laws: Object, Function and Duration of Each** (Mountain View, California, reprinted in 1989 by Leaves of Autumn), p. 46

The role of this teaching office, however, went **far beyond** just **explaining** and **applying** the oral and written revelation to everyday life.

The rabbis frequently **brought forth religious practices and beliefs** which were **not implicitly** and **much less explicitly** contained in the written revelation. When they did this, were they claiming to bring forth **new truth not previously revealed** by God? Not at all! They taught that

these truths were **part of the deposit of unwritten traditions** which God had previously revealed to Moses. They believed that though these traditions had not previously been brought to light, they **had been preserved in the deposit Tradition** which had been **handed down** from generation to generation. In other words, the rabbis believed that they were merely bringing these truths to light or **discovering them in the deposit** of oral tradition.

The Issue of Authority to Teach

This brings us to the issue of **authority**. The Pharisees believed that only an **elite cadre** of carefully **trained theological experts** guided by God could **bring to light, explain, interpret and apply** the **written** Scriptures as well as the **unwritten** traditions.

This was what Jesus was speaking to when He remarked in **Matthew 23:2** that the Pharisees ‘sit on Moses’ **cathedra**.’ Concerning the meaning of this expression, the Roman Catholic **Jerome Bible Commentary** states:

*“The phrase is most probably a **metaphor** for the **authority** of the scribes to teach. In rabbinical tradition the interpretation of the Law was carried on in a scribal tradition that theoretically went back through an **unbroken chain** of scribes to Moses. This view is, of course, **entirely unhistorical**.” (The **Jerome Bible Commentary**, volume 2 (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 102)*

When the Pharisees and Scribes **spoke ex-cathedra**, that is, ‘from (Moses’) the throne,’ their word was to be accepted as **final**. The **general populace** was required **to accept** these rabbinical views and interpretations and to **obey them without question**. Thus the **genuine meaning** of both the written Scriptures and the unwritten traditions could **only be determined by the rabbis** and the general populace had **no say in the matter!** Concerning this, George Foot Moore remarks:

*“Learning is the privilege of leisure. Husbandmen and artisans are the support of the social structure, but, wholly occupied as they must be in their several callings and often highly expert in them, they have **no time** for the wide-ranging studies that make the **scholar**. They are therefore **not qualified** to be called to the council or to take the lead in the assembly; they cannot sit on the judge’s bench, for they **do not understand the principles of the law**, and cannot bring out the rights of the case and a just judgment. Different is the case of the man who gives his whole mind to it, and concentrates his thought on the law of the Most High. He will seek out the **wisdom of all the ancients** and occupy himself with the study of the prophecies, and pay attention to **expositions of famous men**, and will penetrate into the elusive turns of parables. He will search out the hidden meaning of proverbs, and will be versed in the enigmas of parables.” (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1, pp. 40-41)*

In this way the religious leaders had **absolute control** over **every person** and **sphere of public and private life**. Whoever **questioned the opinion or authority** of the rabbis was in danger of being **cast out of the synagogue**, as we can see from the story of the man who was **born blind** (John 9:22)

Jesus spoke to this problem in **Matthew 23:13** when He accused the Scribes and Pharisees of **closing the kingdom** of heaven to men as well as to themselves:

*"But woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you **shut up the kingdom** of heaven against men; for you neither go in yourselves, nor do you allow those who are entering to go in."*

What Jesus meant by this is found in the parallel passage of **Luke 11:52** where He accused the doctors of the law of **taking away** the **key of knowledge** which would have opened the door to the kingdom of heaven both to them and to the people:

*"Woe to you lawyers! For you have taken away the **key of knowledge**. You did not enter in yourselves, and those who were entering in you hindered."*

Stranglehold on the People

Jesus' rebuke of the Scribes and Pharisees in **Matthew 23** had the intention of **breaking the stranglehold** which they had over the people. George Foot Moore writes about the **influence** which the Scribes and Pharisees had **on the people**:

*"The **Scribes**, on the other hand, had the support of the **Pharisaean** party, to which many of them belonged. The Pharisees in turn had **the people behind them**, and with the growing importance of the synagogue, the **professionally educated class** gained increasing influence as the teachers of the people." (George Foot Moore, **Judaism**, volume 1, p. 43)*

Flavius Josephus adds this testimony:

*"The Pharisees have delivered to the **common people** by **tradition** from a **continuous succession of fathers** certain legal regulations which are **not written** in the Law of Moses, on which account the Sadducean sort rejects them, affirming that what is written is to be regarded as law, but what comes from the **tradition of the fathers** is not to be observed. On this point the Pharisees **have the mass of the people on their side**, and they have **so much influence that anything they say, even against a king or a high priest, finds ready credence.**" (Flavius Josephus, **Antiquities of the Jews**, xvii.2.4., paragraph 41)*

Ellen White concurs with this in the following words:

*"The interest of the people in Christ and His work had steadily increased. They were charmed with His teaching, but they were also **greatly perplexed**. They had **respected** the priests and rabbis for their intelligence and apparent piety. In all religious matters they had ever **yielded implicit obedience to their authority**. Yet they now saw these men trying to cast discredit upon Jesus, a teacher whose virtue and knowledge shone forth the brighter from every assault. . . . Through their reverence for **tradition** and their **blind faith in a corrupt priesthood, the people were enslaved.**" (Ellen G. White, **The Desire of Ages**, p. 611, 612)*

Scholarship in Christ's Day

From the extant sources we know that much of the scholarship in Christ's day consisted in quoting from what previous rabbis and fathers had said about Scripture and tradition rather than from the Scripture itself. Thus the opinions of men took the place of the Word of God. Regarding the teaching method of the rabbis Ellen White makes this telling statement:

"The teaching of the scribes and the Pharisees was a continuous repetition of fables and childish traditions. Their opinions and ceremonies rested on the authority of ancient maxims and rabbinical sayings which were frivolous and worthless. Christ did not dwell on weak and insipid saying and theories of men." (Ellen G. White, The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, 'The Word of God,' August 22, 1907)

She states further:

"The teaching of the scribes and elders was cold and formal, like a lesson learned by rote. They explained the law as a matter of custom, but no authority from God sanctified their utterances, no holy inspiration stirred their own hearts and those of their hearers." (Ellen G. White, The Spirit of Prophecy, volume 2, p. 176)

LESSON #15 – A CASE STUDY: MARK 7:1-13

Review

In our last study together I read a series of quotations from Flavius Josephus, Marcel Simon and George Foot Moore on the Jewish concept of tradition in the times of Jesus. The Jews in the days of Christ believed in:

- A deposit of Tradition which was composed of the writings of Moses and the unwritten oral traditions
- A transmitting mechanism to pass on in a trustworthy manner from generation to generation the writings of Moses and the unwritten traditions. This required an unbroken succession of religious scholars who kept the Tradition pure.
- An authoritative, authentic living teaching office in each generation composed of professional scholars who could, infallibly explain, apply, amplify and bring forth from the deposit of Tradition the truths that were found in the writings of Moses and the unwritten traditions
- The key words are ‘tradition’, ‘receive’, ‘pass on’ ‘hold’
- Talmud in *Aboth* [“the Fathers”] 1:1-2 describes the process of transmission:

“[1] Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to [2] Joshua, and Joshua to the [3] elders, and the elders to the [4] Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the [5] Great Synagogue [after the Captivity].”

Verses 3-13 then affirm that the men of the Great Synagogue passed the Tradition by an unbroken succession of scholars from Simeon the Just in the days of Ezra to Shammai and Hillel in the days of Christ

Today we will study a passage in the gospel of Mark where this view of tradition is vividly described - Mark 7:1-13. Here is the passage with certain key expression emphasized:

Mark 7:1-13

“Then the Pharisees and some of the scribes came together to Him, having come from Jerusalem. ² Now when they saw some of His disciples eat bread with defiled, that is, with

unwashed hands, they found fault. ³ For the Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they wash their hands in a special way, **holding the tradition of the elders**. ⁴ When they come from the marketplace, they do not eat unless they wash. And there are **many other things** which they have **received** and **hold**, like the washing of cups, pitchers, copper vessels, and couches. ⁵ Then the Pharisees and scribes asked Him, "Why do Your disciples not **walk** according to the **tradition of the elders**, but eat bread with unwashed hands?" ⁶ He answered and said to them, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: 'This people honors Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me.' ⁷ And in vain they worship teaching as **doctrines the commandments of men**.' ⁸ For laying aside the **commandment of God**, you **hold** the **tradition of men** — the washing of pitchers and cups, and **many other such things** you do." ⁹ He said to them, "All too well you reject the **commandment of God**, that you may keep **your tradition**." ¹⁰ For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.' ¹¹ But you say, 'If a man says to his father or mother: "Whatever profit you might have received from me is Corban"—'(that is, a gift to God), ¹² then you no longer let him do anything for his father or his mother, ¹³ making the **word of God of no effect** through your **tradition** which you have **handed down**. And **many such things** you do."

Technical Terminology

We are immediately struck by the technical terminology we have already found in rabbinical sources:

- '**Holding** to the **Tradition of the elders**' (7:3)
- 'Which they have **received** to **hold**' (7:4)
- '**Tradition of the elders**' (7: 5)
- 'hold the **tradition** of men (7:8)
- 'your **tradition**' (7:9)
- '**tradition** which you have **handed down**' (7:13)

The word 'received' indicates a process of transmission from previous generations as does the word 'tradition'. In fact, the word 'tradition' is used only in the singular in this passage indicating that we are dealing here with a single body or deposit of tradition of which the ceremonial washing of hands is only one element.

The word 'hold' also indicates the existence of a deposit which they preserved in their day from previous generations.

A Group of Spies

Mark 1:

"Then the **Pharisees** and some of the **scribes** came together to Him, having come from Jerusalem."

Why did these religious leaders come from Jerusalem to where Christ was teaching?

Review and Herald March 8, 1898:

“This deputation was sent from Jerusalem for the express purpose of watching Jesus, that something might be found with which to accuse him.”

It is important to identify who these religious leaders were and what their motivation was.

Jesus made it clear that these religious leaders relished the recognition their position accorded them. Their religion consisted mainly of externals—with the intention of impressing the populace. According to Jesus they enjoyed being called ‘rabbi’ (Matthew 23:7) and ‘father.’ Regarding this, Jesus warned that the people should call no one on earth their ‘father.’ (Matthew 23:9). Jesus also accused them of devouring the material possessions of the widows (Matthew 23:14) and of reciting long repetitious prayers learned by rote (Matthew 6:5, 6; 23:14). He also rebuked them for showing off their piety and generosity in giving alms to the poor (Matthew 6:1-2).

The Issue: Ritual Cleansing

Mark 7:2:

“Now when they saw some of His disciples eat bread with defiled, that is, with unwashed hands, they found fault.”

The issue here is not hygiene. It is obvious that for health reasons, people should wash their hands before they eat. The point of conflict here is over ritual or ceremonial cleansing which required a tedious process of multiple ablutions. Were these washings required by the written Torah? No! The next verse tells us where the practice came from.

Regarding the nature of the conflict in Mark 7 we are told in The Desire of Ages, p. 395:

“As before, the ground of complaint was His disregard of the traditional precepts that encumbered the law of God. These were professedly designed to guard the observance of the law, but they were regarded as more sacred than the law itself. When they came in collision with the commandments given from Sinai, preference was given to the rabbinical precepts.”

Mark 7:3:

“For the Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they wash their hands in a special way, holding the tradition of the elders.”

We see clearly that the practice did not come from the written Scriptures but rather from the tradition of the elders.

Mark 7:4:

“When they come from the marketplace, they do not eat unless they wash. And there are many other things which they have received and hold [grasp firmly or to hold fast so as not to let go], like the washing of cups, pitchers, copper vessels, and couches.”

The Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament explains the perceived source of these regulations:

“The absolute authority of the tradition is guaranteed primarily by its unbroken derivation from Moses and even from God himself (°Abot 1.1)”

Three times in the passage we are told that the issue is **much broader** than just ritual cleansing. It really involves ‘*many other such like things*’ (Mark 7:4, 8, 13). In other words, this specific conflict is only the **tip of the iceberg**.

Rigorous Casuistry

Not only from Mark 7 but also from passages such as **Matthew 23** we know that the rabbis had developed a system of **rigorous casuistry** which became so **burdensome and oppressive** that no one could obey it. Regarding this Ellen White remarks:

*‘The requirements had become **so complicated** that it was **impossible** for them to be fulfilled.’* (Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, p. 617)

No dimension of life escaped their **prescriptions** and **proscriptions**. Most often the rabbinical regulations **majored in minors** and **minored in the ‘weightier matters** of the law.’ (Matthew 5:20; 23:23; 23:16-22). Jesus spoke of these burdens too heavy to bear in **Matthew 23:4**.

Marcel Simon remarks about this oppressive casuistry:

*“. . . the code of the Torah [writings of Moses], which regulated both the individual and the collective life of the Jews, did not make provision for every possible situation. This was the task of the doctors of the law and their students. In the light of sacred Scripture, they were to **fix the conduct** to be followed in **each individual case**. The Pharisees’ casuistry balanced on the edge of **formalism**, and sometimes fell over into it. It seems to us to have been overly **meticulous and hairsplitting** in the extreme. When we read of discussion on **minute points**, of quibbles, and of distinctions bordering on the **ludicrous**, we sometimes feel that we are in the presence of a **sterile form of mental gymnastics**.”* Marcel Simon, *Jewish Sects*, p. 32

Ellen White is in agreement with Simon:

*“They occupied men’s minds with **trifling distinctions** and turned their attention from essential truths. Among other things the people were required to strain all the water used, lest it should contain the smallest insect, which might be classed with the unclean animals. Jesus, contrasting these **trivial exactions** with the magnitude of their actual sins, said to the Pharisees, ‘Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.’”* Ellen White, *The Desire of Ages*, p. 617

Mark 5:

*“Then the Pharisees and scribes asked Him, “Why do Your disciples not walk according to the **tradition of the elders**, but eat bread with unwashed hands?”*

Regarding the meaning of the expression ‘*tradition of the elders*’, the Roman Catholic **Jerome Bible Commentary** says:

*“A rabbinical term for the body of **unwritten laws** that the Pharisees considered as **equally binding** as the **written Torah**”* (*The Jerome Bible Commentary, volume 1, ‘The Gospel According Mark’, 42:42, p. 36*)

*“When Christ came to this world He found the Jewish people burdened with a heavy weight of traditions and ceremonies which the religious teachers had **handed down** from **generation to generation**. So great was the **mass of tradition** brought in that the commandments of God were made of none effect.” Manuscript Releases, volume 20, p. 338*

*“Many of the Jewish traditions were of so **trifling** and **worthless** a character as to **cheapen** their whole religion, and these traditions were **handed down** from **generation to generation**, and were regarded by many **as the word of God**. Human inventions, which were constantly becoming more foolish and inconsistent, were placed **on an equality with the moral law**, until at the time of Christ's first advent, **pure doctrine** had given place to **false ideas**.” Signs of the Times, January 3, 1900*

The fact that the Scribes and Pharisees **expected Jesus to compel His disciples** to obey the tradition of the elders indicates that this tradition had **the force of law** (Mark 7:5). The rabbis were expected to compel their disciples to obey this tradition by **precept and example**.

Jesus Confronts the Leaders

The way **Jesus faced** this conflict is significant. He quoted the **written Word** of God **three times**.

The **first quotation** comes from **Isaiah 29:13**. Here Jesus provides a vivid description of religion of the scribes and Pharisees:

Mark 6:

*“He answered and said to them, ‘Well did **Isaiah prophesy** [Isaiah 29:13] of you hypocrites, as **it is written**: ‘This people honors Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me.’”*

The text in Isaiah 29:13 continues:

*“... and their **fear** toward Me is taught by the commandment of men. . .”*

Jesus interprets this text in an interesting way. He links the idea of fear with **worship**. In Revelation 14:6, 7 the words ‘fear’ and ‘worship’ are linked together. The word ‘fear’ refers to a deep and reverent respect that leads us to worship God.

Mark 7:

*“**And in vain** they **worship** Me, teaching as doctrines the **commandments of men**.”*

- The issue in the passage is crystal clear. The battle is between the **written word of God** and the **unwritten tradition** of men.
- Even **more specifically** the conflict is between the **commandments of God** and the **traditions of men**.
- Finally, the conflict is over **true worship** and **vain worship**
- Are these the very issues that will divide the world into **two groups** at the end of time?

The book of **Revelation** indicates clearly that the final conflict will revolve around the

commandments and worship (Revelation 12:17; 14:6, 7, 9-11). We will further pursue this thought in a future lecture in this series.

According to Jesus, to teach the commandments of men in place of the word of God constitutes **vain worship**. In other words, when we follow the commandments of men instead of the word of God our worship is empty, useless and pointless.

Though Jesus did not quote **Isaiah 29:14** it is loaded with meaning because it reveals that the **traditions of men** came from the so called **wise men** and **prudent men** of Israel, in other words, from the scholars:

*"Therefore, behold, I will again do a marvelous work among this people, a marvelous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their **wise men** shall perish, and the understanding of their **prudent men** shall be hidden."*

Mark 8:

*"**For** [your worship is vain because] laying aside the **commandment of God**, you hold the **tradition of men**—the washing of pitchers and cups, and **many other such things** you do."*

Notice the contrast is between the **commandment of God** and the **tradition of men** which **contradicts** the commandment of God

Mark 9:

*"He said to them, "All too well you **reject the commandment of God**, that you may keep **your tradition**"*

Once again the contrast is between the commandment [singular] of God and your tradition.

A Living Example

Ellen White explained the law of Corban (which means, 'dedicated')

*"An undutiful child had only to pronounce the word "Corban" over his property, thus **devoting it to God**, and he could retain it for his own use during his lifetime, and after his death it was to be appropriated to the temple service. Thus he was at liberty, both in life and in death, to **dishonor and defraud** his parents, under cover of a **pretended devotion to God.**" DA 396*

Mark 10:

*"For **Moses** [by whose authority they claimed to teach while sitting on the Cathedra of Moses] **said** [written Scripture], 'Honor your father and your mother'; and, 'He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death. [Exodus 21:17]"*

This **second quotation** that Jesus used comes from **Exodus 20:12**: "Honor your father and your mother."

Here Jesus actually quotes the **fifth commandment** of God's holy Ten Commandment Law. Thus their tradition of Corban contradicted the Law of God.

The third quotation is from Exodus **21:17** where Moses said:

"And he who curses his father or his mother shall surely be put to death."

The **purpose** of the second and third quotations is to prove that the commandments of men which come from the deposit of **unwritten Tradition** really **conflict** with the written **commandments of God** which come from the deposit of the **written** Word of God. The Scribes and Pharisees claimed to teach by the **authority of Moses** and yet they **contradict what Moses wrote!**

Jesus, in unmistakable language, shows that the tradition of **Corban** which is found in the **body of unwritten tradition**, not only **conflicts** with the **fifth commandment** of the **written law** of God but actually **abolishes it!!**

Mark 11-12:

*"But **you say** [notice the contrast], 'If a man says to his father or mother, "Whatever profit you might have received from me is Corban"—' (that is, a gift to God), ¹² then you no longer let him do anything for his father or his mother."*

Closing Argument

Mark 7:13

*". . . making the **word of God** of no effect through **your tradition** [not God's word] which you have **handed down**. And **many such things** you do."*

Reaction of the Religious Leaders

The logic of Jesus was impeccable and could **not be refuted**. They hated Jesus because he came at them with the **written word** and with the **Ten Commandments** and showed that their traditions **contradicted** the word of God and the Ten Commandments (will this happen at the end as well?). Notice that because Jesus stood upon the written word of God and not upon tradition he was despised by the religious leaders. (Does this sound familiar?):

*"The deputies from Jerusalem were **filled with rage**. They could not accuse Christ as a violator of the law given from Sinai, for He spoke as its **defender against their traditions**. The great precepts of the law, which He had presented, appeared in striking contrast to the petty rules that men had devised." *The Desire of Ages*, p. 397*

Because Jesus required **proof from Scripture**, the religious leaders turned the people against Him and eventually led them to **seek His destruction**. In a very real sense, what led the Jews to reject Christ was their view of tradition. This will happen at the end of time as well.

*“The law of God **unmixed with human tradition** was presented by Christ as the great standard of obedience. This **aroused the enmity** of the rabbis. They had set **human teaching** above God's word, and had turned the people away from His precepts. They would not give up their **man-made commandments** in order to obey the requirements of the **word of God**. They would not, for the truth's sake, sacrifice the pride of reason and the praise of men. When Christ came, presenting to the nation the claims of God, the priests and elders denied His right to interpose between them and the people. They would not accept His rebukes and warnings, and they set themselves to turn the people against Him and to compass His destruction. COL 304, 305*

*“They [the Pharisees] presumed to make **nice distinctions** as to the **comparative guilt** of various sins, passing over some lightly, and treating others of perhaps less consequence as unpardonable. For a **money consideration**, they excused persons from their vows. And for **large sums of money** they sometimes passed over aggravated crimes. At the same time these priests and rulers would in other cases pronounce severe judgment for trivial offenses.” (Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages, p. 616)*

LESSON #16 – JESUS AND THEOLOGICAL CONFLICT

Introduction

This morning we sang *A Mighty Fortress is our God* which has come to be known as the **Battle Hymn** of the **Protestant Reformation**. Every time I sing this hymn (which is a **paraphrase of Psalm 46**) I can almost see Martin Luther standing before **Emperor Charles V** and the **luminaries** of the Roman Catholic Church at the **Diet of Worms** with a **face like flint** and refusing to recant his teachings. In his own words:

*"... my conscience is captive by the **Word of God**. Therefore I cannot and will not recant, since it is difficult, unprofitable and dangerous indeed to do anything against one's conscience. So help me God. Amen."*

Protestantism and Catholicism

If there is **one word** that **epitomized** the Protestant Reformation it is the word: **SOLA**

- Sola **Gracia** (grace alone)
- Solo **Christo** (Christ alone)
- Sola **Fide** (faith alone)
- Sola **Scriptura** (Scripture alone)
- **Soli Deo Gloria** (God's glory alone)

In **contrast** to the motto of the Protestant reformers, the Catholic Church **was and is** characterized by the **three-letter** word **AND**:

- Grace **and** human effort
- Christ **and** Mary
- Faith **and** works
- Glory to God **and** to the holy ones who achieved sainthood by their good works
- Scripture **and** tradition

Ellen White has explained the **meaning** of *Sola Scriptura*:

The Great Controversy, p. 595: "But God will have a people upon the earth to maintain the Bible, and the **Bible only**, as the standard of **all doctrines** and the basis of **all reforms**. The opinions of **learned men**, the deductions of **science**, the **creeds** or decisions of **ecclesiastical**

councils, as numerous and discordant as are the churches which they represent, the voice of the **majority**--not **one nor all** of these should be regarded as evidence for or against any point of **religious faith**. Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should **demand** a plain "Thus saith the Lord" in its support."

Immediately after this statement Ellen White explains how religious leaders are able to control their members:

The Great Controversy, p. 595: "Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention **to man** in the place of God. He leads the people to look to **bishops**, to **pastors**, to **professors of theology**, as their guides, instead of **searching the Scriptures** to learn their duty for themselves. Then, by controlling the minds of these leaders, he can **influence the multitudes** according to his will."

The **truth** of these statements is confirmed by our **great exemplar**, Jesus Christ. If the religious leaders of Christ's day had not interposed the world would have seen the greatest revival ever:

"If the priests and rabbis had not interposed, His teaching would have wrought such a reformation as this world has never witnessed." *The Desire of Ages*, p. 205

How did **Jesus face** and settle **theological controversies** that he had with the **ministers** and **theologians** of His day? Did he ever appeal to **tradition** or quote the great **scholars**?

The Authority of Jesus

As far as we know, **not even once** did Jesus ever quote a **rabbi or scholar as an authority**. It is a well-known fact that Jesus **did not attend** the schools of the rabbis. He was **home schooled**. In this way He **remained undefiled** by the traditions of the scholars.

Concerning His childhood education we are told in *The Story of Jesus*, p. 30:

*"God Himself by His Holy Spirit instructed Mary **how** to bring up His Son. **Mary taught Jesus** from the Holy Scriptures and He learned to **read and study** them for Himself."*

The **Spirit of Prophecy explains** that His **mother**, in order to **prevent controversy**, attempted to **convince Jesus** to follow the traditions of the elders but Jesus would have none of it. He always appealed to the clear statements of written Scripture:

Signs of the Times, August 6, 1896: "When the priests and rulers came to Mary to persuade her to **force Jesus** to give allegiance to their ceremonies and traditions, she felt **much troubled**. But peace and confidence came to her troubled heart as her Son presented the **clear statements of the Scriptures** in upholding His practices."

Thus, whenever Jesus defended his **teachings** or his **actions**, He always appealed to the **written words** of the **Old Testament**. Though He was aware of the traditions of the rabbis, He **never approvingly quoted** any of these supposed **oral sayings** of Moses or the fathers.

Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and Students, pp. 446, 447: “Jesus and John were represented by the educators of that day as **ignorant** because they had not learned in the **schools of the rabbis**; but the God of heaven was their Teacher and all who heard were astonished at their knowledge of the **Scriptures**.”

From the time of his **first visit** to the temple, Jesus appealed to the **written word** of God. Regarding this incident, Ellen White remarks:

The Desire of Ages, p. 85: “In every gentle and submissive way, Jesus tried to please those with whom He came in contact. Because He was so gentle and unobtrusive, the scribes and elders supposed that He would be **easily influenced** by their teaching. They urged Him to receive the **maxims and traditions** that had been **handed down** from the **ancient rabbis**, but He asked for their authority in **Holy writ**. He would hear every word that proceeds from the mouth of God; but He could not obey the **inventions of men**. Jesus seemed to **know the Scriptures** from beginning to end and He presented them in their true import. The rabbis were **ashamed** to be instructed by a child. They claimed that it was **their office to explain** the Scriptures and that it was His place to accept **their interpretation**. They were **indignant** that He should stand in opposition to **their word**.”

The Temptation

Jesus **set the tone** at the **very beginning** of His ministry. When Jesus was **tempted** of the devil, **four times** His defense was, ‘it is **written**’

Matthew 4:3-10: God had **just said** that Jesus was His beloved Son at the **baptism** and now **Satan came with doubt** and Jesus **detected him** right away!

Temptation #1:

“Now when the tempter came to Him [as an angel of light], he said: “**If** You are the Son of God, command that these stones become bread.”⁴ But He answered and said, “**It is written**, ‘Man shall not live by bread alone, but by **every word** that proceeds from the **mouth of God**’” (verses 3, 4)

Temptation #2:

“Then the devil took Him up into the holy city, set Him on the pinnacle of the temple,⁶ and said to Him, “**If** You are the Son of God, throw Yourself down. For **it is written**: ‘He shall give His angels charge over you, [he omitted the words: ‘to keep Thee in all Thy ways’. Satan quoted the promise without the condition upon which God could fulfill the promise] ‘and, ‘In their hands they shall bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone.’”⁷ Jesus said to him, “**It is written again**: ‘You shall not tempt the Lord your God [God had said that Jesus was His Son and to demand proof would show a lack of faith] (verses 5-7).

Temptation #3: Satan now reveals his **true identity.**

*“Again, the devil took Him up on an exceedingly high mountain, and showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. ⁹ And he said to Him, “All these things I will give You if You will fall down and worship me.” ¹⁰ Then Jesus said to him, “Away with you, Satan! For **it is written**, ‘You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only you shall serve’” (verses 8-10).*

Beginning of His Ministry

When Jesus **began His public ministry** He entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day, turned to the book of Isaiah, chapter 61:1, 2, read the passage and then said:

Luke 4:21:

*‘This day is this **scripture** fulfilled in your ears’*

The Writings of Moses

John 5:45-47: Jesus affirmed that Moses **wrote** about Him.

“Do not think that I shall accuse you to the Father; there is one who accuses you — Moses, in whom you trust. ⁴⁶ For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me; for he wrote about Me. ⁴⁷ But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?”

Mark 7

In my last sermon we studied Mark 7 and found that Jesus quoted **three Scriptures** to contradict their tradition:

- **Isaiah 29:13:** *“These people honor me with their lips but their heart is far from me” and “In vain do they worship me teaching as precepts the commandments of men.”*
- **Exodus 20:12** *“Honor your father and your mother”*
- **Exodus 21:** *“He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death”*

The Great Commandment in the Law

A certain young scholar came to **test** Jesus by asking what he needed to do to **inherit eternal life**. Jesus answered:

Luke 10:26: *‘What is **written** in the **law** [this would be the Torah]? How do you read?’ The young man quoted **Deuteronomy 6:4** and **Leviticus 19:18** to which Jesus said:*

“You have answered correctly, do this and you will live.”

Two Witnesses

The enemies of Jesus came to Him and said: “Your testimony is **not valid** because you are your **own witness** and the testimony of one witness cannot **confirm any word.**”

Jesus answered their objection with the **written word**:

John 8:17, 18: “It is also **written** in your law that the testimony of **two men** is true. 18 **I am** One who bears witness of Myself, and the **Father** who sent Me bears witness of Me.”

Sabbath Conflict

Matthew 12:3-5: Jesus used the example of David in the **written word** to defend His style of Sabbath observance

“But He said to them, “Have you **not read** what David did when he was hungry, he and those who were with him: ⁴ how he entered the house of God and ate the showbread which was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those who were with him, but only for the priests? ⁵ Or have you not **read in the law** that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?”

Dispute over Marriage

Matthew 19:4-6: When a dispute over **divorce** surfaced, Jesus resolved the issue by referring to the **written Scriptures**

“And He answered and said to them, “Have you **not read** that He who made them at the beginning ‘made them male and female,’ ⁵ and **said**, ‘For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh’? ⁶ So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.”

Triumphal Entry

Matthew 21:16: When the Pharisees commanded Jesus to rebuke those who were praising Him at the Triumphal Entry, Jesus justified their behavior by quoting Scripture:

“And Jesus said to them, “Yes. Have you never **read**, ‘Out of the mouth of babes and nursing infants you have perfected praise’?”

Cleansing the Temple

His cleansing of the temple was justified by the **written** Word:

Matthew 21:13:

*"And He said to them, "**It is written**, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer,' but you have made it a 'den of thieves.'"*

When any religious dispute was to be settled, Jesus quoted from the **written** Word, never from tradition!

The Vineyard Workers

After telling the parable of the **vineyard workers**, Jesus **asked** the religious leaders:

"What will the father do to those who threw the son out of the vineyard and killed him?"

They answered:

"He will destroy those wicked men miserably, and lease his vineyard to other vinedressers who will render to him the fruits in their seasons."

Then Jesus **quoted Scripture** to prove that they were the vinedressers:

Matthew 21:42:

*'Did ye never **read** in the **Scriptures**, 'The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?'*

Dispute over the Resurrection

Jesus had a dispute with the **Sadducees** who did not believe in the resurrection of the dead. They presented to Him an imaginary scenario: There were **seven brothers** and one of them married a certain woman. **He died** and his brother married his wife. **All seven of them died** after having married the same woman. Whose wife would she be in the resurrection?

Mark 12:24-27

*"Jesus answered and said to them, "Are you not therefore **mistaken**, because you do not know the **Scriptures** nor the power of God [the Scriptures teach the resurrection and God has the power to resurrect dead people]? ²⁵ For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven. ²⁶ But **concerning the dead, that they rise**, have you not **read** in the **book of Moses**, in the burning bush passage, how God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? ²⁷ He is **not the God of the dead** [because he will resurrect Abraham Isaac and Jacob], but the God of the living. You are therefore **greatly mistaken**."*

The Son of David

While Jesus was **in the temple** for the **last time** he had several discussions with the religious leaders:

Matt 22:41-45: "While the **Pharisees** were gathered together, Jesus asked them, ⁴² saying, "What do you think about the Christ [Messiah]? Whose Son is He?" They said to Him, "The **Son of David.**" ⁴³ He said to them, "How then does David **in the Spirit call Him 'Lord,'** saying [quoting Psalm 110:1]: ⁴⁴ 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at My right hand, till I make Your enemies Your footstool"'? ⁴⁵ If David then calls Him 'Lord,' **how is He his Son?**"

If David calls **his son Lord**, then the **son has to be greater** than David and cannot be **David's literal son**.

After the Resurrection

After His resurrection Jesus explained His mission to the **two disciples** on the road to Emmaus by quoting from the **written** Scriptures.

Luke 24:25-27: The Disciples on the Road to **Emmaus**.

"Then He said to them, "O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe in all that the **prophets** have spoken! ²⁶ Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into His glory?" ²⁷ And beginning at **Moses** and all the **Prophets**, He expounded to them in all the **Scriptures** the things concerning Himself."

Luke 24:44-47: The apostles in the **Upper Room**.

"These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were **written** in the **Law of Moses** and the **Prophets** and the **Psalms** concerning Me." ⁴⁵ And He opened their understanding, that they might comprehend **the Scriptures.** ⁴⁶ Then He said to them, "Thus **it is written**, and thus it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, ⁴⁷ and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

People Wonder at Jesus' Teaching

The people were constantly **wondering where Jesus had gotten** His knowledge, **not having studied** under any of the great rabbis:

Matthew 13:54:

"When He had come to His own country [Nazareth], He taught them in their synagogue, so that they were astonished and said, "**Where did this Man get this wisdom** and these mighty works?"

John 7:14,15:

"Now about the middle of the feast [of Tabernacles] Jesus went up into the temple and taught. ¹⁵ And the Jews marveled, saying, "**How does this Man know letters**, having **never studied?**"

John 7:45, 46:

"Then the **officers** came to the chief priests and Pharisees, who said to them, "Why have you not brought Him?" ⁴⁶ The officers answered: "**No man ever spoke like this Man!**"

Authority of Jesus Questioned

The right or authority of Jesus to act and speak was constantly questioned by the Scribes and Pharisees:

Mark 11:27, 28:

'And they come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, and say unto him: ²⁸ By what authority doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority to do these things?'

It is clear here that the religious leaders believed that the right to teach was an authority which belonged to them alone and which they alone could delegate.

After telling the Story of the man who built his house on the rock and the man who built his house on the sand we find the following words:

Matthew 7:28, 29: *'And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine; ²⁹ for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.'*

LESSON #17 – THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF TRADITION - Part 1

Review

In our study of the rabbinical concept of divine revelation we have noticed that there were certain key concepts and terms:

- ‘Tradition’
- ‘handed down’
- ‘passed on’
- ‘received’
- ‘hold’
- ‘unbroken succession’
- Implicit obedience of the people
- Religious leaders sat on Moses’ Cathedra

In our study today we are going to see that there is a striking similarity between the rabbinical view of tradition in the apostate Jewish church in the days of Christ and that of the apostate Roman Catholic Church of today.

Unbiblical Doctrines and Practices

Have you ever wondered how the Roman Catholic Church can justify beliefs and practices which do not have even one iota of support in the written Scriptures?

Where, for example, is the written Biblical evidence for infant baptism, baptism by sprinkling, prayers for the dead and to the dead, the canonization of saints, purgatory, limbo, the celibacy of the priesthood, the sale of indulgences, the worship of images, the rosary, the immaculate conception, Mary as mediatrix, Mary as the mother of God, the assumption of Mary, the perpetual virginity of Mary, the observance of Sunday, Lent, auricular confession, among other things? The answer is found in the Roman Catholic view of tradition.

Things not Written

The Roman Catholic view of Tradition is virtually identical with that of the Jews in the time of Christ. However, instead of God giving the information to Moses the Roman Catholic Church says that Christ gave the oral information to Peter who presided over the college of the apostles.

Roman Catholic scholars underline the fact there were many teachings and actions of Jesus which were never recorded in the Gospels. This much is true for we are told explicitly told in John 21:25 and 20:30-31 that Jesus said and did many things which were not written in the Gospel of John.

But nowhere are we told in the New Testament that God intended to pass on orally from generation to generation the things that were not written. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Peter and the apostles preserved these oral traditions absolutely pure and passed them on orally and infallibly to their successors.

These successors in turn preserved all of these oral traditions and transmitted them with 100% inerrancy to the next generation and the next to the next in unbroken succession to our very day.

The Roman Catholic Church employs Matthew 16:18, 19 to support this view. They say that Christ built His church upon Peter, the rock, and then gave him the keys of the kingdom to bind and loose.

What this means in Roman Catholic theology, is that Peter presiding over the college of the apostles, was given the authority to preserve, define and explain, not only the written Word of God but also the unwritten Tradition.

Unbroken Chain of Successors

Notably, according to Roman Catholic theology, when the Pope in union with the college of bishops, speaks on faith and morals, he speaks ex-cathedra, that is, from Peter's throne and thus his teachings have infallible apostolic authority.

How it Works

Let's put this in practical terms. The Roman Catholic Church believes that there is a [1] deposit of revelation which is contained in the written Scriptures of the New Testament and in the unwritten Tradition that was given orally to Peter. They also believe that there is a [2] transmitting element to pass on divine revelation from generation to generation in an authoritative and trustworthy way. This transmitting mechanism is known as apostolic succession where one generation of bishops places their hands in ordination upon the next generation of bishops in unbroken succession from the time of Peter till our day.

The Teaching Office or *Magisterium*

But, according to Roman Catholic theology, there must also be an authoritative living voice in the church in every generation to bring forth, define, explain, interpret and amplify Tradition both in its written and unwritten form. This is done by the Magisterium or teaching office of the church, an elite cadre of scholars especially trained for the task.

We can immediately see the striking similarity between this Roman Catholic view and the Jewish concept in Christ's day. They are virtually identical.

Implicit and Unquestioning Obedience

According to Roman Catholic theology, when the Pope speaks ex-cathedra, that is, from Peter's throne, his pronouncements must be accepted as final and infallible. That is to say, the faithful must render implicit obedience to the will of the Pope and the Magisterium under pain of being anathema or excommunicated!

This is, as we have seen, precisely what was expected of the populace in the days of Christ. This is the way in which the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church exerts full and total control over the masses and governs them according to its will.

You say: "Where is the evidence that the Roman Catholic Church believes this?"

The clear evidence is found in the official declaration of the Roman Catholic Church on divine revelation at Vatican Council II and also in The Catechism of the Catholic Church. But before we turn to these sources let's examine what was taught at the Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent

The Council of Trent was celebrated from 1545-1563 and had the express purpose of arresting the growing Protestant Reformation. The Council had some very definite things to say about divine revelation:

"The sacred and holy, ecumenical, and general Synod of Trent,--lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost,--seeing clearly that this truth and discipline [of the gospel] are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books of the Old and New Testament--seeing that one God is the author of both--as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession." Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546) Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, translated by, Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (4th ed., revised, New York: Harper, 1919), volume 2, pp. 79, 80.

The **Profession of Faith** of the Council of Trent states:

*“The apostolic and ecclesiastical **traditions** and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church I most firmly admit and embrace. I likewise accept Holy Scripture **according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held and does hold**, whose [office] is to judge of the **true meaning and interpretation** of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the **unanimous consent** of the **Fathers**.”* Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, **The Riddle or Roman Catholicism** (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 82

Dei Verbum (“The Word of God”)

Now let’s examine the declaration on the **Word of God** that was drafted at **Vatican Council II** and promulgated by **Pope Paul VI** on **November 18, 1965**. This is not the **personal opinion** of the pope but rather the declaration of an **ecumenical council** which gives it **apostolic authority**. Please notice how the key expressions mirror the Jewish view of tradition in the days of Christ:

*“But in order to keep the gospel forever whole and alive within the Church, the apostles **left bishops** as their **successors**; **handing over** their own **teaching office** to them and so the apostolic preaching, which is expressed in a special way in the inspired books, was to be preserved by a **continuous succession** of preachers until the end of time. Therefore, the apostles **handing on** what they themselves had **received**, warn the faithful to **hold fast** to the traditions which they have learned either by **word of mouth** or by **letter** (cf. 2 Th. 2:15), and to fight in defense of the faith **handed on** once and for all (cf. Jude 3). Now what was **handed on** by the apostles includes everything which contributes to the holiness of life, and the increase in faith of the People of God; and so the Church, in her teaching, life, and worship, perpetuates and **hands on** to **all generations** all that she herself is, all that she believes.*

*“This **tradition** which comes from the apostles **develops** in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. For there is a **growth in understanding** of the realities and the words which have been **handed down**. This happens through the contemplation and study made by believers, who treasure these things in their hearts (cf. Lk. 2:19, 51), through the intimate understanding of spiritual things they experience, and through the preaching of those who have **received** through **episcopal succession** the sure gift of truth. For as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward toward the **fullness of divine truth** until the words of God reach their **complete fulfillment** in her. . . .*

*“Hence there exist a close connection and communication between **sacred tradition** and **sacred Scripture**. For **both of them**, flowing from the **same divine wellspring**; in a certain way **merge into a unity** and tend toward the same end. For sacred Scripture is the word of God inasmuch as it is consigned to writing under the inspiration of the divine Spirit. To the **successors of the apostles**, sacred tradition **hands on** in its **full purity** God’s word, which was entrusted to the apostles by Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. Thus, led by the light of the Spirit of truth, these **successors** can in their preaching **preserve** this word of God faithfully, **explain** it, and make it*

more **widely known**. Consequently, it is **not from sacred Scripture alone** that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed. Therefore both **sacred tradition** and **sacred Scripture** are to be accepted and venerated with the **same sense** of devotion and reverence.

“Sacred tradition and sacred Scripture form **one sacred deposit** of the word of God, which is committed to the Church. **Holding fast** to this **deposit**, the entire holy people **united with their shepherds** remain always steadfast in the teaching of the apostles, in the common life, in the breaking of the bread, and in prayers (cf. **Acts 2:42**, Greek text), so that in **holding to**, practicing, and professing the heritage of the faith, there results on the part of the bishops and faithful a remarkable common effort.

“This task of **authentically interpreting** the word of God whether written or **handed on**, has been entrusted **exclusively** to the **living teaching office** of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ. This **teaching office** is not above the word of God, but serves it, teaching only what has been **handed down, listening** to it devoutly, **guarding** it scrupulously, and **explaining** it faithfully by divine commission and with the help of the Holy Spirit; it draws from this **one deposit of faith** everything which it presents for belief as divinely revealed.

“It is clear, therefore, that **sacred tradition, sacred Scripture, and the teaching authority** of the Church, in accord with God’s most wise design, are so linked and joined together that **one cannot stand without the others**, and that all together and each in its own way under the action of the one Holy Spirit contribute effectively to the salvation of souls.” (Walter M. Abbott., general editor, **The Documents of Vatican II**, ‘Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation,’ (**The America Press**, 1966), pp. 115-118)

Roman Catholic Catechism

We will now turn to **article # 2** of the **Catechism of the Catholic Church** which deals with ‘the transmission of divine revelation’:

“**76** In keeping with the Lord’s command, the Gospel was **handed on** in two ways:

--**orally** ‘by the apostles who **handed on**, by the spoken word of their preaching, by the example they gave, by the institutions they established, what they themselves **received**--whether from the lips of Christ, from his way of life and his works, or whether they had learned it at the prompting of the Holy Spirit,’

--**in writing** ‘by those apostles and other men associated with the apostles who, under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit, committed the message of salvation to writing’.

. . . **continued in apostolic succession**

77 In order that the full and living Gospel might always be preserved in the Church the apostles left bishops as their successors. They gave them ‘their own position of teaching authority.’ Indeed, ‘the apostolic preaching, which is expressed in a special way in the inspired books, was to be preserved in a continuous line of succession until the end of time.’

78 This living transmission, accomplished in the Holy Spirit, is called Tradition since it is distinct from Sacred Scripture, though closely connected to it. Through Tradition, ‘the Church, in her doctrine, life, and worship perpetuates and transmits to every generation all that she herself is, all that she believes.’ ‘The sayings of the holy Fathers are a witness to the life-giving presence of this Tradition, showing how its riches are poured out in the practice and life of the Church, in her belief and her prayer.’

One common source. . . .

80 ‘Sacred Tradition and Sacred Scripture, then, are bound closely together and communicate one with the other. For both of them flowing out from the same divine well-spring, come together in some fashion to form one thing and move towards the same goal.’ Each of them makes present and fruitful in the Church the mystery of Christ, who promised to remain with his own ‘always, to the close of the age.’

. . . . two distinct modes of transmission

81 ‘Sacred Scripture is the speech of God as it is put down in writing under the breath of the Holy Spirit.’

‘And [Holy] Tradition transmits in its entirety the Word of God which has been entrusted to the apostles of Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. It transmits it to the successors of the apostles so that, enlightened by the Spirit of truth, they may faithfully preserve, expound, and spread it abroad by their preaching.’

82 As a result the Church, to whom the transmission and interpretation of Revelation is entrusted, ‘does not derive her certainty about all revealed truths from the holy Scriptures alone. Both Scripture and Tradition must be accepted and honored with equal sentiments of devotion and reverence.’

Apostolic Tradition and ecclesial traditions

83 The Tradition here in question comes from the apostles and hands on what they received from Jesus teaching and example what they learned from the Holy Spirit. The first generation of Christians did not yet have a written New Testament, and the New Testament itself demonstrates the process of living Tradition

The heritage of faith entrusted to the whole of the Church

84 The apostles entrusted the 'Sacred deposit' of the faith (the depositum fidei), contained in Sacred Scripture and Tradition, to the whole of the Church. 'By adhering to [this heritage] the entire holy people, united to its pastors, remains always faithful to the teaching of the apostles, to the brotherhood, to the breaking of bread and the prayers. So, in maintaining, practicing, and professing the faith that has been handed on there should be a remarkable harmony between the bishops and the faithful.'

The Magisterium of the Church

85 'The task of giving an authentic interpretation of the Word of God, whether in its written form or in the form of Tradition, has been entrusted to the living, teaching office of the Church alone. Its authority in this matter is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ.' This means that the task of interpretation has been entrusted to the bishops in communion with the successor of Peter, the Bishop of Rome.'

86 'Yet this Magisterium is not superior to the Word of God, but is its servant. It teaches only what has been handed on to it. At the divine command and with the help of the Holy Spirit, it listens to this devotedly, guards it with dedication, and expounds it faithfully. All that it proposes for belief as being divinely revealed is drawn from this single deposit of faith.'

Significant Words of Pius XII

Concerning this Magisterium, Pope Pius XII once stated:

"Together with these sacred sources of Scripture and tradition, God has given a living magisterium to His Church, to illumine and clarify what is contained in the deposits of faith obscurely and implicitly." Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of Roman Catholicism (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 83.

Additional Quotations

"Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths.

"Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, Tradition is to us more clear and safe." Joseph Faa di Bruno, Catholic Belief, revised by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), p. 45

"Some of the truths which God has revealed and which have always been taught by the Catholic Church are not contained in the Bible. These truths have come down to us by what is called oral tradition; that is, they have been handed down by word of mouth. By Catholic Tradition, therefore, we understand all those truths which the Church received from Jesus Christ and the

Apostles, but which are **not found in the Bible**. These truths we firmly believe, because they were revealed by God and are proposed to us **by the Church**.

“Some of the truths that have been **handed down** to us by **Tradition** and are **not recorded** in the Sacred Scripture, are the following: that there are just seven Sacraments; that there is a Purgatory; that, in the New Law, Sunday should be kept holy instead of the Sabbath; that infants should be baptized, and that there are precisely seventy-two books in the Bible.

“The truths of Catholic Tradition have been **handed down** in the Church by means of the writings of the **‘Fathers of the Church,’** as well as by the **decrees of Councils**, by approved Creeds and by **the prayers and ceremonies** of the Church. These ancient writings and institutions show plainly what has been the faith of the Church from the earliest times.

“However, it is only the **infallible teaching office** of the Church that **secures us** against error as to the truth contained in Tradition as well as in the Holy Scripture. **The voice of the Church is the voice of God.**” Francis J. Butler, **Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms** (Boston: **Thomas J. Flynn & Co.**, 1904), p. 63.

“From all of which it must be abundantly clear that **the Bible alone is not a safe and competent guide** because it is not now and has never been accessible to all, because it is **not clear and intelligible to all**, and because it does **not contain all the truths** of the Christian religion.

“The simple fact is that the Bible, like all **dead letters**, calls for a **living interpreter** [yes, the Holy Spirit does this, not the Magisterium]. . . . Just as the Supreme Court is the authorized **living interpreter** of the constitution, so the Catholic Church is the **living authoritative interpreter** of the Bible. She has been the **preserver and custodian** of the Bible through the centuries, and she **interprets it for us** in the name and with the authority of Jesus Christ.” (John O’Brien, **The Faith of Millions** (Huntington, Indiana: **Our Sunday Visitor**, Inc., 1974), pp. 137, 138)

“By **TRADITION** we do not mean a mere report, a hearsay, wanting sufficient evidence to deserve belief; or a local tradition started by men, and therefore merely human, as were those traditions of the Pharisees condemned by our Lord; but we mean a Tradition first coming from God, continually taught, recorded, and in all desirable ways kept alive by a **body of trustworthy men successively chosen** in a divine, or divinely appointed manner, well instructed, and who are, **as a body**, protected by God **from teaching what is wrong**, or **handing down** unfaithfully to others the doctrine committed to them.” Joseph Faa di Bruno, **Catholic Belief**, revised by Louis A. Lambert (New York: **Benzinger Brothers**, 1884), pp. 39, 40

“Since the truths contained in Scripture and those **handed down** by Tradition both come from God, Scripture and Tradition are of **equal value** as sources of faith. Both deserve the same reverence and respect. **Each alone** is sufficient to establish a truth of our holy faith. . . .

“Scripture and Tradition are called the **remote rule of faith**, because the Catholic **does not base his faith directly on these sources**. The **proximate rule of faith** is for him [the Catholic] the One,

Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which **alone** has received from God the authority to **interpret infallibly** the doctrines He has revealed, whether these be contained in Scripture or in Tradition.” John Laux, **A Course in Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies**, part 1 (New York: **Benziger Brothers**, 1936), pp. 50, 51

“Because the origin of our faith is **not the Bible alone**, but the **Church** which gives us both the written and the unwritten word. . .

“So in the New Law, Catholics believe **some things not in the Scriptures**, although wholly **in accord with them**, because of the **infallible** witness of the Church as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must **look outside the Bible** to the voice of tradition, which is not human, but **divine**, because guaranteed by the divine, **infallible** witness of the Catholic Church.” Bertrand L. Conway, **The Question Box Answers** (New York: **The Columbus Press**, 1910), pp. 75, 76.

Thus the Roman Catholic Church claims that the Bible is **subservient** to her rather than **she to the Bible**. Regarding this, **Keith Fournier** states:

“I believe the Bible is the Book of the church, not that the church is the church of the book.” (Keith Fournier, **Evangelical Catholics**, p. 17)

Regarding this supremacy of the **church over the Bible**, John A. O’Brien—for many years a professor of theology at the University of **Notre Dame**, has stated:

“She [the Church] is not the child of the Bible, as many non-Catholics imagine, but **its mother**. She derives neither her existence nor her teaching authority from the New Testament. She **had both before the New Testament was born**: she secured her being, her teachings, her authority directly from Jesus Christ.

“If all the books of the Bible and all the copies thereof were **blotted out**, she would still be in possession of all the truths of Christ and could **still continue to preach** them as she did before a single word of the New Testament was written; for those truths are **deep in her mind, heart and memory**, in her liturgical and sacramental life, in the traditions, written and unwritten, which go directly back to Christ.” (John A. O’Brien, **The Faith of Millions** (Huntington, Indiana: **Our Sunday Visitor**, Inc., 1974), p. 129.

Important Conclusions

From the foregoing **quotations** and from the **empirical observation** of contemporary Roman Catholicism, we can reach the following conclusions:

Roman Catholicism has a virtually **identical view** of divine revelation as did **apostate Judaism** in the days of Christ. The three elements of a [1] **sacred deposit written and oral**, a [2]

transmitting mechanism and an **[3]** authoritative **living interpreter** are all present in both systems. Strikingly, the **terminology is virtually identical** as well:

- 'Tradition'
- 'handed down'
- 'passed on'
- 'received'
- 'hold'
- 'unbroken succession'

In both systems the oral traditions supposedly go back to an **original source**. In the case of the Jews, that source was **God through Moses**; in the case of the Roman Catholic Church it was **Christ through Peter**.

Amazingly when the Pope speaks **ex-cathedra** his word is considered infallible and final. When the rabbis spoke from **Moses' cathedra** their word was considered **infallible** and final as well.

In both systems the oral tradition and the written word were in theory given **equal authority** but in **actual practice** oral tradition transcended the authority of the written word and frequently contradicted it.

In Judaism, the people were expected to **render implicit and unquestioning submission** to the theological views of the scholars. It was believed that the common man could not correctly interpret the Scriptures so he must depend upon the interpretation of the 'experts'. Any divergence was swiftly punished with **expulsion from the synagogue**.

In Roman Catholicism the same is true. Any disagreement with the theological *cadre* is punished with threats of **excommunication**. In fact, **even theologians** who disagree with the *magisterium* are defrocked from their teaching positions, as can be seen, for example, in the case of **Hans Kung**.

LESSON #18 – THE ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF TRADITION - Part 2

Review from previous lectures

From three main sources, the Roman Catholic Catechism, Dei Verbum and numerous scholars we have noticed that Roman Catholicism has a virtually identical view of divine revelation as did apostate Judaism in the days of Christ. The three elements of a [1] sacred deposit written and oral, a [2] transmitting mechanism and an authoritative [3] living interpreter are all present in both systems.

Strikingly, the terminology is virtually identical as well:

- 'Tradition'
- 'handed down'
- 'passed on'
- 'received'
- 'hold'
- 'unbroken succession'

In both systems the oral traditions supposedly go back to an original source. In the case of the Jews, that source was God through Moses; in the case of the Roman Catholic Church it was Christ through Peter.

When the rabbis spoke from Moses' kathedra their word was considered infallible and final. When the Pope speaks ex-cathedra his word is considered infallible and final.

In both systems the oral tradition and the written word were in theory given equal authority but in actual practice oral tradition transcended the authority of the written word and contradicted it.

In Judaism, the people were expected to render implicit and unquestioning submission to the theological views of the scholars. Any divergence was swiftly punished with expulsion from the synagogue.

In Roman Catholicism the same is true. Any disagreement with the theological *cadre* is punished with threats of excommunication.

How to Control the Masses

In the times of Christ the people were captivated by the teachings of Jesus. In fact, multitudes followed Him. But through the influence and pressure of the religious leaders, the multitude eventually clamored for the blood of Jesus (**Matthew 27:20**)

Trust in the Preachers

To blindly trust in the opinions of religious leaders is dangerous. If Satan can control the religious leaders, he can control the masses. In fact, by controlling the teachings of the *Magisterium*, Satan can control the masses.

Notice this amazing statement by Ellen G. White:

“Satan is constantly endeavoring to attract attention to man in the place of God. He leads the people to look to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology, as their guides, instead of searching the Scriptures to learn their duty for themselves. Then, by controlling the minds of these leaders, he can influence the multitudes according to his will.” Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 595

Interestingly, Ellen White then compares the plight of the populace in Christ’s day with the condition of the people who belong to the Roman Catholic system today. Regarding the control the Jewish leaders exerted over the populace in Christ’s day, she states:

“When Christ came to speak the words of life, the common people heard Him gladly; and many, even of the priests and rulers, believed on Him. But the chief of the priesthood [the equivalent of the pope] and the leading men [the equivalent of the Magisterium] of the nation were determined to condemn and repudiate His teachings. . . . These opponents of Jesus were men whom the people had been taught from infancy to reverence, to whose authority they had been accustomed implicitly to bow. ‘How is it,’ they asked, ‘that our rulers and learned scribes do not believe on Jesus? Would not these pious men receive Him if He were the Christ?’ It was the influence of such teachers that led the Jewish nation to reject their Redeemer.”

Protestant Leaders

And regarding the control of the Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy over their masses, Ellen White says:

“Christ foresaw that the undue assumption of authority indulged by the scribes and Pharisees would not cease with the dispersion of the Jews. . . . The Roman Church reserves to the clergy the right to interpret the Scriptures. On the ground that ecclesiastics alone are competent to

explain God's word, it is **withheld** from the common people. Though the Reformation gave the Scriptures to all, yet the **selfsame principle which was maintained by Rome** prevents multitudes in Protestant churches from searching the Bible for themselves. They are taught to accept its teaching **as interpreted by the church**; and there are thousands who dare receive nothing, however plainly revealed in Scripture, that is contrary to their creed or the established doctrine of **their church**. . . .

"There are today thousands of professors of religion who can give no other reason for points of faith which they hold than that they were so **instructed by their religious leaders**. They pass by the Savior's teachings almost unnoticed, and place **implicit confidence** in the words of the ministers. But are ministers infallible? How can we trust our souls to their guidance unless we **know from God's word** that they are light bearers? A lack of moral courage to step aside from the beaten track of the world leads many to follow **in the steps of learned men**; and by their reluctance to **investigate for themselves**, they are becoming **hopelessly fastened in the chains of error**. They see that the truth for this time is plainly brought to view in the Bible; and they feel the power of the Holy Spirit attending its proclamation; yet they allow the **opposition of the clergy** to turn them from the light. Though reason and conscience are convinced, these deluded souls **dare not think differently from the minister**; and their individual judgment, their eternal interests, are sacrificed to the unbelief, the pride and prejudice, **of another**." (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 595-597)

Lipstick

Like in Judaism, Roman Catholicism is caught up in a system of **oppressive casuistry**. In fact, **Canon Law** would be equivalent to the Jewish **Talmud** where the rules and regulations are codified. Notice the following two examples from canon law (there are **1752** canon laws):

"Question 1: Is there any reason to fear that lip-stick will break the eucharistic fast?"

"Question 2: If the lips of a woman who is receiving Extreme Unction are coated with lip-stick, is there any danger that the anointing of the mouth will not be valid?"

"Answer 1: It is not conformable with theological teaching to warn women against the use of lip-stick before receiving Holy Communion on the ground that they are likely to break their fast."

"Answer 2: If there is a thick coating of lip-stick on the lips, there would be grave danger that the anointing of the mouth performed on the lips would not be valid; and in that event the validity of the sacrament would be doubtful. . . ." (Quoted in, Jaroslav Pelikan, **The Riddle of Roman Catholicism** (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 87)

Commenting on this **prescription of canon law**, Pelikan remarks on the same page:

*“The penitent can never be certain of whether he has been obedient to **every detailed prescription of the law**, and yet he must be certain in order to find salvation and peace.”*

This is the same problem which existed in the days of Christ. The Jews had developed so many **prescriptions and proscriptions** that not even the most pious believer could obey them all. Thus the Jewish laws contained in the **Talmud** are paralleled by the laws contained in Roman Catholic **canon law**. And there are **thousands** of casuistic regulations in Roman Catholic canon law!!

The **1983** Code of Canon Law contains **7 books** with **1752 canons**, or laws, most of which are **subdivided into multiple paragraphs**

Canon Law and Marriage

Now let's take a look at the second example from the sphere of **marriage**:

*“**Divorce is forbidden**. But this general principle is subject to **all sorts of qualifications**: separation ‘from bed and board’ is permitted under certain circumstances and may become permanent; a marriage may be declared null and void if upon investigation it is determined that it was not valid; a convert may, after baptism, avail himself of the ‘Pauline privilege’ of separation from his unbaptized spouse and may obtain permission to remarry.” (Jaroslav Pelikan, **The Riddle of Roman Catholicism**, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959), p. 89.*

Does this sound like the problem of **Mark 7**? A **mockery is made of marriage** when **qualifications** and **exceptions** (traditions of men) are added to the commandment of God.

Many times the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church **contradict** the clear Word of God. For example, one of the declarations of the Council of Trent stated:

*“If anyone saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is **not better** and **more blessed** to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony; let him be **anathema**.” (Council of Trent, Session XXIV (November 11, 1563), Canons of the Sacrament of Matrimony, canon 10, in **Dogmatic Canons and Decrees** (New York: Devin Adair Company, 1912), p. 164.*

In the background of this view is the fact that the Roman Catholic Church, beginning primarily with **St. Augustine**, teaches that original sin was sexual sin. This is the **real reason for the celibacy** of priests and nuns.

The fact is that this statement from the Council of Trent is a **blatant contradiction** of **Genesis 1:28** where God blessed marriage and commanded man to be fruitful and multiply. **Jesus sanctioned marriage** by performing His first miracle at a **wedding in Cana** of Galilee. It is also in flat contradiction to the fact that all the **bishops, elders, deacons and pastors of the early**

church were married, even the apostle Peter who supposedly was the first Pope!!! This is a clear example of making of none effect the Word of God by tradition.

Reading Scripture

The same could be said about Bible study. Even though the Roman Catholic Church in this age of enlightenment allows, and in some cases even encourages, reading the Bible, it was not always so.

In Canon 14 of the Council of Toulouse (France) which was celebrated in the year 1229 A. D. we find the following prohibition:

"We forbid the laity to have in their possession any copy of the books of the Old and New Testament, except the Psalter, and such portions of them as are contained in the Breviary, or the Hours of the Blessed Virgin; and we most strictly forbid even these works in the vulgar tongue."

Around this same time, William Tyndale was burned at the stake for translating the New Testament into English contrary to the will of the church. Roman Catholic theologian John Gilmary Shea admits that the Catholic Church forbade the reading of the Scriptures in the common tongue:

"In early times, the Bible was read freely by the lay people, and the Fathers constantly encourage them to do so, although they also insist on the obscurity of the sacred text. No prohibitions were issued against the popular reading of the Bible. New dangers came during the middle ages. When the heresy of the Albigenses arose there was a danger from corrupt translations, and also from the fact that the heretics tried to make the faithful judge the Church by their own interpretation of the Bible. To meet these evils, the Council of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible. Pius IV required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of the Scripture, unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such readings was likely to prove beneficial." Shea John Gilmary Ed, The Catholic Educator: A Library of Catholic Devotion and Instruction, New York, Peter J. Ryan, p 61)

The Council of Trent reaffirmed the same position. Rules on Prohibited Books was approved by Pope Pius IV, in 1564:

"Since it is clear from experience that if the Sacred Books are permitted everywhere and without discrimination in the vernacular, there will by reason of the boldness of men arise therefrom more harm than good, the matter is in this respect left to the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor, who may with the advice of the pastor or confessor permit the reading of the Sacred Books translated into the vernacular by Catholic authors to those who they know will derive from such reading no harm but rather an increase of faith and piety, which permission they must have in writing. Those, however, who presume to read or possess them without such permission, may not receive absolution from their sins till they have handed them over to the

ordinary. Book dealers who sell or in any other way supply Bibles written in the vernacular to anyone who has not this permission, **shall lose the price of the books**, which is to be applied by the bishop to pious purposes, and in keeping with the nature of the crime they shall be subject to other penalties which are left to the judgment of the same bishop. Regulars who have not the permission of their superiors **may not read or purchase them.**"

How is it that the Roman Catholic system, **in its church councils** can **condemn the reading of the Bible** by the common lay person when **Jesus** said, 'search the Scriptures' and **Paul** said that they are able to make one 'wise unto salvation?' Once again, **tradition has made of none effect** the Word of God!

Mariology

St. Alphonsus di Liguori

- **St. Alphonsus di Liguori** lived in the **17th century**.
- **22 volumes** of his work have been published.
- He was **canonized as a saint by Pope Gregory XIV** in **1839** and was declared a **doctor of the church** by Pope **Pius IX**. He is one of only **32 doctors** of the church whose writings are especially trustworthy and of authority.
- Liguori wrote **The Glories of Mary**, a book which is greatly venerated by Roman Catholics.
- Lest you think that this volume contains only **one man's opinion** about Mary, I would mention that the book is actually a **collection of the patristic wisdom** of the Roman Catholic Church from the Early Church Fathers till his day. Thus the book does **not reflect Liguori's** view of Mary but rather what has been taught by Roman Catholic **theologians, doctors and saints** throughout the course of the centuries.
- Liguori himself expresses **the reason** for preparing his book:

*"I endeavored to collect, from as many authors as I could lay my hands on, the choicest passages, extracted from Fathers and theologians, and those which seemed to me to be the most to the point, and have put them together in this book, in order that the devout may with little trouble and expense be able to **inflame themselves with the love of Mary**, and more particularly to furnish the priests with matter for their sermons, wherewith to **excite others to devotion towards this divine Mother.**" **The Glories of Mary**, p. 30.*

- The work consists of **several chapters**. In each, Liguori seeks **to prove a certain point** about Mary. At the end of each chapter, he gives an **illustration** of the point and ends with a **prayer** to Mary based on the content of the chapter.
- The edition I am using was published by the **Redemptorist Fathers** in **1931** and bears the imprimatur by **Patrick (Cardinal) Hayes on April 16, 1931.**

- The preponderance of Liguori's quotations come from the **church fathers**, the **apocryphal books** of **Ecclesiasticus** and **Wisdom of Solomon** and the Old Testament books of **Proverbs** and **Song of Solomon**. Most of these quotations in their original context apply to **wisdom personified** (Jesus) or to **Solomon's bride** (the church) and yet Liguori applies them to Mary simply because the Church has said so.
- **Liguori persistently tears texts out of their contexts**. Texts are extracted from the Old Testament and applied to Mary when there is not any New Testament warrant to do so. Many times, verses that **originally applied to Jesus**, Liguori applies to Mary.

Notice the following misuse of texts:

- *"If Mary is for us, who can be against us?" (Romans 8:31) **Glories of Mary**, p. 101*
- *"Mary was prefigured by the dove which returned to Noah in the Ark with an olive branch in its beak, as a pledge of the peace which God granted to men." **Glories of Mary**, p. 202*
- *"Glorious things are said of you, O city of God" **Glories of Mary**, p. 244*
- *"Correctly, then, can we here say with St. Paul, Having this seal, the Lord knoweth who are His; that is to say, whoever carries with him the mark of devotion to Mary is recognized by God as his." **Glories of Mary**, pp. 244, 245*

The high regard which the Roman Catholic Church has for Liguori can be seen by the fact that sometime after his death, his **grave in Nocera was opened** and his Three writing fingers were cut off and sent to Rome by wish of Pope Pius VII who said:

*"Let those three fingers that have written so well for the honor of God, of the Blessed Virgin and of religion, be carefully preserved and sent to Rome." Cited in, **The Glories of Mary**, p. 20*

Fundamental Flaw

*"But God was pleased that Mary should in **all things resemble** Jesus; and as her Son died, it was becoming that the mother should also die." **Glories of Mary**, p. 407.*

This is the fundamental **leap of logic** that the Roman Catholic Church employs to exalt Mary. They use expressions such as **"it was fitting," "it was necessary," "it was befitting"** for Mary to be equal with Jesus. Where to we find that in all things Mary was to resemble Jesus? In Roman Catholic theology Mary actually becomes a **rival of Jesus** and **overshadows** him.

A Perpetual Virgin?

According to the Roman Catholic Church, Mary was **perpetually a virgin**. In other words, Mary **never had sexual relations** with Joseph either before or after Jesus was born. How does this square with the written Scriptures?

- The affirmation in **Luke 2:7**: that Jesus was the **first-born** of Mary strongly suggests that she had other children after Jesus: *“And she brought forth her **firstborn Son**, and wrapped Him in swaddling cloths and laid Him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn.”*
- The statement in **Matthew 1:18** that Mary was with child before she and Joseph **came together** strongly hints at the idea that they came together after marriage: *“Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows: After His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph, **before they came together**, she was found with child of the Holy Spirit.”*
- **Matthew 1:24-25** explicitly states: *“Then Joseph, being aroused from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord commanded him and took to him his wife,²⁵ and **did not know her till** she had brought forth her firstborn Son. And he called His name JESUS.”*
- **Psalm 69:8** seems to indicate that Jesus was only one of Mary’s children. Several verses in this Psalm clearly indicate that the Messiah was in view: *“Zeal for your house has eaten me up” (verse 9) “gall for food and vinegar to drink” (verse 21) “I have become a stranger to my brothers, and an alien to **my mother’s children**.”* Mary was conceived without **original sin**.

What the Fathers said about Mary

In his book Liguori gathers a mass of information that has been handed down by previous generations about Mary. I summarize the Roman Catholic ‘wisdom’ that has been handed down from generation to generation according to Liguori:

- Mary was the **mother of God**
- Mary was taken **bodily to heaven**

Roman Catholic theologian, Karl Keating, states: *“Still, Fundamentalists ask, where is the proof from Scripture? Strictly, there is none. It was the Catholic Church that was commissioned by Christ to teach all nations and to teach them infallibly. The **mere fact** that the Church teaches the doctrine of the Assumption as something definitely true is a guarantee that it is true.”* Karl Keating, *Catholicism and Fundamentalism: The Attack on ‘Romanism’ by ‘Bible Christians’*, p. 275.

- The **world was created** by God and Mary
- She was born **immaculate and holy**
- She **never sinned**
- She is the **incarnation of the Holy Spirit**
- She is **full of grace** and can dispense it to human beings at will
- She is a **priest**
- She is our **advocate or mediatrix**

Regarding this, the conciliar declaration *Lumen Gentium* states: “Taken up to heaven she did not lay aside this saving office but by her **manifold intercession** continues to bring us the gifts of eternal salvation. . . Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked in the Church under the titles of Advocate, Helper, Benefactress, and **Mediatrix**.” *Lumen Gentium*, section 62

- Mary **loved the world** that she **gave her only-begotten Son**
- Mary is our **ladder**
- We are to **pray to Mary** to ask for favors
- We can **only know God through Mary**
- Mary **helps us when we are tempted**
- Mary is **the way to the Father**
- She is the **door**
- She is the **rod out of the root of Jesse**
- She is **co-redemptrix**

“If the drive [to declare Mary co-redemptrix] succeeds, Catholics would be obliged as a matter of faith to accept three extraordinary doctrines: that Mary participates in the redemption achieved by her son, that all graces that flow from the suffering and death of Jesus Christ are granted **only through Mary’s intercession with her son**, and that all prayers and petitions from the faithful on earth **must likewise flow through Mary**, who then brings them to the attention of Jesus.” Kenneth L. Woodward, *Newsweek*, “Hail Mary”, August 25, 1997, p. 49

“In place of the Holy Trinity, it would appear, there would be a kind of **Holy Quartet**, with Mary playing the multiple roles of **daughter of the Father**, **mother of the Son** and **spouse of the Holy Spirit**.” Kenneth L. Woodward, *Newsweek*, “Hail Mary”, August 25, 1997, p. 49.

Regarding the position of Mary, Roman Catholic theologian Mark Miravalle has stated: “The union between the Immaculata and the Holy Spirit is so inexpressible, yet so perfect, that the Holy Spirit acts only by the Most Blessed Virgin, **his Spouse**. This is why she is the **mediatrix of all graces** given by the Holy Spirit.” *Mark Miravalle*, p. 54.

- She is our **refuge**
- She is our **throne of grace**
- She is the **light of the sun**
- She is **our life**
- She **changes and transforms our lives**
- She **protects us from the power of Satan**
- She is **our propitiation**
- She has a name that is **above all names**
- **If we die we have assurance of life** in her
- **All power** is given to her in heaven and on earth

- She is **all-powerful**
- She is the **morning star**
- She is the **mercy seat**
- She **crushes the serpent's head**
- She is the **pillar of cloud and fire**
- We can **cast out devils in her name**
- She is the **water of life**
- She is the **peacemaker**
- She is the **tower of refuge**
- She **draws all men** to herself
- She **gives eternal life**
- She is **worthy of being praised**
- She is **our hope**
- We can be **saved by Mary's merits**
- She is the **rainbow of promise**
- She died, her body saw no corruption, she resurrected and **ascended on the third day**

The final issue in the great controversy will be: What is your source of authority for your beliefs and practices? Is it the church or is it the Bible?

LESSON #19 – SABBATH CONTROVERSIES AND TRADITION

The Rabbis and Oral Tradition

The most revered institution in Judaism is the Seventh-day Sabbath. For the rabbis the Sabbath was equal in importance to all the other precepts of the Torah combined. One Rabbi stated: “He who observes the Sabbath, is kept from sin.” Another stated: “If Israel were to keep two Sabbaths according to the laws thereof, they would be redeemed immediately.” It is said that Rabbi Levi once affirmed: “If Israel kept the Sabbath properly even for one day, the son of David would come. Why? Because it is equivalent to all the commandments.”

But, were these rabbis referring to the Sabbath as it is found in the written Scriptures? Robert Johnston responds:

“One of the distinguishing features of Pharisaism had been its high regard for oral tradition. The Pharisees claimed to be heirs of Ezra the scribe and his court known as the Great Assembly, the beginning of the Sanhedrin. Indeed, Ezra and the Great Assembly were regarded as transmitters of oral laws that could be traced all the way back to Moses.” Robert Johnston, The Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 70

Regarding the mass of oral tradition in Judaism, Johnston explains:

“For a long time the oral law was indeed oral; there was an inhibition against writing it down for fear that it might be treated as Scripture. Instead, it was stored up in the heads of the rabbis and their disciples. However, as scholars continually added to the body of tradition, it grew so massive that memories were too severely taxed.” The Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 70

This is the reason why oral tradition was codified in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds.

Sabbath Prohibitions

The Old Testament has relatively few Sabbath prohibitions. Among those prohibited activities are [1] Work, [2] kindling a fire, [3] trading and [4] cooking. But the rabbis expanded these

simple prohibitions into an **entire system** of rules and regulations. On the basis of **Deuteronomy 25:3 thirty nine major** activities were forbidden on the Sabbath but each of these was **subdivided** into an **almost endless** list of specific prohibitions:

“The main classes of work are forty save one: sowing, plowing, reaping, binding sheaves, threshing, winnowing, cleansing crops, grinding, sifting, kneading, baking, shearing wool, washing or beating or dyeing it, spinning, weaving, making two loops, weaving two threads, separating two threads, tying, loosening, sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches, hunting a gazelle, slaughtering or flaying or salting it or curing its skin, scraping it or cutting it up, writing two letters, erasing in order to write two letters, building, pulling down, putting out a fire, lighting a fire, striking with a hammer and taking anything from one domain to another. These are the main classes of work: forty save one.”

Some of the rules that the rabbis had **added** to the Sabbath to ‘protect it’ from being broken were:

- A fruit on the ground under a tree could not be picked up and **eaten** on the Sabbath because it might have fallen on that very day.
- An egg **could not be removed** from a nest on the Sabbath but it could be protected until after the Sabbath when it could be eaten.
- **Instrumental music** was forbidden on the Sabbath.
- If a **house caught fire** on the Sabbath **life** could be saved but not any **property** that was in the house.
- All **sacred books** could be saved from the fire and **enough food** and drink for the remaining Sabbath meals.
- It was a cardinal offense to **tilt a lamp** in order to make more oil run toward the wick because this would make it burn brighter which was the sin of kindling.
- A person could not **read by the light of a lamp** on the Sabbath.
- A person could not **touch money** or any of the **tools** of his trade even if he did not intend to work with them.
- **Climbing** a tree, **swimming**, **clapping** the hands, **slapping** the thighs and **stamping** the feet were forbidden.
- **Burials** and **weddings** could not take place on the Sabbath.
- **Writing** was forbidden on the Sabbath.
- A chair could not be **dragged** across the floor with the intention of making a furrow with it but if the furrow was unintended it was allowed.
- Persons could not directly **carry a stone** but they were permitted to lift up a child even if he had a stone in his hand.
- Treatment of **non-mortal ailments** and handicaps could not be treated on the Sabbath but an **eye salve** could be placed on the eye **before sundown** of Friday or a plaster could

be placed on the wound so that the healing continued on the Sabbath.

- If a **deer wandered** into your house on the Sabbath **one man** could not trap it but two could do so.
- It was forbidden **to tithe** on the Sabbath.
- No Jew was allowed to **travel more** than two thousand cubits beyond the city limits where he lived.
- To mitigate the 2000 cubit limit one need **only deposit enough food** for two meals at 2000 cubits distance and declare the place his **temporary abode** and then from there he could travel an additional 2000 cubits.

Sabbath Controversies

Of all the controversies that Jesus faced, **none was greater** than those over the Sabbath. He was in **constant conflict** with the **denominations** of his day and was **despised by them** because He did not keep **their** Sabbath.

Most of these controversies dealt with the issue of **healing** people with **chronic illnesses** [a man born blind, a paralytic for 38 years, a woman who could not straighten out for 18 years, a man with a withered hand, a case of the flu on the Sabbath.

Some **evangelical scholars** have said that Jesus actually broke the Sabbath by healing people on it. But, **did he** break the Bible Sabbath?

Actually, Jesus said it was **lawful** to do so (for example, **Matthew 12:12**) while the scribes and Pharisees said it was **unlawful**.

The critical question to be answered is this: **On what basis** did Jesus say it was **lawful** and on what basis did the scribes and Pharisees say it was **unlawful**? In other words, what **source of authority** did the scribes and Pharisees use to prove that it was unlawful and **which authority** did Jesus use to prove that it was lawful?

Nowhere in the Old Testament Scriptures do we find that it is wrong to **alleviate suffering** or to **heal the sick** on the Sabbath. In fact, in **Isaiah 58** we are told that the Sabbath is the **special day to alleviate** the suffering of the oppressed.

Where, then, did the scribes and Pharisees get the idea that it was unlawful to heal on the Sabbath? Not from the written Scriptures but rather from the **deposit of unwritten tradition!**

Plucking Grain on the Sabbath

Let's take the case of the disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath to satisfy their hunger. Nowhere are we told that it is wrong for a person to pluck grain to satisfy hunger on the Sabbath [though it was wrong to harvest your crop for commercial purposes on the Sabbath].

Samuele Bacchiocchi has shown that Jesus broke at least four rabbinical rules when He allowed His disciples to satisfy their hunger on the Sabbath. These rules were: **[1] reaping, [2] threshing, [3] winnowing and [4] preparing a meal** (see, Samuele Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977, p. 49)

In other words, Jesus was not breaking the Sabbath commandment as found in the written Scriptures. He was breaking the rabbinical sabbath that had been created by oral tradition.

The question is: How did Jesus answer the rabbis on this issue? The answer is simple. On several occasions Jesus referred to written Scripture to justify his behavior on the Sabbath:

- Mark 2:25-27 [I Samuel 21:6; Genesis 2:1-3]
- Luke 13:15 [Deuteronomy 5:14]
- John 7:22-23 [Leviticus 12:3]

Jesus made it clear that by not helping the needy, the Pharisees were actually breaking the Sabbath while He was keeping it. In other words, their Tradition had made of none effect the written Word of God. Their rules which had the intention of protecting the Sabbath from being broken actually led them to break it!

So in a very real sense, the Sabbath of the Pharisees was:

- A counterfeit sabbath
- A man made sabbath
- A Sabbath based on tradition
- A sabbath of their creation

The Sabbath Issue in the End Time

As Seventh-day Adventists we believe that the great issue in the final controversy will involve the commandments of God versus the commandments of men and true worship to God versus false worship to the beast!

Will the final conflict involve a false Sabbath and a true Sabbath? Yes. The only difference between the times of Jesus and ours is that in those days the ones who claimed to be the people of God kept the Sabbath in the wrong way while in the end-time the Christian world will

keep the wrong day. But the principle is the same. In both cases it is a Sabbath of created by man based on tradition and not the Sabbath which God made at creation.

The conflict in Christ's day was actually over the Sabbath made by God versus the Sabbath made by human tradition, and to keep a Sabbath made by man is to practice false worship!!

Intention to Kill

It must be underlined that the Pharisees not only broke God's Sabbath by abstaining from doing good on the Sabbath but they also broke the Sabbath by intending to kill Jesus on it (Mark 3:6; Matthew 12:14; John 5:14).

Irony of ironies, they condemned Jesus for healing on the Sabbath but they wanted to kill on it because he did not keep it as they thought He should!! Certainly their rules of Sabbath observance had made of none effect the commandment which says: 'You shall not kill.'

Does this also ring a bell? Is there as time coming when the Christian world will want to kill those who do not keep their Sabbath, that is, a Sabbath of human invention? Revelation 13:15 says that this is just what will happen.

Is Sabbath Keeping Legalism?

It has always been an enigma to me how the Christian world can accuse Seventh-day Adventists of being legalists for keeping the Sabbath and then turn right around some day and say, 'You either keep the Sunday or we will kill you!' What worse legalism could exist than to keep the Sunday for fear of death rather than out of love for God?

We also know that the Christian world will teach that the increasing natural disasters in the world are due to God's wrath because of the desecration of Sunday as the day of worship. They will say: 'Let us return to God, keep Sunday, and then God will bless America once again.' This is legalism—attempting to earn God's favor or turning away His disfavor by keeping Sunday!

Roman Catholics and the Sabbath

A challenge to Protestants by John Eck, the enemy of Luther:

"The Scripture teaches 'Remember that you sanctify the day of the Sabbath; six days shall you labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God', etc. But the Church has changed the Sabbath into the Lord's [day] by its own authority, concerning which you have no scripture. . . The Sabbath is commanded many times by God; neither in the Gospels nor in Paul is it declared that the Sabbath has ceased; nevertheless the Church has instituted the Lord's Day through the tradition of the apostles without Scripture." (Johann Eck, Enchiridion Locorum Communium . . . Adversus Lutheranos [Handbook of Common Places])

against the Lutherans]. Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Fratres de Sabio, 1533, fols. 4v, 5r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank Yost. [FRS No. 127]

The following Roman Catholic scholar **refers to all of the texts** we commonly use to **defend the Sabbath** but he then says that we are supposed to **keep Sunday**. Why?

*“The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day: ‘God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it’ (Genesis 2:3). This precept was confirmed by God in the Ten Commandments: ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God’ (Exodus 20). On the other hand, Christ declares that He is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it (Matthew 5:17). He Himself observed the Sabbath: ‘and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day’ (Luke 4:16). His disciples likewise observed it after His death: ‘They rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment’ (Luke 23:56). Yet with all this **weight of Scripture authority** for keeping the Sabbath, or seventh day, holy, **Protestants of all denominations** make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now **what authority have they for doing this?** None, whatever, except the **unwritten word**, or **tradition of the Catholic Church** which **declares** that the apostles made the change in honor of Christ’s resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.” John Milner, **End of Religious Controversy**, (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 89*

Notice this **indictment** of Protestants by another Roman Catholic Scholar:

*“**Protestants** often deride the authority of **Church tradition**, and claim to be directed by the **Bible only**; yet they, too, have been guided by the customs of the ancient Church, which find **no warrant in the Bible**, but rest on **Church tradition only!** A striking instance of this is the following: The first positive command in the Decalogue is to ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy’, and this precept was enforced by the Jews for thousands of years. But the Sabbath day, the observance of which God commanded, was our Saturday. Yet who among either Catholics or Protestants, except a sect or two, like the ‘Seventh Day Baptists’, ever keep that commandment now? None. Why is this? The Bible which Protestants claim to obey exclusively, gives **no authorization** for the **substitution** of the first day of the week for the seventh. On what authority, therefore, have they done so? Plainly on the **authority of that very Catholic Church** which they abandoned and whose **traditions** they condemn.” John L. Stoddard, **Rebuilding a Lost Faith** (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1922), p. 80*

*“Is it not strange that those who make the Bible their only teacher should inconsistently follow in this matter the **tradition of the Church?**” Bertrand L. Conway, **The Question Box Answers**, (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 254, 255*

Notice this **candid** and **unapologetic** admission:

*“So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things **not in the Scriptures**, although wholly in accord with them, because of the infallible witness of **the Church** as to their divine or apostolic*

origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look **outside the Bible to the voice of tradition**, which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, **infallible witness of the Catholic Church**.” Bertrand Conway, **The Question Box Answers** (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76

“Now the **Scriptures alone do not contain** all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? You may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will **not find a single line** authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The **Scriptures enforce** the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we [Catholics] never sanctify.” James Cardinal Gibbons, **The Faith of Our Fathers** (Baltimore: James Murphy Company, 110th edition revised and enlarged) p. 80

“**Nothing is said in the Bible** about the **change** of the Lord’s day from Saturday to Sunday. We know of the **change** only from the **tradition of the Church**—a fact **handed down** to us from the earliest times by the **living voice** of the **Church**. That is why we find so illogical the attitude of many non-Catholics, who say that they will believe nothing unless they can find it in the Bible and yet will continue to keep Sunday as the Lord’s day on the **say-so of the Catholic Church**.” Rev. Leo J. Trese and John J. Castletot, S. S., **Salvation History and the Commandments** (1963 edition), p. 294

“The **Catholic Church** for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, **changed** the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her divine mission, because he who called himself the ‘Lord of the Sabbath,’ endowed her with his own power to teach, ‘he that heareth you, heareth me;’ commanded all who believe in him to hear her under penalty of being placed with the ‘heathen and publican;’ and promised to be with her to the end of the world. She holds her charter as teacher from him—a charter as **infallible** as perpetual. The Protestant world at its birth [in the Reformation of the sixteenth century] found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the **church’s right to change the day**, for over three hundred years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore to this day, the acknowledged **offspring** [interesting in the light of Ellen White’s remark that the Sunday is the child of the papacy—**Counsels to the Church**, p. 317; GC 54] **of the Catholic Church** as spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.” **The Catholic Mirror** (Baltimore, September 23, 1893)

“Q. (a) The Bible says ‘The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,’ and we read in your literature that it is the only Bible Sabbath there is. Will you please explain how the Sunday observance originated? (b) Do you think the Seventh Day Adventists keep the right day?

A. If you follow the **Bible alone** there can be **no question** that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord. In

keeping Sunday, non-Catholics are simply following the practice of the **Catholic Church** for 1800 years, a **tradition**, and **not a Bible ordinance**. What we would like to know is: Since they deny the authority of the Church, on what grounds can they base their faith of keeping Sunday. Those who keep Saturday, like the Seventh Day Adventists, unquestionably have them by the hip in this practice. And they cannot give them any sufficient answer which would satisfy an unprejudiced mind. With the Catholics there is no difficulty about the matter. For, since we **deny that the Bible is the sole rule of faith**, we can fall back upon the constant practice and **tradition of the Church** which, long before the reign of Constantine, even in the very days of the apostles themselves, were accustomed to keep the first day of the week instead of the last." F. G. Lentz, **The Question Box** (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), pp. 98, 99

Protestants and the Sabbath

"God made the world in six days and rested on the seventh, sanctifying this day, and setting it apart from all others as holy **to Himself**, to be observed by His people throughout their generations. But the man of sin, exalting himself above God, sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself to be God, thought to change times and laws. This power, thinking to prove that it was not only equal to God, but above God, changed the rest day, placing the first day of the week where the seventh should be. And the **Protestant world** has taken this **child of the papacy** to be regarded as sacred. In the Word of God this is called her fornication [Revelation 14:8]." **Last Day Events**, p. 123

"The man of sin, who thought to change times and laws, has exalted himself above God by presenting this spurious sabbath to the world; the Christian world has accepted this **child** of the Papacy, and **cradled** and **nourished** it, thus defying God by removing His memorial and setting up a rival sabbath." **Selected Messages, Volume 3** p. 406

"The Protestant world have set up an **idol sabbath** in the place where God's Sabbath should be, and they are treading in the footsteps of the Papacy." Letter 90, 1897

The Idol Sabbath

"The Sabbath question is one that will demand great care and wisdom in its presentation. Much of the grace and power of God will be needed to **cast down the idol** that has been erected in the **shape of a false sabbath**." **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 9, p. 211

"Satan has taken the world captive. He has introduced an **idol sabbath**, apparently giving to it great importance. He has stolen the homage of the Christian world away from the Sabbath of the Lord for this **idol sabbath**. The world bows to a tradition, a **man-made commandment**." **Review and Herald**, March 8, 1898

The Final Issue

The final issue will be **one of authority**: Is it **God and the Bible** or the **papacy and tradition**? Is **homage paid to God** by worshiping him **on the day that he created** or is homage **paid to the papacy** by **worshiping on the day that it established**?

Thus **worship** to God and **keeping his commandments** will distinguish one group and **worship** to the beast and **keeping his commandments** will be on the other side.

*“Among professed Christians there are **idolaters**, men and women who are not sealed by God. Many have subverted the Christian faith into **idolatry**, giving to a **man-made** institution the glory and honor that God requires for His Sabbath day, and compelling others to **worship this idol**. Such ones will surely be visited with God's retributive judgments, which are to be poured out without mixture of mercy upon the unrepentant despisers of God's law.” **Manuscript Releases**, Volume 19, p. 244*

The Bible, in terms **too clear to be misunderstood**, repeatedly tells us that the **SEVENTH** day is the Sabbath of the Lord! And yet the Roman Catholic Church and Protestants inform us that **Sunday is the Sabbath**. On what ground can they do this? Certainly not on Biblical grounds!

But the Roman Catholic Church has become **craftier**. **John Paul II**, in his recent pastoral letter, **Dies Domini** made a valiant effort to defend Sunday sacredness from a **Biblical perspective**. He appeals to **philosophical arguments** based on **human reason**. Yet none of his arguments are persuasive to those who take the **Bible as their only reliable standard** of truth. Nowhere in the Bible are we told that Sunday is **holy**, or that we are to keep it in **honor of Christ's resurrection** or that we are required to **attend church** regularly on that day.

It is a telling fact that John Paul II quotes **212 scholars**, church **councils**, **creeds** and **church fathers** to bolster his **weak Biblical case**! Once again, tradition has made of **none effect** the clear Word of God!

What should we do as Seventh-day Adventists?

*“We are to give to the world a manifestation of the pure, noble, holy principles that are to distinguish the people of God from the world. Instead of the people of God becoming less and less definitely distinguished from those who do not keep the seventh-day Sabbath, they are to make the observance of the Sabbath **so prominent** that the world cannot fail to recognize them as Seventh-day Adventist.” **Manuscript 162**, 1903 [found in **Evangelism**, p. 233].*

LESSON #20 – DIES DOMINI

The Horn that Attempted to Change God’s Law

Introduction

Daniel 7:25: This verse describes how the Roman Catholic Papacy would attempt to change God’s law:

*“He shall speak **pompous words** against the Most High, shall **persecute** the saints of the Most High, and shall intend to **change** times and **law**. Then the saints shall be given into his hand for a **time and times and half a time**.”*

Until his recent death, the **most respected and admired** man on the planet, **hands down**, was **Pope John Paul II**. On **May 31, 1998** (on the **Solemnity of Pentecost**) he published the **Apostolic Letter *Dies Domini*** which was written primarily for the **religious leaders** of the Roman Catholic Church. What did the pope have to say about Sabbath and Sunday?

What I am going to share with you in this study has **nothing to do with John Paul II as a person**. I am simply going to **compare** what he says in his **Apostolic Letter** with what the **Bible** says. We will keep the discussion on a **theological level**, not a **personal one**.

#1: According to the Bible, which day did of the week did God bless and sanctify and which day is the Lord’s Day?

The Bible says that God **ble**ssed the **seventh-day Sabbath** and made it **holy**. It also says that Jesus is the **Lord of the seventh-day** Sabbath. The book of Genesis also makes it crystal clear that the Sabbath was established before there was any **Jew** and before there was any **sin**. It is part of God’s **original plan** for the human race.

Genesis 2:2, 3:

*“And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. ³ Then God **ble**ssed the **seventh day** and **sanctified it**, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made.”*

Exodus 20:8-11:

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. ⁹ Six days you shall labor and do all your work, ¹⁰ but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God. In it you shall do no work: you, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your male servant, nor your female servant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger who is within your gates. ¹¹ For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

Mark 2:27-28:

"And He said to them, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. ²⁸ Therefore the Son of Man is also Lord of the Sabbath."

Isaiah 58:13-14:

"If you turn away your foot from the Sabbath, from doing your pleasure on My holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy day of the Lord honorable, and shall honor Him, not doing your own ways, nor finding your own pleasure, nor speaking your own words, Then you shall delight yourself in the Lord..."

#1: According to *Dies Domini*, which day of the week did God bless and sanctify and which day is the Lord's Day?

Paragraph #14:

"In the first place, therefore, Sunday is the day of rest because it is the day 'blessed' by God and 'made holy' by him, set apart from the other days to be, among all of them, 'the Lord's Day."

Samuel Bacchiocchi, who dedicated many years to study the manner in which the Sabbath was changed to Sunday, explained what would have happened if the apostles had taught the abandonment of Sabbath observance:

"... if Paul or any other apostle had attempted to promote the abandonment of the Sabbath, a millenarian institution deeply rooted in the religious consciousness of the people, and the adoption instead of Sunday observance, there would have been considerable opposition on the part of Jewish-Christians, as was the case with reference to the circumcision. The absence of any echo of Sabbath/Sunday controversy in the NT is a most telling evidence that the introduction of Sunday observance is a post-apostolic phenomenon." Samuele Bacchiocchi, "Pope's Call for Observance of Sunday" Issues, Friday, August 7, 1998.

#2: According to the Bible, which day stands at the heart of all worship? Which day distinguishes the Creator from His creatures?

Revelation 14:6-7:

*“Then I saw another angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to those who dwell on the earth — to every nation, tribe, tongue, and people—⁷ saying with a loud voice: “Fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment has come; and **worship Him who made heaven and earth, the sea and springs of water.**”*

The language of Revelation 14:6, 7 comes directly from the fourth commandment of God’s holy law in Exodus 20:11 where God is identified as the Creator and His sign is the Sabbath.

Exodus 20:11:

*“For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord **blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.**”*

#2: According to *Dies Domini* which day stands at the very heart of all worship?

Paragraph #19:

“The intimate bond between Sunday and the Resurrection of the Lord is strongly emphasized by all the Churches of East and West. In the tradition of the Eastern Churches in particular, every Sunday is the anastasimos hemera, the day of Resurrection, and this is why it stands at the heart of all worship.”

#3: According to the Bible, what is the distinguishing mark of God’s people?

Ezekiel 20:12:

“Moreover I also gave them My Sabbaths, to be a sign between them and Me that they might know that I am the Lord who sanctifies them.”

Ezekiel 20:20:

“... hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a sign between Me and you that you may know that I am the Lord your God.”

#3: According to *Dies Domini* which is the sign that identifies God’s true people?

Paragraph #21:

*“The book of Revelation gives evidence of the practice of calling the **first day** of the week ‘the Lord’s Day’ (1:10). This [Sunday observance] would now be a characteristic **distinguishing Christians** from the world around them.”*

John Paul II believed that the expression “Lord’s day” in Revelation refers to Sunday even though this name is never applied to Sunday until the end of the second century in the **Apocryphal Gospel of Peter**. The meaning of this expression as it was used at the end of the second century cannot be read back into a text that was written at the end of the first century. The Bible must tell us which day is truly the Lord’s Day and every other text in the Bible clearly states that the Seventh day Sabbath is the Lord’s Day.

According to scholars the Gospel of John and the book of Revelation were written by the **same person** at about the **same time**, that is, at the end of the **first century**. Neither of these books refers to Sunday as the [1] **Lord’s Day** or as a [2] **memorial of the resurrection**. Neither book attributes [3] **any holiness to Sunday**. It is not called a [4] **day of rest** nor are believers encouraged to go [5] **to church** on it. Neither book states that Sunday [6] **must be kept** in honor of the resurrection of Jesus.

It is a well-documented fact that for more than **one hundred years** after the resurrection the church **did not keep the weekly Sunday** in honor of the resurrection but rather commemorated it **once a year** on the date of the **Passover on the 14th day of Nissan** no matter which day the Passover fell on. It was only in the **second century** that **Bishop Victor** excommunicated the Christians **in Asia** for not commemorating the resurrection on the weekly Sunday.

Paragraph #30:

*“Given its many meanings and aspects, and its link to the very foundations of the faith, the celebration of the Christian Sunday remains, on the threshold of the Third Millennium, an **indispensable element of our Christian identity**.”*

Paragraph #7:

*“Sunday is a day which is **at the very heart of the Christian life**.”*

#4: According to the Bible, which of the Ten Commandments is the only one that has the necessary elements of a seal? According to the Bible, which is the day above all days?

The Bible teaches that God’s seal is related to God’s law (Isaiah 8:16). The **only commandment** in God’s law that has the **three necessary elements** of a seal is the fourth. This commandment identifies the lawgiver, his title and the territory over which He rules. Notably God placed His

seal also on creation week when on the seventh day he rested and set the Sabbath apart as a reminder of His creative power.

The Bible sets the Sabbath apart from all other days. It is the day that is over and above every other day of the week. It is the only day that has a name and a number and it's the only day that God calls His. **Not only did God set the Sabbath apart from all other days at creation but He also set it apart by making it the only day on which He did not send manna**

Exodus 20:11:

"For in six days the [1] Lord [2] made the [3] heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

In an archeological dig in Ugarit, tablets were unearthed that parallel Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments have the following characteristics:

- **They are a covenant:** Deuteronomy 4:13
- **They were written on tables:** Deuteronomy 4:13
- **They were written on both sides of the tablets:** Exodus 32:15, 16
- **The Seal was placed in the middle:** Exodus 20:8-11
- **The seal contains three elements:** The name of the lawgiver, His position and His territory

#4: According to *Dies Domini* upon which day has God placed His seal?

Paragraph # 23:

"Saint Augustine notes in turn: 'Therefore the Lord too has placed his seal on this day [Sunday], which is the third day after the Passion.'"

#4: According to *Dies Domini* which is the day above all other days?

Paragraph #25:

"In effect, Sunday is the day above all other days which summons Christians to remember the salvation which was given to them in baptism and which has made them new in Christ."

Paragraph #55:

"Blessed be he who has raised the great day of Sunday above all other days."

#5: How does God look upon the ancient practice of sun worship?

Ezekiel 8:16, 17:

“So He brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house; and there, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about twenty-five men with their backs toward the temple of the Lord and their faces toward the east, and they were worshipping the sun toward the east.¹⁷ And He said to me, "Have you seen this, O son of man? Is it a trivial thing to the house of Judah to commit the abominations which they commit here? For they have filled the land with violence; then they have returned to provoke Me to anger.”

#5: According to *Dies Domini* what relationship exists between the pagan practice of sun worship and the Christian practice of worship on the day of the sun?

Paragraph #27:

“Wise pastoral intuition suggested to the Church the Christianization of the notion of Sunday as ‘the day of the sun’, which was the Roman name for the day and which is retained in some modern languages. This was in order to draw the faithful away from the seduction of the cults which worshipped the sun, and to direct the celebration of the day to Christ, humanity’s true ‘sun’.”

Is it the same thing to worship the sun as it is to worship on the day of the sun? In principle it is the same thing. In fact it can be historically proven that Sunday came into the Christian Church from paganism as did many other church observances. In fact, Constantine called it *“The Venerable Day of the Sun.”*

The Catholic Catechism quotes St. Justin:

“We all gather on the day of the sun, for it is the first day [after the Jewish Sabbath, but also the first day] when God, separating matter from darkness, made the world; and on this same day Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead.” Catechism of the Catholic Church, paragraph # 2174

The Roman Catholic Church is obsessed with the sun. In almost every single case when the priest faces the altar he is facing east with his back toward the congregation. Roman Catholic churches, museums and other buildings are filled with suns and sun bursts. There are suns on chalices, suns on vestments, suns on altars, suns on glass stained windows (for example in St. Peter’s Basilica) and suns on works of art. The host is yellow and round and the priests have a round tonsure on their heads which was an ancient practice of the priests of the sun god.

#6: According to the Bible should religious observances be guaranteed by civil legislation?

The **first table** of the law we should render only to God. According to the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Congress should neither **establish** the observance of a rest day nor **forbid** the free exercise thereof.

Matt 22:21-22: Jesus separated the civil power from the religious power

*"And He said to them, "Render therefore to **Caesar** the things that are Caesar's, and to **God** the things that are God's."*

#6: According to *Dies Domini*, should the state guarantee the right of citizens to observe Sunday as a religious day of rest?

Paragraph #64:

"Only in the fourth century did the civil law of the Roman Empire recognize the weekly recurrence, determining that on 'the day of the sun' the judges, the people of the cities and the various trade corporations would not work. Christians rejoiced to see thus removed the obstacles which until then had sometimes made observance of the Lord's Day heroic. They could now devote themselves to prayer in common without hindrance."

This **civil law** was given by **Constantine the Great** on **March 7** in the year 321. **Canon 29** of the **Synod of Laodicea** held in the year **336**, made Sunday observance a religious law. Constantine's law read as follows:

*"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades rest on the **venerable day of the sun**."*

The law of the **Synod of Laodicea** (which was approved in the ecumenical council of Chalcedon in the year **451**) stated:

"Christians must not judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honoring the Lord's Day; and, if they can, resting then as Christians. But if any shall be found to be judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ."

Paragraph #66:

*"Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical **Rerum Novarum** spoke of Sunday rest as a worker's right which **the State must guarantee**."*

Paragraph #67:

*"Christians will naturally strive to ensure that **civil legislation** respects their duty to keep Sunday holy."*

Benedict XVI's Apostolic Exhortation, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, paragraph 74:

*"Finally, it is particularly urgent nowadays to remember that the day of the Lord is also a day of rest from work. It is greatly to be hoped that this fact will also be **recognized by civil society**, so that individuals can be permitted to **refrain from work** without being penalized."*

In recent years the papacy has been **putting pressure** on the parliament of the **European Community** to pass a secular Sunday law. But history proves that secular Sunday laws eventually morph into religious Sunday laws.

#7: According to the Bible on which day of the week did Jesus especially alleviate the suffering and pain of His fellow human beings?

Isaiah 58 clearly describes how the Sabbath should be the special day to alleviate the suffering of the less fortunate in society. Jesus also chose the Sabbath as the special day to alleviate human suffering.

Miracles Jesus performed on Sabbath:

- A man with a **withered hand** (**Matthew 12:12**)
- Cast out **demons** (Mark 1:21-24)
- Peter's **mother-in-law**
- A woman who could not straighten out for **18 years** (**Luke 13:10-17**)
- A man with **dropsy** [a disease where liquid is retained in the joints causing great pain and suffering (**Luke 14:1-6**)
- A man **paralyzed** for 38 years (**John 5**)
- A man who was **born blind** (**John 9**)

#7: According to *Dies Domini* which should be the special day to alleviate the suffering of our fellow human beings?

*"If Sunday is a day of joy, Christians should declare by their actual behavior that we cannot be happy "on our own". They look around to find people who **may need their help**. It may be that in their neighborhood or among those they know there are **sick people, elderly people, children or immigrants** who precisely on Sundays feel more keenly their **isolation, needs and suffering**. It is true that commitment to these people cannot be restricted to occasional Sunday gestures. But presuming a wider sense of commitment, why not make **the Lord's Day a more intense time of sharing**, encouraging all the inventiveness of which Christian charity is capable? Inviting to a meal people who are alone, **visiting the sick**, providing food for needy families, spending a few hours in voluntary work and acts of solidarity: these would certainly be ways of bringing into people's lives the love of Christ received at the Eucharistic table."*

#8: According to the Bible, which day will be kept when God creates a new heaven and a new earth?

Isaiah 66:22, 23:

"For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before Me," says the Lord, "So shall your descendants and your name remain. ²³ And it shall come to pass that from one New Moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh shall come to worship before Me," says the Lord."

#8: According to *Dies Domini* which day will be keep when history as we know it comes to an end?

Paragraph #84:

"From Sunday to Sunday, enlightened by Christ, she goes forward towards the unending Sunday of the heavenly Jerusalem, which "has no need of the sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light and its lamp is the Lamb" (*Revelation 21:23*)."

#9: According to the Bible, which day of the week was kept holy by the Blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus?

Luke 23:55, 56:

"And the women who had come with Him from Galilee followed after, and they observed the tomb and how His body was laid. 56 Then they returned and prepared spices and fragrant oils. And they rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment."

#9: According to *Dies Domini*, which day of the week did the Blessed Virgin Mary venerate and keep?

"I entrust this Apostolic Letter to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, that it may be received and put into practice by the Christian community. Without in any way detracting from the centrality of Christ and his Spirit, Mary is always present in the Church's Sunday. It is the mystery of Christ itself which demands this: indeed, how could she who is Mater Domini [Lord's mother] and Mater Ecclesiae [mother of the church] fail to be uniquely present on the day which is both dies Domini [Lord's Day] and dies Ecclesiae? [Church's Day]"

#10: According to the Bible, of how much value are the traditions of men that contradict the written word of God?

"And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men." (*Mark 7:7*)

#10: According to *Dies Domini*, by whose authority was the day of worship changed from Sabbath to Sunday?

In *Dies Domini* John Paul (presumably in order to build bridges with Protestants) made a valiant effort to prove that the New Testament already contemplated the change from Sabbath to Sunday.

In paragraphs 20, 21 John Paul II provides a seemingly impressive list of things that occurred on Sunday. This is the very list that is provided by Protestants to defend the observance of Sunday:

- Jesus resurrected on the first day of the week
- The same day Jesus talked with two disciples on the road to Emmaus (**Luke 24:36**)
- He appeared to the eleven apostles on the first day of the week (**John 20:19**)
- A week later he appeared to the apostles again on a Sunday (**John 20:24-28**)
- If you count (inclusive reckoning) 50 days after the first-fruits you have another first day of the week. Thus the church was established on the first day of the week and the Holy Spirit was poured out on Sunday
- The first proclamation of the gospel took place on Sunday
- The first baptisms took place on Sunday
- This long list is superfluous. The fact is that Jesus did not resurrect on Sunday to make Sunday holy but rather He resurrected on Sunday because He had to rest in the tomb on the Sabbath. The Manna episode clearly pointed out that the body of Jesus would see no corruption on the Sabbath as the Manna did not breed worms or stink on the Sabbath.

John Paul also refers to three other additional texts that Protestants use to try and prove that the change of the Sabbath was an apostolic phenomenon:

- I Corinthians 16:1, 2
- Acts 20:7-9
- Revelation 1:10
- The reason why he quotes these verses is because he wants to give the appearance that Sunday was the day of worship even in the New Testament.

But the bottom line is that nowhere does the New Testament state that Sunday was [1] made holy and blessed by God, that [2] we must keep it in honor of the resurrection or [3] that we are to go to church on that day.

A careful reading of *Dies Domini* reveals where John Paul II claims that the change came from:

Paragraph #6:

*“It seems more necessary than ever to recover the deep doctrinal foundations underlying **the Church’s precept** . . . [In keeping it] “we follow in the footsteps of the **age-old tradition of the Church.**”*

Paragraph #18:

*“**Christians** . . . made [not God] the first day after the Sabbath a festive day, for that was the day on which the Lord rose from the dead.”*

Paragraph #27:

*“**Christian reflection**” and “**pastoral practice**” changed it*

Paragraph #63:

*“**Christians**, called as they are to proclaim the liberation won by the blood of Christ, **felt that they had the authority to transfer** the meaning of the Sabbath to the day of the resurrection.”*

Paragraph #81:

*“The spiritual and pastoral riches of Sunday, as it has been **handed on to us by tradition**, are truly great.”*

The amazing thing is that the Roman Catholic Church teaches that the **Sabbath has been changed in the new dispensation** but they continue to practice most of the things of the **old dispensation**. They have temples, altars, incense, vestments, chalices, literal sacrifice of the Mass, etc. They have all the remnants from Judaism but they refuse to keep the Sabbath.

The pope states in *Dies Domini* that the Sabbath was the day of the **old covenant** and calls it the **Jewish Sabbath**. The problem with this argument is that the Sabbath was established in Genesis **before sin, before an old covenant** and **before there was any Jew**.

Ellen G. White in **The Great Controversy** describes the process whereby the apostate Christian church got rid of the Sabbath:

*“The arch-deceiver had not completed his work. He was resolved to gather the **Christian world** under his banner and to exercise his power through **his vice-regent**, the proud pontiff who **claimed to be the representative of Christ** [Vicarius Filii Dei]. Through half-converted pagans, ambitious prelates, and world-loving churchmen he accomplished his purpose. Vast councils were held from time to time, in which the dignitaries of the church were convened from all the world. **In nearly every council the Sabbath which God instituted was pressed down a little lower, while the Sunday was correspondingly exalted. Thus the pagan festival came finally to***

be honored as a divine institution, while the Bible Sabbath was pronounced a relic of Judaism, and its observers were declared to be accursed.” Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 53.

Daniel Seven’s View of the Judgment

The first question we must ask is: Where does the judgment of Daniel 7 take place, in heaven or on earth? There are at least three reasons why this judgment transpires in heaven. 1) As we have already seen (page 2), the prose sections of Daniel 7 describe earthly events while the poetry sections describe heavenly scenes. All judgment passages in Daniel 7 are in poetry—a clear indication that the judgment is taking place in heaven. 2) The Son of Man goes before the Ancient of Days for the judgment. It is clear that the Ancient of Days is God the Father whose dwelling place is in heaven not earth (**Matthew 6:9**). 3) The timing of the judgment also helps us understand that it is transpiring in heaven.

Three times in Daniel 7 we are told that the judgment would take place after the nefarious work of the little horn. In fact, we are told that the judgment was to be God’s response to the evil dominion of the little horn (verse 8 followed by verses 9-14; verse 21 followed by verse 22; verse 25 followed by verses 26-27). As we have previously shown, the dominion of the little horn represents the Papacy’s supremacy from 538-1798. Obviously, the little horn cannot be judged before its period of dominion is over, so the judgment must have begun sometime after 1798.

This judgment not only transpires after 1798 but it also takes place before the second coming. And why is this? Because in Daniel 7:13 Christ goes **to the Father in heaven** to judge and only after He has finished does He come back **to earth** to give the kingdom to His people. The same sequence is found in the book of Revelation. In Revelation 14:6-12 we find God’s final warning message to the world. Three angels are seen descending from heaven to deliver this three-part message... The first angel (**Revelation 14:7**) announces that the hour of God’s judgment ‘has come’ (past tense in Greek). It is clear that the judgment begins before the second and third angels have delivered their messages. If the judgment begins before the second and third angels’ messages are delivered, then the judgment must be before the second coming. It would be nonsensical to say that Jesus will come before the second and third angels’ messages have been delivered. Not until all three messages have been delivered is Jesus seen seated on the cloud coming to the earth! (**Revelation 14:14**)

Needless to say, this proves that the judgment did not take place at the cross or in the time of the apostles because the little horn had not yet ruled. Paul makes it crystal clear that the judgment was still future in his day (**Acts 17:30-31; I Corinthians 5:10**). The above perspective also proves that we are not judged the moment we die. After all, why would God proclaim a specific hour for the judgment to begin if people already went to heaven or hell when they died? If the judgment begins after 1798 and before the second coming, then it did not take place when people died.

The Bible is very clear that the **location** of the judgment is the most holy place of the sanctuary where the Ark of the Covenant and the law are found. Since 1798 there has been no earthly most holy place so the judgment must have begun in heaven, not on earth!

Another question comes to the fore: Who is the judge in this heavenly judgment? The Bible **seems** to be equivocal on this point. But is it really? Let's consider the evidence.

Daniel 7 informs us three times that the Ancient of Days is the judge (verses 9, 13, 22). This would seem to indicate that God the Father is the judge. However, there are other Biblical texts which indicate that the Father judges no man but has committed all judgment to the Son of Man. In II Corinthians 5:10 the apostle Paul tells us that we must all stand before the great judgment seat of Christ. And John 5:22, 27 unequivocally states that the Father has committed all judgment to the Son. What is all the more amazing about these verses in the gospel of John is that they have three clear links with the judgment scene in Daniel 7: God, the Son of man, and judgment. How do we solve this **apparent** discrepancy? An analogous case will help us understand that there is no discrepancy at all.

In the Bible, God the Father is identified as the Creator (**Revelation 4:11**). Yet the Bible tells us that the Father executed the works of creation **through** Jesus (**John 1:1-3; Colossians 1:16-17; Hebrews 1:2**). In other words, the Father performed the work of creation through the instrumentality of His Son. The Father is the Master Architect and the Son is the Master Builder. In similar fashion, the apostle Paul tells us in Acts 17:30-31 that the Father will judge the world **through** 'that Man whom He has appointed.' Ellen White clarifies:

*"Says the Psalmist: 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.' Psalm 90:2. It is He, the source of all being, and the fountain of all law, that is to **preside** in the judgment. And the holy angels as ministers and witnesses, in number 'ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands,' attend this great tribunal." (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 479 emphasis supplied*

"Above the distractions of the earth He sits enthroned; all things are open to His divine survey; and from His great and calm eternity He orders that which His providence sees best." (Ellen G. White, **The Ministry of Healing**, p. 417)

We conclude, then, that the Father presides the judgment in a supervisory role, while the Son is the active agent who deals with the 'nuts and bolts.'

Two things strike us about this judgment scene. One is its awesome **solemnity** and the other its intense **movement**. The expression 'Ancient of Days' underlines the Father's eternity, while the white garments and hair represent His spotless moral purity and uprightness. The throne ablaze with flames and the wheels as burning fire represent the purging process of the judgment (see, **Malachi 3:3-5; Matthew 3:12; Psalm 50:3; 97:1-14; Isaiah 30:27-28**). The Father's sovereign will is implemented by millions of angels who stand before His throne, an idea to which we will return shortly.

The emphasis on movement is obvious. Notice the progression: First thrones are 'cast down.' At this point no one is sitting on them (7:9). The Chaldee word for 'cast down' is the same that is used to describe Daniel being 'cast' into the lions' den and his three friends being 'cast' into the

fiery furnace. It is also the same word which Daniel used to depict the work of casting down that the little horn performed in Daniel 8: 10, 11, 12 The little horn cast down the place of the sanctuary, the stars and the truth but now God will respond by turning the tables and 'casting down' thrones to judge it for its misbehavior. After the thrones were 'cast down,' (which clearly shows that they were not there before!) the Ancient of Days 'did sit.' The question immediately suggests itself: Where was the Father before He sat down? Was He just standing there where the thrones were put in place or was He in some other location and then came to where the thrones were placed? Daniel 7:9 does not tell us but Daniel 7:22 does. We are told there, that the Ancient of Days **came** to the place of judgment which means He was not there before (The same Aramaic word is used in Daniel 7:13 where the Son of man '**came**' and was '**brought**' before the Father). Once again we ask: Where was the Father before he sat down on his newly placed throne?

The answer to this question is found in the Hebrew sanctuary. There were four key places in the Hebrew sanctuary: the encampment, the court, the holy place and the most holy place. The **encampment** was the place where needy sinners resided. The **court** was the location where the sacrifices were offered. In the **holy place** the blood of the sacrifices was applied by the priest and in the **most holy place** sins were blotted out once a year at the end of the year.

It is obvious that the encampment and the court symbolized the earth. It is on earth where needy sinners reside and it was on earth where Jesus Christ was sacrificed for sin. Where did Jesus go upon His ascension? The Bible tells us that He sat down at the right hand of God (his role as king of the kingdom of grace. After all, kings **sit** on thrones) and that He was standing at the right hand of God (His role as ministering High Priest, because priests **stand** ministering before God) [**Acts 7:55; Hebrews 1:3**]. Obviously, both the Father and the Son were in the same place upon the ascension. But, which place? There can be no doubt that it is the holy place. And why is this? The geography of the Hebrew sanctuary dictates it because after the court was the holy place.

Those who believe that Jesus went directly into the most holy place upon His ascension are at a loss to explain why Jesus would leap from the court to the most holy place upon His ascension thus totally bypassing the holy place. Both Peter and Paul clearly inform us that Jesus went to heaven with His blood to be our intercessor, a work which clearly belongs to the holy place (**Hebrews 7:25-26; I Timothy 2:5; Romans 8:34; Acts 2:16-39**). This is why Jesus, after His ascension, is depicted as one walking among the seven candlesticks and ministering before the golden altar of incense (**Revelation 1; 8:3-5**). It doesn't take the brain of a rocket scientist to figure out that if the Father and the Son were in the holy place in 1798 and then moved for the judgment at some point thereafter, they must have moved to the most holy place. There are no other options because the work of judgment must be performed in the most holy place where the Ark of the Covenant and the Law of God are found!! (Study **Revelation 11:15-19** where this is made crystal clear). Thus we conclude that both the Father and the Son were in the holy place until the beginning of the judgment.

But sometime after 1798, the Father moved from the holy to the most holy place. This movement is highlighted by the fact that the Father's throne, as seen in the synonymous

parallelism, has wheels—fiery wheels!! [‘His throne was ablaze with flames, **its** wheels were a burning fire,’ [NASB] The angels actually move the wheels (**Daniel 7:10**; see the description of the same throne in **Ezekiel 1**) as they bring the Father into the most holy place. But note that there is not only one throne. There are thrones [plural]. How many are there and who sits upon them? We are not told in Daniel 7 but one thing is certain, it is not the angels who sit on the thrones. How do we know this? The Bible makes it clear that the angels are constantly on the move. They are ministering spirits sent out to minister to those who will inherit salvation (**Hebrews 1:14**). In the Bible the angels always **stand** before God and are **sent** to minister throughout the universe. In fact, in Ezekiel 1 the angels are in constant movement, never having a restful moment! Notice the following awesome description given by Ellen G. White:

*“The Bible shows us God in His high and holy place, not in a state of inactivity, not in silence and solitude, but surrounded by ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of holy beings, all waiting to do His will. Through these messengers, He is in active communication with every part of His dominion. By His Spirit He is everywhere present. Through the agency of His Spirit and His angels He ministers to the children of men.” (Ellen G. White, **The Ministry of Healing**, p. 417)*

Revelation 5:11 makes it abundantly clear that God is surrounded by ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands of angels. But it is not the angels who sit upon the thrones but rather the 24 elders (**Revelation 4:4**). As we study Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 together, we discover that there are 24 thrones and the elders sit upon them. But who these elders are and what their role is remains to be seen. There is undoubtedly a close link between Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 which we must return to later, but before we do, we must make a few remarks about the relationship between Daniel 7 and Ezekiel 1-11. Even a hasty glance at these two passages will reveal their close relationship. In both we have a chariot-throne, angels who guide the wheels, fire, clouds, and an awesome being who sits on the chariot-throne. In both, the idea of judgment is at the forefront.

It should not surprise us that Daniel and Ezekiel spoke in similar terms because they were contemporaries. A thorough study of Ezekiel 1 is far beyond the scope of this paper, but as William Shea has shown elsewhere, Ezekiel 1 describes the journey of God from heaven to earth to judge apostate Jerusalem. The date for Ezekiel 1 is 592 B. C. It is of critical importance to remember that in Ezekiel it is God’s **apostate people** who are in view. They are committing **abominations**, the greatest of which is sun-worship (8:16), they are called a **harlot** (chapter 16), they are shedding **innocent blood**, the priests do violence to the **law**, and prophets and kings are corrupt. But in their midst is a **remnant** who sigh and cry because of the abominations which are being committed. These will be **sealed** for salvation while the apostate ones will be marked for destruction (9:1-6). Finally, the **Shekinah** departs (11:22-23), the city is left **desolate** and Nebuchadnezzar comes and executes God’s judgment upon it in 586 B. C. Like Daniel, Ezekiel presents three steps in the judgment process: Investigation (9:1-4), sentence (11:22-23, the Shekinah leaves), execution of the sentence (9:5-6).

I believe that what happened with Jerusalem locally and historically (Ezekiel’s view) is a type of what will take place universally and prophetically (Daniel’s view). In other words, Ezekiel depicts

the type while Daniel presents the antitype. In Ezekiel God comes to judge Jerusalem, but in Daniel 7 God comes to judge a worldwide apostate Christianity.

As we have already shown, Daniel seven's little horn symbolizes an **apostate Christian power**. This power is committing **abominations (Matthew 24:15; Revelation 17:5; Daniel 11:31)**, it is described as a **harlot (Revelation 17:1)**, it sheds **innocent blood (Revelation 17:6)**, it thinks it can change the **law (Daniel 7:25)**, it persecutes a **remnant** who remain faithful to God (**Daniel 7:21, 25**). God's faithful ones will be **sealed** for salvation (**Revelation 7:1-4**) whereas the apostates will be marked for **destruction (Revelation 14:9-11)**. The **Shekinah** will depart the heavenly temple (**Revelation 15:5-8**) and then **desolation** and destruction will come upon the apostates in the form of the seven last plagues (**Revelation 16-19**). The key point we should remember here is that both Daniel and Ezekiel portray a judgment process which has God's professed people in view. Clearly, among those who claim to be God's people, there are genuine and counterfeit believers. The judgment process has the purpose of separating these two groups.

Now let's take a look at the relationship between Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5. The striking similarities between these two passages have led some scholars to conclude that they are both describing the same historical event. Is this true? Are both Daniel 7 and Revelation 4-5 describing the judgment which begins sometime after 1798? I believe the answer to this question is a resounding no!! Why, then, are there so many similarities? Simply because the two passages are portraying two **different events** where the **same beings** are present.

It is clear that the scene of Revelation 4-5 is describing the inauguration of Christ's priesthood upon His ascension to heaven. We are told in Acts 1:9-11 that Jesus was taken to heaven in a cloud. Before Jesus arrives, the Father is seen sitting upon His throne by himself (**Revelation 4:2**). Surrounding Him are elders on 24 thrones (4:4). There is no evidence that the Father moved to this throne from somewhere else, He is simply there. At this point Jesus has not yet arrived. But in 5:6 Jesus appears on the scene, not as the Son of man of Daniel 7, but as a lamb 'as if it had been slain.' A song is then sung extolling Jesus as the one who was slain to redeem mankind (5:9). Revelation 5:11 uses almost the same terminology as Daniel 7 to describe the angelic hosts.

As we have already seen, Jesus ascended to the Father in the holy place for His inauguration. Upon His arrival, the Father was waiting for Him as were the 24 elders, and the angelic hosts to celebrate His work of redemption as the Lamb of God. This is the glorious event which Peter described in his eloquent sermon of Acts, chapter 2. Ellen G. White makes this clear in her book, ***The Desire of Ages***, pp. 831-835. All the beings which would later be present for the beginning of the judgment were also present for His inauguration. This is why the two scenes appear so similar.

In Daniel 7 the entire heavenly entourage moves from the holy to the most holy place. Notice that when this happens, a different song is sung extolling God as judge and king! (**Revelation 11:15-19**). Ellen White describes this glorious movement in ***Early Writings***, pp. 54-56 where she is clearly making reference to the vision of Daniel 7. In other words, Revelation 4-5 describes

Jesus going from **earth** to **heaven** on a **cloud** to His **Father** upon His **ascension** to be invested as **High Priest**. On the other hand, in Daniel 7, He is portrayed as coming on **clouds** from the **holy** to the most **holy place** to His **Father** in 1844 to be invested as **King**. The same beings are present on both occasions and this is why the scenes are so similar. It is rather obvious that the coming of Jesus to the Ancient of Days cannot be at the ascension because at that time books were not opened and the little horn had not yet ruled. Daniel 7 makes it crystal clear that the Son of Man comes to the Ancient of Days only after the little horn has done its nefarious work. This judgment cannot be at the second coming either because at that time Jesus comes to the earth rather than going to the Ancient of Days.

In summary, Daniel 7 presents a clear sequence of events. First, thrones are put in place. Then, the angels bring the Father on His chariot-throne from the holy to the most holy place and He sits down on His throne. The 24 elders then sit on their thrones. Then the Son of man is brought by the clouds of angels in the chariot-throne to where the Father had been brought. This movement of the Son of man is expressed by the verbs, '**came . . . came . . .** they [notice the plural, the clouds] **brought** Him near before Him.' (**Daniel 7:13**). Then the judgment sits [is inaugurated] and the books are opened (**Daniel 7:10**). The text is very clear that Jesus does not come to the earth at this point but rather goes to the Ancient of Days. Regarding this, Ellen G. White affirms:

"The coming of Christ here described is not His second coming to the earth. He comes to the Ancient of Days in heaven to receive dominion and glory and a kingdom, which will be given Him at the close of His work as a mediator. It is this coming, and not His second advent to the earth, that was foretold in the prophecy to take place at the termination of the 2300 days in 1844." (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 479-480)

The Millerites and most contemporary Christians have erroneously assumed that Daniel 7:13-14 is describing the second coming of Jesus to this earth. One reason for this misunderstanding is that Jesus is here spoken of as coming on the clouds of heaven, an expression which clearly refers to the second coming in other contexts (**Revelation 1:7; Matthew 24:30, 31**). However, when Jesus ascended to heaven, he was received by a cloud (**Acts 1:9-11**) and on the Day of Atonement [Israel's Day of Judgment] the pillar of cloud moved into the most holy place (**Leviticus 16:1-2**). Furthermore, when God came down from heaven to the Jerusalem temple to judge Israel in the days of Ezekiel, He was surrounded by a cloud. The distinction between cloud [singular] and clouds [plural] does not seem to be significant because Revelation 14:14 describes Jesus' second coming on a cloud [singular] whereas the same event is described in Revelation 1:7 as Jesus coming with clouds [plural]. Needless to say, the Bible identifies clouds as symbolic of angels (see, **Psalms 104:3-4** and compare **Matthew 24:30, 31**) and Daniel 7:13 personifies [or should we say, 'angelifies'] the clouds by saying that **they** brought Jesus into the presence of the Ancient of Days.

Significantly, there is no evidence that the Son of man sits down during this judgment and the reason for this is that Jesus is the Advocate and will not occupy the throne until He receives the kingdom at the conclusion of the judgment.

And what is the nature of this heavenly judgment? In other words, what takes place during this investigative pre-Advent judgment? Before we can answer this question, we must ask another: Is the judgment of Daniel 7 restricted to the little horn and those whom it oppressed during the 1260 year period or does it include all believers from all periods of human history as well?

There can be no doubt that the central focus of the judgment scene in Daniel 7 is upon the little horn and the people whom it oppressed during the 1260 years. But does this exclude other believers from other historical periods? Not necessarily.

Perhaps an analogy will help us understand what I mean. When we read the Sabbath commandment as it is recorded in Deuteronomy 5:12-15 we might be led to conclude that it was given only to literal Israel because it refers to their specific historical situation. God, in essence, is saying to Israel: 'I delivered you from slavery and gave you rest, therefore you are to keep the Sabbath in commemoration of your emancipation.' Does this restricted use of the Sabbath commandment mean that it was given only to literal Israel? Was it not given also for the entire human race? Other texts make it abundantly clear that the Sabbath was given for all people of all ages (**Exodus 20:8-11; Genesis 2:1-3; Mark 2:27**). Does the restricted use of the Sabbath commandment in Deuteronomy 5 cancel out its broader use in other texts of Scripture? Absolutely not! We might just as well ask: Does the restricted use of the judgment in Daniel 7 to the period of the little horn cancel out the broader application to the entire human race? Of course not! At the conclusion of this judgment we are told that the saints received the kingdom. Are we to understand that only the saints who lived during the 1260 years will receive this kingdom? Of course not! Other texts of Scripture broaden the view by telling us that all the redeemed will inherit the kingdom. So we conclude that the specialized view of the judgment in Daniel 7 does not exclude the broader view in other portions of the Bible.

Now let's return to our original question. What is the nature of the judgment? In order to understand what takes place during this judgment we must first understand the relationship between the 'books' [plural] and the 'book' [singular]. Let's take a look at the 'books' first.

Daniel 7:10 informs us that the judgment sat and 'the books [plural] were opened.' And, what is in the books? The answer is actually quite simple. The books contain a complete record of our lives. Nothing is missing—not a thought, a feeling, an act, a word. God keeps an exact transcript of each person's life from conception till death. Our life story is there (**Psalms 139:16**), our secrets (**Ecclesiastes 12:13**), our words (**Matthew 12:34-37**), our works (**Revelation 22:12**), our evil deeds (**Isaiah 65:5-6**), our tears (**Psalms 56:8**). Our good deeds are written in the books of remembrance (**Malachi 3:16**). So to speak, God has another Stephen P. Bohr in heaven in written form. This record of each person's character, self-identity or individuality is carefully preserved in the heavenly books. Regarding this, Ellen G. White remarks:

*"The grand judgment is taking place, and has been going on for some time. Now the Lord says, Measure the temple and the worshipers thereof. Remember when you are walking the streets about your business, God is measuring you; when you are attending your household duties, when you engage in conversation, God is measuring you. Remember that your words and actions are being daguerreotyped [photographed] in the **books** of heaven, as the face is*

reproduced by the artist on the polished plate. . .” (**The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, ‘Ellen G. White Comments,’ volume 7, p. 972, emphasis supplied)

“Accurately recorded in the **books** of heaven are the sneers and trivial remarks made by sinners who pay no heed to the call of mercy when Christ is represented to them by a servant of God. As the artist takes on the polished glass a true picture of a human face, so God daily places upon the **books** of heaven an exact representation of the character of every individual.” (Ellen G. White, **Manuscript 105**, 1901 as found in **The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, volume 4, p. 1171, emphasis supplied)

“Remember that this world is God’s daguerreotyped [photography] office. The pictures of all who live here, old and young, are being made in the **books** of heaven. What shall the likeness be?” (Ellen G. White, **Manuscript Releases**, volume 3, p. 352, emphasis supplied)

This exact transcript of every nook and cranny of our lives is what the Bible calls the spirit. Notice the following awesome statement:

“Our personal identity is preserved in the resurrection, though not the same particles of matter or material substance as went into the grave. The wondrous works of God are a mystery to man. The **spirit**, the **character** of man, is **returned** to God, there to be **preserved**. In the resurrection every man will have his own **character**. God in His own time will call forth the dead, giving again the breath of life, and bidding the dry bones live. The same form will come forth, but it will be free from disease and every defect. It lives again bearing the same individuality of features, so that friend will recognize friend. There is no law of God in nature which shows that God gives back the same identical particles of matter which composed the body before death. God shall give the righteous dead a body that will please Him.” (**The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, ‘Ellen G. White Comments,’ volume 6, p. 1093, emphasis supplied)

Notice that it is not only the breath of life which returns to God when we die. It is our self-identity [that which makes me ‘me’ in distinction to others] which is preserved there until the day of the resurrection. Does the Bible corroborate this view of Ellen White that the spirit is the character of man? Absolutely!

In the above statement, Ellen White is actually commenting on Job 19:25-27 where Job expresses the assurance that when he resurrects, it will be **he himself** and not another. In other words, he will receive his own self-identity at the resurrection. Besides Job 19:25-27, there are three other texts which show that Ellen White was correct in her assessment. Luke 8 contains the story of the resurrection of Jairus’ daughter. When Jesus called her to rise, we are told that ‘**her** spirit returned to her.’ (**Luke 8:55**) Notice that it does not say: ‘**the** spirit returned to her.’ What God gave back to her was the breath of life along with **her own self-identity**. This is why the flow of her thoughts picked up exactly where it had left off when she died. She was hungry when she died and she was hungry when she rose from the dead.

The same can be said about Jesus when He died on the cross. When He cried out: ‘Father, into your hands I commend **my** spirit,’ (**Luke 23:46**). He was not merely saying: ‘Into your hands I commend my breath of life.’ He was really saying, ‘Into your hands I commend my **self-identity**,

my individuality, my character.’ When Jesus resurrected, He picked up at the very instant where he had left off when He died.

The same can be said of Stephen. As he was being stoned, he cried out, ‘Lord Jesus, receive **my** spirit.’ (**Acts 7:59**) Notice that he does not say ‘**the** spirit’ but rather, ‘**my** spirit.’ It was His self-identity or the record of his life that he wanted Jesus to preserve until the day of the resurrection. Similarly, when Jesus resurrected Lazarus, there can be no doubt that Lazarus’ thoughts began where they had left off when he died. The exact character or self-identity which God had preserved in the books was returned to him intact!! Though not directly related to the pre-Advent judgment, the same can be said about the wicked when they resurrect after the millennium. Notice the following statement:

*“There are kings and generals who conquered nations, valiant men who never lost a battle, proud, ambitious warriors whose approach made kingdoms tremble. In death these experienced no change. As they come up from the grave, **they resume the current of their thoughts just where it ceased.** They are actuated by the same desire to conquer that ruled them when they fell.”* (Ellen G. White, ***The Great Controversy***, p. 664)

Why do wicked resurrect wicked and the righteous, resurrect righteous? Simply because they are given the very ‘spirit,’ character or **self-identity** they went into the grave with. So, we conclude that the ‘books’ contain an exact transcript of each person’s life. But, what is contained in the ‘book’ [singular]?

An examination of the Biblical evidence clearly reveals that the ‘book’ contains the **names** of all who have professed the name of Jesus (**Philippians 4:3; Daniel 12:1; Psalm 69:28; Exodus 32:32-33; Luke 10:20; Revelation 13:8; 17:8; 21:27**). There are righteous people who have claimed the name of Jesus and also wicked people who have claimed His name (**Matthew 7:21-23**). The purpose of the pre-Advent judgment is to weed out the professors from those who truly received Jesus.

Now that we have identified what is in the ‘books’ and what is in the ‘book,’ we can study how they relate to each other in the judgment process. Let’s use Abel as our example. Ellen White has made it very clear that the pre-Advent investigative judgment began in 1844 with the dead. She also informs us that the dead are judged chronologically, that is, starting with those who first lived on the earth. Notice the following statement:

*“As the **books** of record are opened in the judgment, the lives of **all who have believed** on Jesus come in review before God. Beginning with those who **first lived** upon the earth, our Advocate presents the cases of each **successive generation**, and closes with the living.”* (Ellen G. White, ***The Great Controversy***, p. 482, *emphasis supplied*)

If the judgment began in 1844 with those who first lived upon the earth and continues with each successive generation in chronological order, then it is certain that Abel (the fourth person to live on the earth), was judged in 1844 or shortly thereafter. The Bible tells us that all must appear before the great judgment seat of Christ (**II Corinthians 5:10**). The question is: How could Abel appear before the judgment seat of Christ when he was dead in 1844? The answer is

quite simple: Abel did not need to appear there in person because the exact transcripts of his life—with not a jot or tittle missing—are there in the books. He is judged *in absentia* just like a person can graduate from school *in absentia*. Ellen White states the following with Biblical corroboration:

*“Those who in the judgment are ‘accounted worthy’ will have a part in the resurrection of the just. Jesus said: ‘They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead . . . are equal unto the angels; and are the children of the resurrection.’ Luke 20:35, 36. And again He declares that ‘they that have done good’ shall come forth ‘unto the resurrection of life.’ John 5:29. The righteous dead will not be raised until after the judgment at which they are accounted worthy of the ‘resurrection of life.’ Hence **they will not be present in person** at the tribunal when their records are examined and their cases decided.” (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 482, emphasis supplied*

Now, Abel’s name is found in the Book of Life [singular] because he claimed to receive Jesus as his personal Savior (**Hebrews 11:4**). As the books [plural] are opened, it is shown, beyond any doubt, that Abel truly confessed and overcame sin by the blood of Jesus. The sins he has truly repented of and confessed are registered in the books of heaven but they are covered with the blood of Jesus. In fact, Jesus represents Abel in court as his Advocate. Regarding this, Ellen White remarks: ‘Jesus will appear as their [the righteous] advocate, to plead in their behalf before God.’ (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 482) Abel’s case is examined by the heavenly court and he is pronounced ‘not guilty’ by virtue of Christ’s blood. At this moment, all of Abel’s sins are blotted out from the books to be remembered no more. The name of Abel will then be secure in the Book of Life forever and when Jesus returns, He will resurrect Abel (**Hebrews 11:35**) and give him back the self-identity (‘spirit’) he possessed before he died. But there is one thing which will not be given back to him—his sins—for these have been blotted out from the books in the judgment!! Notice how Ellen White continues the statement above:

*“Every name is mentioned, every case closely investigated. Names are accepted, names rejected. When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their **names will be blotted out of the book of life**, and the record of their **good deeds** [notice that the bad deeds are not erased at this time because they will come up during the millennium. We will come back to this when we analyze **Revelation 20:11-15**] will be erased from the book of God’s remembrance [Ellen White quotes **Exodus 32:33** and **Ezekiel 18:24** as the Biblical foundation for what she has just stated]. . . . All who have truly repented of sin, and by faith claimed the blood of Christ as their atoning sacrifice, have had pardon entered against their names in the books of heaven; as they have become partakers of the righteousness of Christ, and their characters are found to be in harmony with the law of God, their sins will be blotted out, and they themselves will be accounted worthy of eternal life.” [Ellen White provides **Isaiah 43:25; Revelation 3:5; Matthew 10:32, 33** as the Biblical corroboration for the blotting out of the sins of the righteous](Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 482-483) emphasis supplied*

But the story of Abel would be incomplete without Cain. After all, we always speak of Cain and Abel. What about Cain? Did he profess to worship and serve God? As a matter of fact, he did.

Genesis 4 tells us that Cain came to worship God. He brought an offering but contrary to Abel's offering, it was bloodless, and 'without the shedding of blood, there is no remission' of sin (**Hebrews 9:11**). By neglecting to offer blood, Cain was rejecting Jesus as his Savior. Yet he claimed to be a true worshiper and so, his name must have been in the Book of Life until his name came up in the judgment

When Cain killed Abel a great injustice was done. This is why Genesis 4:11 tells us that the blood of Abel cried out from the ground. The righteous Abel was slain by unrighteous Cain and yet both of them claimed to worship the true God. Obviously, this terrible wrong had to be righted, but how?

When Cain's name came up in 1844 the entire universe saw that while he had claimed to serve God he really had clung to sin and refused to be cleansed by the blood. His lawless life and impenitence were clearly revealed, as the books of record were opened. Jesus could not be his Advocate because Cain had refused to be cleansed by the blood. His vile act of murder was seen in all its hideousness and it was determined that Abel was right and Cain was wrong. This was the moment of Abel's vindication and the cry of his innocent blood was answered. Now all the good deeds which Cain had performed in his life were blotted out and then his name was blotted out from the Book of Life. However, all his evil deeds remained on the books of record to be examined in heaven during the millennium and in the white throne judgment after the millennium (more on this in a few moments).

Though we have spoken first of Abel and then of Cain, we must remember that in point of time, Cain was judged first and then immediately after (Abel was the next person born after Cain) Abel was judged. Thus the murderer was found guilty of Abel's innocent blood and then immediately afterwards, Abel was vindicated and reckoned worthy of eternal life. In other words, the judgment on earth was reversed—the martyr whom Cain had reckoned to be worthy of death, was reckoned in the heavenly court as worthy of life in the future kingdom while the murderer who had lived in sin was accounted worthy of death and will be deprived of the kingdom.

In the light of the story of Cain and Abel we can now better comprehend the judgment in Daniel 7. In this chapter, the little horn plays the role of Cain while the saints of the Most High play the role of Abel. While in Genesis we have two individuals, in Daniel 7 we have two corporate groups composed of individuals. But the process and principles of the judgment are the same. Let's take a look.

In Daniel 7 the little horn is judged first and then the saints are judged afterwards. The character of the little horn resembles the character of Cain—it is lawless, it murders the saints of the Most High, it tramples on the sanctuary and its services, particularly the daily (which represents the sacrifice of Christ for sin). And yet, as we have seen, the little horn (those individuals who belong to this system) claims to worship and serve the true God. Those who belonged to this vile power must have had their names in the Book of Life because they claimed to be doing the work of Christ!! During the 1260 years this power slew the saints of the Most High and their blood, like Abel's, cried out for justice (**Revelation 6:9-11**). In earthly tribunals God's people were falsely accused and condemned to die. There was no one to plead their

cause. The wicked were portrayed as righteous and the righteous were portrayed as wicked. Obviously this was a travesty in justice which needed to be rectified. Ellen White tells us that every single act of injustice done to God's people during the 1260 years was written in the books of record. Speaking of the Inquisition, she remarks:

*"In the thirteenth century was established that most terrible of all engines of the papacy—the Inquisition. The prince of darkness wrought with the leaders of the papal hierarchy. In their secret councils Satan and his angels controlled the minds of evil men, while unseen in the midst stood an angel of God, **taking the fearful** record of their iniquitous decrees and writing the history of deeds too horrible to appear to human eyes." (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 59, emphasis supplied)*

Once again, speaking of the dark record of the papacy, the Lord's servant comments:

*"The history of God's people during the ages of darkness that followed upon Rome's supremacy **is written in heaven**, but they have **little space in human records**. Few traces of their existence can be found, except in the accusations of their persecutors. It was the policy of Rome to obliterate every trace of dissent from her doctrines or decrees. Everything heretical, whether persons or writings, she sought to destroy. Expressions of doubt, or questions as to the authority of papal dogmas, were enough to forfeit life of rich or poor, high or low. Rome endeavored also to destroy every record of her cruelty toward dissenters. Papal councils decreed that books and writings containing such records should be committed to the flames. Before the invention of printing, books were few in number, and in a form not favorable for preservation; therefore there was little to prevent the Romanists from carrying out their purpose." (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 61-62, emphasis supplied)*

On May 5, 1487, pope Innocent VIII sent a Bull to the archbishops of France encouraging them to invoke the support of the king of France, of the Duke of Savoy and of the Lords 'in order to proceed with armed hand against the said Waldenses and all other heretics, and to crush them like venomous serpents.' The pope offered a plenary indulgence to all who participated in this crusade against the Waldenses and gave the crusaders permission to seize all the possessions of the heretics and to lose all neighbors and servants from all obligations to them. Referring to the author of this Bull, Ellen White states:

*"Did this haughty potentate expect to meet those words again? Did he know that they were **registered in the books of heaven**, to confront him at the judgment?" (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 77, emphasis supplied)*

And when were these deeds of injustice to be rectified? Why were records of their deeds kept in the minutest detail? Because they will have to face them again in the judgment of Daniel 7!!

What about the righteous who were mowed down by this evil power? In conjunction with the condemnation of their oppressors, the righteous will receive a heavenly verdict in their favor. To the wicked oppressors, Christ now becomes the judge and to the righteous martyrs Jesus now assumes the role of Advocate. How wonderful! The judge will be our Advocate!! Rather than fearing the judgment, we should relish it. The apostle Paul made it clear that those who

are in Christ have peace with God (**Romans 5:1**) and are no longer under condemnation (**Romans 8:1, 34; John 5:24**) The books of record will reveal that the martyrs are worthy of inheriting the kingdom and enjoying everlasting life. Their cause will be vindicated. The verdicts of earthly courts will be reversed. It will be shown that they truly laid hold of Christ even in the times of their greatest peril. We know this is true because they are called the *Amartyrs of Jesus* (**Revelation 17:6**) They have not loved their lives even unto death because they have overcome the devil with the blood of the lamb and the word of their testimony (**Revelation 12:10-12**). At this point, all their sins will be blotted out and their names will be made secure in the Book of Life forever!! All that remains is for Jesus to come from heaven to raise them from the dead (**I Thessalonians 4:15-17; Revelation 20:4**) and give them back their 'spirit' or self-identity minus the sins which were blotted out in the pre-Advent judgment. Christ will then give them the kingdom and everlasting life as an actual possession.

This scenario shows that neither the wicked persecutors nor the martyrs are present personally in heaven for the judgment. This is made clear by Daniel 7 itself. This judgment is taking place in heaven while the little horn and the saints are on earth. Furthermore, Revelation 6:10-11 explicitly tells us that the righteous martyrs were given white robes—that is, they were reckoned worthy of everlasting life—and told to **rest** a while until the last martyr is slain. Revelation 14:13 explicitly tells us that this 'rest' takes place when a person dies. Notice that the white robe is given to those who are dead, because they are told to rest **yet** a little while. They have been resting to that point and they will continue to rest until the last martyr dies and then they will be resurrected to reign with Christ a thousand years (**Revelation 20:4**). At this time those who ruled on earth will lose their dominion (God's people will be kings, **Revelation 20:4-6**) and God's people will be given dominion. This will be the judgment's great reversal of fortunes!! Incidentally, we can now see how closely related the doctrines of the judgment and the state of the dead are: If the righteous go to heaven when they die, why even bother to have a heavenly judgment? And if the wicked go to hell when they die, why bother to judge them if their destiny has already been determined at death?

Further evidence that the righteous and the wicked are judged *in absentia* is found in the parables of Jesus. In Matthew 25 we find the story of the ten virgins. The bride in this parable cannot represent the faithful members of the church because these go into the wedding as guests! Obviously they cannot be guests and the bride at the same time! In Matthew 22:8-14 we find the same idea. The redeemed are spoken of as the guests so they cannot be the bride. Furthermore, the righteous and the wicked are not there personally for the wedding for the man without a wedding garment could not have sneaked into heaven inadvertently! In Luke 12:35-37 we are told that we should be ready when the Lord **returns** from the wedding. This must mean that Christ's wedding takes place in heaven while God's people wait for His return on earth. Luke 19:11-15, just like Daniel 7, makes it absolutely clear that Jesus will receive His kingdom before He comes. The same idea is set forth in Luke 22:29-30. If the church is not the bride, then who is? Revelation 21:2, 9-10 states that the New Jerusalem is the bride and Revelation 19:9 indicate that the saved are the guests who are invited to the wedding so they cannot also be the bride. We cannot emphasize enough that the saved do not attend the wedding in person but *in absentia*. Just like we can now by faith come boldly to the throne of

grace (**Hebrews 4:16**) though we are on earth, even so we can enter the most holy place by faith to be present for Christ's wedding with the New Jerusalem.

But someone might object: How is it possible that Jesus marries a city? After all, when we get married, we marry a person, not an impersonal city. This objection betrays a desire to impose a western mind-set on an eastern book. You see, in ancient times when a prince was coronated as king, it was considered that he had married the kingdom. This is seen, for example, in Exodus 19:5-6 where God chooses Israel as his **kingdom** of priests at Mount Sinai. But this establishment of the kingdom is identified as God's **wedding** with Israel in Jeremiah 31:32. Thus, Israel is referred to as God's bride and as God's kingdom in the Old Testament. There is no contradiction; they are two different ways of describing the same reality. Thus, when Israel played the harlot and broke her wedding vows, God went to divorce court and took away the kingdom. When Israel returned to the Lord, He gave them back the kingdom, that is to say, he remarried them.

Though not directly related to our present study, the day of a king's coronation was also considered the day of his birth. This is why, when David was crowned king, God said to him: 'You are my son, today I have begotten thee' (**Psalms 2:9**). This is also why, when God made the covenant with Israel at Mt. Sinai, he employed the analogy of birth to describe the event (**Ezekiel 16:8-13**). It is no coincidence that when a king took over the kingdom in antiquity, he began counting his regal years afresh just like we begin counting our years when we are born or count the number of anniversaries since we got married. All of this sounds strange to the analytical western mind but it makes perfect sense to those who are trained to think in eastern categories.

The portrayal of Daniel 7 is clear. Jesus goes to His father to perform the work of judgment. In the heavenly court the Father legally takes away the kingdom from the little horn and gives it to Jesus, to whom it rightfully belongs. Then Jesus gives it back to man who lost it in the first place. God does not take the kingdom back by force. Rather, he takes the little horn to court! This process is made clear in Daniel 7:14, 18 and 22.

Notably, Daniel 7:27 employ both the singular and the plural:

*"Then the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given **to the people**, the saints of the Most High. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey **Him**."*

The above analysis helps us better understand how it is that the Father has a kingdom (**Matthew 26:29; Luke 9:27**), the Son has His kingdom (**Matthew 16:28**), and Jesus will give His people the kingdom (**Luke 12:32; Matthew 25:34**). Are there really three kingdoms? No. A careful study of the Bible reveals that the kingdom originally belonged to the Father. When the world was created, the Father delegated rulership to Adam and Eve (**Genesis 1:26-28; Psalm 8:5-8**) Satan then stole the rulership of this world from Adam and Eve (Luke 4:5-8). At the second coming, this kingdom will be restored to Jesus (**Matthew 16:28**) Who will then restore it to His people (**Revelation 20:4; Daniel 7:26-27**) At the end of the Millennium, Jesus will then

give it to His Father to whom it belonged in the first place (**I Corinthians 15:24-28; Matthew 26:29; Luke 9:27**; For more on this, study carefully, **Luke 22:29-30**).

This study of the judgment would not be complete without taking into account the relationship between Daniel 7 and 8 and Daniel 12. When the judgment **began** in 1844, (as described in **Daniel 7:9-10, 13; and 8:14**) Jesus is portrayed as High Priest. He is seen ministering in the heavenly sanctuary in both the daily and yearly services in behalf of His people. There is not a hint in these passages that Jesus has assumed His position as **king**. In fact, Daniel 7:14, 18, 26-27 makes it abundantly clear that only at the conclusion of this judgment does Jesus receive the kingdom. So if Jesus will not become king (we are speaking here, not of the kingdom of grace but of the kingdom of glory) until after the judgment, then what is He now? The book of Hebrews clearly indicates that Jesus has been our High Priestly Advocate since His ascension (**Hebrews 8:1-2; I Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 7:25-26; Romans 8:34**). In 1844 Jesus did not cease being our High Priestly Advocate but rather added another function to His ministry—that of Judge. In the Old Testament cultus the High Priest retained his high priestly garments until the Day of Atonement was over. If we are now in the antitypical Day of Atonement, Jesus must still be garbed in the garments of the High Priest. But at the conclusion of the judgment Jesus will lay aside His priestly vesture and garb himself with the raiment of a king.

And when will this take place? Daniel 12:1 pinpoints the time: It will be when Michael **'stands up.'** The expression 'stand up' is employed in other places of Daniel 11 to refer to a king who takes the throne or begins to reign (11:2-3). Notice here that Jesus stands up or begins to reign before the time of trouble. This must mean that Jesus will receive the kingdom in heaven at the close of probation before He comes back at the end of the time of trouble.

This fits perfectly with Daniel 7 where Jesus goes to His Father to receive the kingdom but only delivers it to His people upon His return to the earth. It also squares with the parables of the kingdom we have previously referred to. This must be the time when He changes His priestly garments to His kingly robes.

A crucial point has been missed by virtually all commentators and it is this: Jesus is now garbed as High Priest but when He comes He will be garbed as King of kings and Lord of lords. Revelation 19:11-16 actually describes his raiment. Now, you don't need the wisdom of a King Solomon to figure out that if Jesus is now garbed as High Priest but at His coming will be garbed as king, He must have changed at some point in between. Ellen White was biblically accurate when she stated that when Michael stands up He will change his priestly garments to kingly ones!!

In summary: Daniel 7:9-10, 13; 8:14 describes the **beginning** of the heavenly judgment in 1844. At this time Jesus goes **to His Father** to receive the kingdom. During the judgment He is both Advocate and Judge and wears his **High Priestly attire**. Daniel 12:1, on the other hand, describes the moment when this judgment **comes to an end**. Probation closes, Jesus begins to reign and removes his priestly robes and garbs himself with the **garments of a king**. Then the time of trouble (before the second coming) transpires at the end of which Jesus returns **to earth** to give the kingdom to His people.

This Danielic scenario fits also with the perspective of the book of Revelation. In Revelation 14:7 the announcement is made, 'the hour of His judgment is come.' At this point probation has not closed because the second and third angels' messages have not yet been proclaimed. This proves beyond the shadow of any doubt that the judgment begins in heaven before the Advent. After the three angels' messages have been proclaimed, the door of probation closes (**Revelation 15:5-8**) and Jesus changes His raiment from priestly to kingly robes. The plagues are then poured out (**Revelation 16-18**). This is the same time of trouble which is mentioned in Daniel 12:1. Then Jesus returns triumphantly as King of Kings and Lord of Lords (**Revelation 19:11-21**) and gives the kingdom to His people (**Revelation 20:4**). Don't miss the point: When Jesus comes He is no longer garbed as High Priest but rather as King so at some point **before** His coming He must have changed His garments.

In order to fully understand the relationship between the coming of the Son of man to the Father in Daniel 7:13 and the standing up of Michael in Daniel 12:1 it is necessary to keep in mind that the little horn has two periods of dominion. The first was during the 1260 years when millions of God's true children were mowed down. Daniel 7:9-10, 13 describes the moment when Jesus began the process of vindicating those who were unjustly judged by the little horn.

But prophecy affirms that the little horn will have a second period of dominion when it will once again slay the children of God. Jesus will also defend these in the heavenly court in the ongoing process of the judgment before the close of probation (there will be no martyrs after the close of probation).

This two-stage dominion of the little horn is brought out clearly in Revelation 6:9-11 where the martyrs of the past cry out for judgment and vengeance and they are told to rest a while until the rest of the martyrs are slain like they were. Thus two groups of martyrs are brought to view: the martyrs who were slain by the little horn in the **past** and the martyrs who will be slain by this power in the **future**.

Revelation 13 also describes these two stages of the little horn power (now called the beast). This horn slew the saints of the Most High during the period of the 42 months (**Revelation 13:5, 7**). But after its deadly wound is healed, it will once again proclaim a death decree against God's people (**Revelation 13:15**).

The same panorama can be seen in Daniel 7 and 11. In Daniel 7 the little horn slays the saints of God for a period of 1260 years. In Daniel 11:31-39 we find a description of the same period only now the little horn is called 'the king of the north.' But at the time of the end (1798) the king of the south (atheistic communism in the French Revolution) arises against the king of the north (the papacy) and gives it a deadly wound. But then we are told that the king of north regains its power and once again goes out to slay many (11:40-45).

Now the main point is this: In Daniel 7:13 Jesus comes to the Father in heaven to vindicate the cause of those who have been slain by the little horn (as well as the cause of all his children from all ages who have died before the close of probation). Once all His dead children have been vindicated, He then turns to vindicate the righteous saints who are alive and to condemn

the wicked powers of the earth who wish to slay his living saints. As soon as this work of separation is finished, probation closes, and Michael (Jesus) stands up and begins to reign. His kingdom is made up because He has already determined who His subjects are. When the judgment began in Daniel 7:13 Jesus came to vindicate his dead children. In Daniel 12:1 Jesus stands up to defend his living saints from annihilation by the king of the north!!

We must now come to our last consideration. Though the post-millennial judgment does not directly come to view in the book of Daniel, it would be well at this point to say a few words about it because it relates to what we have said about the *modus operandi* of the judgment in Daniel 7. At the end of the millennium the holy city will descend from heaven and the wicked will be resurrected (**Revelation 20:6**). Though some of these wicked people undoubtedly performed good deeds in their lifetimes, they now resurrect only with their evil traits. And why is this so? Simply because they will be given back their own self-identity minus their good deeds which were deleted when their cases were reviewed during the millennial judgment! The righteous at the second coming will be given all the good of their lives but nothing of the bad. On the other hand, at the end of the millennium the wicked are given all the bad of their lives and nothing good. Thus those outside the city are totally wicked and those inside the city are totally righteous.

Interestingly, Ellen White informs us that the very same prelates and priests who condemned the saints during the middle Ages will be gathered outside the city. What a judgment reversal has taken place!! Those who were rulers in the middle Ages are now lost while those who were trampled upon are royalty. This work of reversal is what Jesus performed when he went into the most holy place in 1844. Now, after the millennium the results of the pre-advent judgment are clearly revealed to the enemies of God's children.

Let's turn to Revelation 20:11-15 and examine this post-millennial judgment more closely. At the end of the 1000 years all the wicked will be summoned to the judgment bar of God. The books (which, we are clearly told, contain their works) will be opened and the record of their lives will be laid open before the whole universe. Some have wondered why the book of life is brought to view in this judgment. The passage clearly indicates that the purpose is to show the wicked that their names are not found in it. And why are their names absent? Simply because they have been deleted during the millennial judgment!

We can now summarize the biblical view of the judgment:

- The righteous dead and living are vindicated in the heavenly court during the pre-Advent investigative judgment.
- The wicked oppressors of God's people are found wanting in this same judgment.
- At the second coming Jesus will resurrect the righteous dead and glorify them along with the righteous living. All their sins have been deleted in the pre-advent judgment and therefore they receive only the positive traits of their self-identity. They are now given the kingdom by Jesus (**Revelation 20:4**).
- During the 1000 years the saints (who are now kings, priests and judges) will participate in the sentencing of their wicked oppressors. Their judges on earth are now judged in

heaven. All the good deeds of the wicked will be deleted at this time. The wicked at this point do not know that their cases are being examined in heaven because they are dead. They are judged in heaven, *in absentia*.

- But after the millennium the wicked will be resurrected from the dead. Their own self-identity will be returned to them at this time minus all the good deeds they performed in their life. They will then see, in person, the justice of their sentence and with one accord will proclaim the justice and love of God.
- Then, and only then, can God destroy sin and sinners!

LESSON #21 – NOTES ON DANIEL 8

Introductory Matters

Daniel 8 is dated to the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar. This would be the year 550 BC eleven years were still to pass before the fall of Babylon.

Daniel is really composed of two books in one. The first book comprises chapters 1-7 and the second book is composed of chapters 8-12. It is important to remember that Daniel 8-12 is the sealed book of Daniel 12:4 as well as the little book of Revelation 10. For additional information on this point please consult Pastor Bohr's document, '*Daniel's Little Book*,' at the end of this material.

Daniel 8 follows the same basic sequence of powers as Daniel 7 but there are four significant differences:

First of all, a lion is used in Daniel 7 to represent Babylon, but in Daniel 8 there is **no symbol for Babylon**. Why is this? Different possibilities have been suggested. The first suggestion is that the existence of Babylon is assumed because the vision is dated to the reign of Belshazzar who was a Babylonian king. This is a good point. Less enticing is the idea that no symbol for Babylon is included because Babylon is about to disappear from the prophetic scenario. But the fact is, as indicated above, that Babylon did not fall until the year 539 BC a full eleven years after this vision was given. The best explanation for the exclusion of a symbol for Babylon is that the prophecy of the 2300 days/years began during the period of Persian rule and not during the period of the Babylonian kingdom.

Secondly, Daniel 7 has four beasts and each of them is wild and carnivorous. Daniel 8 has only two beasts and each of them is domestic. In fact, the ram was used in the daily service of the sanctuary and the he-goat was used in the yearly service. This clearly shows that the central emphasis of Daniel 8 is the sanctuary. We will discover in our study that the little horn takes away the daily (represented by the ram) and for this, God will judge it in the yearly service (represented by the he-goat) on the Day of Atonement.

In the *third* place, in Daniel 7 there are two separate symbols for pagan and papal Rome. Pagan Rome is represented by a dragon and papal Rome is represented by a little horn which comes up from the head of the dragon beast. But in Daniel 8 both Pagan and Papal Rome are represented by the little horn. Why does Daniel 8 represent the two Rome's with only one symbol? We will find that one reason is that the Holy Spirit, through Daniel, wants us to think in

terms of the daily and yearly services of the sanctuary. If another beast had been introduced, this sanctuary symbolism would have been blurred.

Another issue we will address later in this study is the reason why the little horn of Daniel 7 arises from pagan Rome while the little horn of Daniel 8 arises from one of the four Hellenistic kingdoms. This **apparent** discrepancy between Daniel 7 and Daniel 8 has led futurist and preterist scholars to conclude that the little horn of Daniel 8 does not represent the same power as the little horn of Daniel 7. Preterists believe the little horn in Daniel 7 and 8 is a symbol of Antiochus Epiphanes. Futurist scholars believe that the little horn of Daniel 7 represents a future individual Antichrist who will sit in a rebuilt Jerusalem temple for three and a half literal years while they believe that the little horn of Daniel 8 represents Antiochus Epiphanes.

Finally, the vision of Daniel 7 concludes with the setting up of Christ's everlasting kingdom. But in Daniel 8 there is no mention of the everlasting kingdom. Thus the vision of Daniel 8 as compared with Daniel 7 is incomplete. Why is this? The fact is that Daniel 8-12 is a book in itself and the central theme of the book is the 2300 days/years. One must wait until the conclusion of the book for the setting up of the everlasting kingdom (**Daniel 12:1-3**). That is to say, Daniel 8:14 provides us with the description of the **beginning** of the judgment (1844 A. D.) and Daniel 12:1-3 presents the **conclusion** of the same judgment and the setting up of the everlasting kingdom. In between these two points of time we find the date for the beginning of the 2300 days/years (Daniel 9), the struggle between Christ and Satan for the decrees to be given (**Daniel 10**), and an amplified outline of events from the kingdom of Persia till the end of the judgment and the setting up of Christ's everlasting kingdom (**Daniel 11:1-12:3**).

Comments on Verses One and Two

There is a tremendous emphasis in these verses on **seeing**. Actually, this emphasis is underlined time and again in verses 1-13. It is of the utmost importance to keep in mind the Hebrew word for 'vision' (*chazon*). We will have occasion to come back to this word which is used three times in verses one and two and once in verse thirteen. It is also important to recognize that Daniel is in Persia when he sees this vision. In other words, the vision begins during the kingdom of Persia even though it is dated to the rule of Belshazzar.

Remarks on Verses Three and Four

Notice once again the emphasis on sight: 'eyes', 'saw', 'behold'. Daniel sees a ram next to the river. The ram has two horns but one is higher than the other and the highest one comes out last. The meaning of the ram symbol is interpreted in verse 20: 'The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia.' Significantly, after Darius the Mede (died in 536 BC), Cyrus (who was half Median and half Persian and died in 530 B. C.), and Cambyses (who was also half Median and half Persian and died in 522 B. C.), all the remaining rulers were Persian. The tallest horn did come up last!! In Daniel 5 we are told that Babylon fell into the hands of the Medes and Persians. In Daniel 8 we are informed that the two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. But after Daniel 8 this kingdom is referred to uniformly only as 'Persia'

(Daniel 10:1, 13, 20; 11:20) [For more on this, see Stephen Bohr's, 'A Dynastic Chart of the Medes and Persians'.]

There is a remarkable parallel between the bear of Daniel 7 and this ram. In Daniel 7 the bear is raised up on one side. In Daniel 8 one of the horns is higher than the other. In Daniel 7 the bear has three ribs in its mouth and in Daniel 8 the ram conquers in three points of the compass—westward (Babylon 539 B. C.), northward (Lydia, 546 B. C.), and southward (Egypt, 525 B. C.)

It is worthy of notice that the ram became 'great'. We will soon see a power which became 'very great' and still another which became 'exceedingly great'. It is also important to realize that the ram conquers only horizontally. In other words, it fights against other 'beasts' (kingdoms) on earth but does not fight vertically against the God of heaven. We will soon see a power in this prophecy which actually fights against God on a vertical level.

Analysis of Verses Five to Eight

Please examine the following information before we move on to verses 5-8:

Hellenistic Civilization (336 BC till the death of the Roman Empire in 476 AD)

Hellenistic Greece (323-133 BC)

- Begins with Alexander the Great (334-323 BC)
- Antigonids [Macedonia-Greece] (283-168 BC)
- Attalids [Pergamum] (263-133 BC)
- Ptolemies [Egypt] (323-30 BC)

Rome's expansion in the east, south and glorious land

- Annexed Macedonia (148 BC)
- Annexed Greece (146 BC)
- Inherited Pergamum (133 BC)
- Conquered the Seleucid Empire (64/63 BC)
- Conquered Palestine (63 BC)
- Fall of Egypt [the Ptolemies] (63 BC)

Hellenism defined

The process of Hellenization began with the death of Alexander the Great and ended between 146-133 BC. In reality, however, Roman civilization was in many ways a continuation of Hellenistic civilization. In the Hellenistic period:

- Greek culture was widely extended over Greeks and non-Greek people alike
- City life was reshaped along the lines of the Greek *polis*—city

- Greek literature became the literature of the learned
- The Greek language became the ordinary medium of commercial and political interchange; the language of the educated
- Artists and craftsmen took the humanistic Greek masterpieces as models for imitation
- New temples were built and old ones reconstructed on traditional Greek architectural lines
- Young men of the oriental cities flocked to the Greek gymnasia
- Greek cults were instituted in regions once sacred to oriental gods (this was a time of great religious syncretism)
- The orient was made a captive to Greek culture but in the course of the second century BC the old oriental influences made their power felt once more forcing themselves into and through the Hellenistic surface

In these verses we once again see a marked emphasis on **seeing**. The he-goat comes from the west. It is not only geographically true that Greece is west of the kingdom of Persia but it is also true that Greece is west of Shushan where Daniel saw the vision next to the river Ulai. There is no doubt that the he-goat of Daniel 8 is parallel to the leopard of Daniel 7. We know this for two reasons:

1) In Daniel 8 the he-goat is conquering so swiftly that it does not even touch the earth. In other words, it is a flying goat. In Daniel 7 the leopard (a swift beast in itself) is rendered even swifter because it has four wings of an eagle.

2) The he-goat of Daniel 8 sprouts four horns and the leopard of Daniel 7 has four heads. As we compare the leopard of Daniel 7 with the he-goat of Daniel 8 we must conclude that this kingdom had two main periods of existence. The first was during the reign of the notable horn and the second was after the notable horn was broken and four came up in its place. If we had only Daniel 7 we might conclude that this was a quadruple kingdom from the start. But Daniel 8 clearly adds to the picture by showing that the kingdom had one ruler at first and later was divided into four parts.

What does this he-goat represent? We do not have to guess. The text clearly informs us that 'the rough goat is the king of Greece; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king.' (**Daniel 8:21**). The first king of the Hellenistic Age was Alexander the Great. His speed of conquest was notable. In only three years he moved from Athens to the Hindu Valley and conquered everything in his path. Contrast this with Nebuchadnezzar who took three years to conquer Jerusalem (588-586 B. C.), and with Assyria which also took three years to conquer Samaria (725-722 B. C.). Greece did run against Medo-Persia 'in the fury of his power' (verse 6) and did 'break his two horns' (verse 7). It is significant that Alexander the Great was broken when 'he was strong' (verse 8). Kingdoms in antiquity always grew strong, then weakened and finally fell to the enemy. But Alexander died at the tender age of 33 when he was at the height of his power (for more on this, read **Daniel 11:4**). It is said that he intoxicated himself to death by his drinking.

We must now turn to the four horns. In Adventist circles the four horns are commonly interpreted as Alexander's four generals: Cassander, Seleucus, Lysimachus and Ptolomy. But this interpretation has its problems. First of all, the four horns are clearly identified as 'kingdoms', not as 'kings' (see **Daniel 8:22**). Secondly, it is a historical fact that Alexander's kingdom was not carved up into four neat kingdoms immediately upon his death. The history of Greece after Alexander's death is complex. Sometimes there were three kingdoms. At other times there were four kingdoms and for a short space just before 280 B. C., there were only two!! [for more on the checkered history of Greece after Alexander's death, read, *The Four Horns of Daniel 8*" included at the end of this material]. Which, then, are the four kingdoms represented by the four horns? Secular historian W. W. Tarn identifies them for us:

*"He [Alexander] left no heir, and had made no arrangements for carrying on the government [notice how this fits precisely with Daniel 8:22 where we are told that the four kingdoms would 'stand up out of the nation, but not in his power']. Once the uprisings of Greece in the Lamian war and of the Greeks in the far east were defeated, a **struggle for power started among his generals** in the shape of war between the satraps (territorial dynasts) and whatever central power aimed at general control; the battle of Ipsus in 301 definitely decided that the Graeco-Macedonian world **could not be held together**, and that world presently returned very much to the political shape it had before Alexander, though under different rulers and a different civilization. By 275 three dynasties, descended from three of his generals, were well established; the **Seleucids** ruled much of what had been the Persian Empire in Asia, the **Ptolomies** ruled Egypt, and the **Antigonids** Macedonia. A fourth European dynasty, not connected with Alexander, the Attalids of **Pergamum** subsequently grew up in Asia Minor at Seleucid expense, and became great by the favor of Rome." (W. W. Tarn, **Hellenistic Civilization** (New York: Meridian, 1971), p. 6, bold is mine.*

It is clear, then, that the four horns represent the **Antigonids** (283-168 BC) who governed Macedonia and Greece in the west, the **Seleucids** (312-63 BC) who ruled Syria and Mesopotamia in the east, the **Ptolomies** (323-30 BC) who ruled Egypt in the south, and the **Attalids** (263-133 BC) who ruled the kingdom of Pergamum in the north. The question still remains: Out of which of these four kingdoms did the little horn come forth? Before we can answer this question we must deal with two issues which are very closely related.

The first issue is the following: Seventh-day Adventists, with few exceptions, have always believed that the little horn of Daniel 7 and the little horn of Daniel 8 represent the same power, namely, Papal Rome. However, this interpretation presents an apparently insurmountable problem and it is this: The little horn of Daniel 7 arises from the dragon beast which is a symbol of pagan Rome. However, the little horn of Daniel 8 rises from one of the four divisions of the Greek empire. How can the little horn arise both from Greece and from Rome? How can this apparent discrepancy be resolved? This brings us to the second issue.

Most Adventist authors have attempted to resolve this problem by affirming that the little horn did not arise from one of the four horns but rather from one of the four winds of heaven. You see, the expression 'the four winds of heaven' is much more indefinite than the expression 'four horns'. If the little horn arises from one of the four winds of heaven, it could arise just

about anywhere, including Rome. However, if it arose from one of the four horns, it would have to arise specifically from one of the four Hellenistic kingdoms. I believe that the attempt to prove that the little horn came forth from one of the winds and not from one of the horns is well intended but unnecessary to resolve the problem. What do I mean?

First of all, we must examine the Hebrew text to determine whether the little horn arose from the winds or from the horns. The text literally reads: 'Four notable ones [feminine] toward the four winds [masculine]. And out of one [masculine] of them [feminine] came forth a little horn.' (**Daniel 8:8, 9**) The gender of the words in the literal text indicates clearly that the little horn was to arise from one of the four horns which are at the four winds of heaven. It is not either/or but rather both/and.

We must also examine 1 Maccabees 1:10, Josephus and the LXX. First from 1 Maccabees 1:8-10:

"Alexander had reigned twelve years when he died. Each of his comrades established himself in his own region. All assumed crowns after his death, they and their heirs after them for many years, bringing increasing evils on the world. From these grew a sinful offshoot, Antiochus Epiphanes, son of King Antiochus. . ."

Even though we cannot agree with the author of Maccabees on the identity of the little horn, we can agree that the evil offshoot came from one of the regions into which the kingdom of Greece was divided.

Notice the reading in the LXX:

". . . and four other horns rose up in its place toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them [out of one of the horns at the four winds] came forth one strong horn. . ."

Now notice the words of Josephus:

". . . he [Daniel] saw a very great horn [Alexander] growing out of the head of the he-goat, and that when it was broken off, four horns grew up that were exposed to each of the four winds, and he wrote that out of them arose another lesser horn, which, as he said, waxed great. . ."

When Josephus speaks of four horns which were exposed to each of the four winds, it is clear that he means that the kingdom of Alexander was divided into four kingdoms which are to be found at each of the points of the compass. In other words, the four horns would be four kingdoms, one to the south, one to the north, one to the east and the other to the west in what used to be Alexander's empire. The critical question is: From which of these four kingdoms did the little horn arise? Before we answer this question we must remember that the little horn is a symbol of both pagan and papal Rome. As we shall see, this can be proved from the Bible text itself!

In order to comprehend from which kingdom the little horn emerges it will be necessary to provide some extensive historical background. Let's begin in Daniel 2.

The story is well known. Nebuchadnezzar had a dream and when he woke up he had forgotten it. So he called the magicians, the astrologers, the sorcerers and the Chaldeans to tell him the dream and its meaning. These wise men of Babylon were unable to explain what the king demanded.

It is well known from history that these Babylonian wise men were polytheistic. In fact, they told the king that only the gods [plural] could give him the information he demanded (**Daniel 2:11**; see also, **Isaiah 47**). The book of Daniel reveals that these wise men hated Daniel and his three friends. They accused Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah when they refused to worship the image which Nebuchadnezzar had raised up (see, **Daniel 3:8-11**). As I have shown when we studied Daniel 3, the image was a symbol of the Babylonian sun-god, Marduk. Notice the four key elements which are apropos to our study: **1)** Nebuchadnezzar who for seven years behaved as a beast, **2)** raised up an image and **3)** gave a decree to worship the image to the beast. **4)** Whoever did not worship the image to the beast was to be killed. These four elements will be picked up again in Revelation 13 where end-time Babylon will repeat the story of Daniel three on a world-wide scale. At this point I just want us to remember that this episode in Daniel 3 is the first link in the chain which connects ancient Babylon with end-time Babylon. We will come back to this later. These Babylonian priests hated Daniel and his friends because they were monotheistic.

When Babylon fell to the Medo-Persian Empire, a new religion was introduced. This religion is known as Zoroastrianism. It is characterized by its strict monotheism. The basic tenets of this religion are that there is one true Almighty God, whose name is Ahura-Mazda. He is the God of light. But there is also an arch-adversary of God whose name is Ahriman. He inhabits the realm of darkness. According to Zoroastrianism, there is a constant battle between the God Ahura-Mazda and Ahriman (see Humphrey Prideaux, **An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments** (London: William Tegg and Co., 1858), pp. 149-150).

As we look at ancient history, we find that nations have the almost incurable tendency toward polytheism. This is made clear in Romans 1:18-32. Even Israel before the Babylonian captivity had an obsession with foreign gods. It is indeed strange to find a nation in a polytheistic environment which suddenly propounds monotheism. Other than in the Judeo/Christian and Muslim traditions, I know of only two other cases. One is in Egypt during the reign of Tutankhamen [was it because of what the Hebrew God did to Egyptian civilization at the Exodus?] and the other is Persia. Why did Persia adopt a strictly monotheistic spirituality?

The answer is not hard to find. Sometime after the fall of Babylon, Daniel had an encounter with Cyrus, king of Persia. The prophet opened up to Cyrus the prophecies of Isaiah regarding the fall of Babylon. In fact, Daniel showed Cyrus that God had chosen him by name to deliver His people one hundred years before his birth (**Isaiah 45:1**). When Cyrus heard this he was deeply impressed. Ezra 1:1-3 reveals that Cyrus became a believer in the God of the Hebrews:

"The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem. . . .³ Who is there among you all his people? His God be with

him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem."

Regarding the encounter between Daniel and Cyrus, Ellen White makes the following enlightening remark:

*"As the king saw the words foretelling, more than a hundred years before his birth, the manner in which Babylon should be taken; as he read the message addressed to him by the Ruler of the universe . . . his heart was profoundly moved, and he determined to fulfill his divinely appointed mission." Ellen G. White, ***Prophets and Kings***, p. 557*

There can be no doubt that the Persian Empire came to knowledge of the true God primarily through the contacts of Darius and Cyrus with Daniel.

Just as a sidelight, I might mention that the wise men who came to visit Jesus were not idolaters. They were most likely from Persia. Ellen White identifies these wise men from the East as 'philosophers'. She also states that these magi studied the starry heavens but they did it with the aid of the Hebrew Scriptures. Regarding this she states:

"Seeking clearer knowledge [than what they could discern by a study of the starry heavens] they turned to the Hebrew Scriptures. In their own land were treasured prophetic writings that predicted the coming of a divine teacher."

Then Ellen White makes a very significant statement:

"Balaam belonged to the magicians, though at one time a prophet of God; by the Holy Spirit he had foretold the prosperity of Israel and the appearing of the Messiah; and his prophecies had been handed down by tradition from century to century. But in the Old Testament the Savior's advent was more clearly revealed."

Ellen White then goes on to explain the nature of the Star:

*"It was not a fixed star nor a planet, and the phenomenon excited the keenest interest. That star was a distant company of shining angels, but of this the wise men were ignorant. Yet they were impressed that the star was of special import to them. They consulted priests and philosophers, and searched the scrolls of the ancient records. Then Ellen White tells us that they found the prophecy of Numbers 24:7." (Ellen G. White, ***The Desire of Ages***, pp. 59-60*

But even after monotheism took hold in the kingdom, there were still Babylonian priests, of the Daniel 2 type, in the realm. These were angry that their religion had been overthrown and they looked for every opportunity to reestablish their lost dominion. Cyrus died in 530 B. C. and was succeeded by Cambyses who governed for seven and one half years.

Let's talk a moment about King Cambyses. History tells us that he went on an expedition to Egypt. When he was in Syria on the way back to Persia, a herald was sent from Shushan who rode into the midst of the army and proclaimed that Smerdis, the son of Cyrus had been crowned king and that all must obey him. Now, when Cambyses set out for Egypt he had placed

Patizithes to tend to governmental affairs in his absence. Patizithes had a brother who greatly resembled Smerdis. In fact, he had the same name. Cambyses was jealous of Cyrus' son and had him killed. Cambyses was a lunatic who was always looking over his shoulder suspicious of all and murdering any potential rival.

For example, Cambyses married his youngest sister because she was very beautiful. But one day he kicked her in the abdomen and killed her because she cried when she heard that Smerdis had died. She was pregnant at the time and the baby died also. Cambyses had several faithful followers buried alive for no reason at all!!

After Smerdis was killed by Cambyses, Patizithes placed his brother on the throne. This Smerdis look-alike who had the same name became known as false Smerdis. Patizithes then informed everyone that false Smerdis was the true son of Cyrus. This false Smerdis was a Mede (not a Persian like Cyrus) and the chief leader of the Babylonian Magi who remained after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. He hated the Jews and gave a decree halting the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple at the bequest of the Samaritans. But the imposture was soon discovered. Seven Persians of the nobility entered the royal palace (the name of the leader was Otanes) and slew false Smerdis and his brother Patizithes. There was also a great slaughter of the polytheistic Magi of the Babylonian type who sympathized with false Smerdis. Significantly, the remnant which remained alive fled to the city of **Pergamum** in Asia Minor. Darius the Persian then reestablished the holy temples and monotheistic religion of Ahura-Mazda (for more on this read, Humphrey Prideaux, **An Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments**, volume 1, pp. 145-147, 205-207).

In 480 b. c., another Persian king, Xerxes (the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther), who was a staunch defender of the monotheistic religion of Persia, destroyed the temples of the Greeks (because he detested their polytheism) and he also undertook a campaign to Babylon where he destroyed the pagan temples there as well (see, Humphrey Prideaux, **An Historical Connection of the Old And New Testaments**, volume 1, pp. 214-215. Once again the Babylonian Magi fled to Pergamum for refuge. Thus it was that the religion of the Babylonian Magi was established in the city of Pergamum in Asia Minor.

There is no doubt that the pagan Roman Empire grew out of Asia Minor. We know this for several reasons. First of all, the Roman poet, Virgil, tells us that Roman civilization and culture came from the ancient city of Troy in Asia Minor. In his famous epic, *The Aenid* (which he wrote during a period of eleven years, 30-19 B. C.), Virgil tells about a Trojan prince who was exiled to Italy in the 12th century b. c. when Troy was destroyed by the Greeks. According to Virgil, this prince established the first settlement in Italy.

In the well-known work, **The Migration of the Etruscans** we are told once again that Roman civilization and culture grew out of Asia Minor. Says Christopher S. Mackay:

“. . . Roman political and religious practices were strongly influenced by the Etruscans. Early Roman art and religion were also strongly influenced by the Etruscans, and the Romans seem to have developed their writing system from them (who borrowed it from the Greeks). Hence, while the Greeks were a strong cultural influence on early Rome, the Etruscans had a more

immediate influence. Herodotus tells us that before the Trojan War the Etruscans migrated from Lydia (in western Asia Minor) to Rome as a result of a great drought which lasted for 25 years @. ([Http://www.ualberta.ca/~csmackay/CLASS_365/Etruscans.html](http://www.ualberta.ca/~csmackay/CLASS_365/Etruscans.html))

But not only did Rome borrow its civilization and culture from Asia Minor, they also borrowed their religion from there. Once again Christopher Mackay states:

“The Etruscans were heavily influenced by Greek art. They adopted many Greek forms, though they strongly adapted them in spirit. They built temples that were like Greek ones, but differed in having a front (Greek temples were symmetrical) and having a three-fold interior (division into three rooms). They were decorated with terra cotta figures. The Romans adopted all these forms.

“The Etruscans were considered a very religious people in antiquity, and the Romans borrowed many religious customs from them. The traditional Roman form of divination was to observe the flight of birds (auspiciation) but they adopted divination through inspection of livers (hepatoscopy/haruspicy) and thunder from the Etruscans.”

Mackay further informs us that the Etruscan kings wore purple robes and sat on a throne called *sella curulis* in Latin. All of these symbols were adopted by the magistrates of the Roman Republic, and presumably reflect the usages of the Roman kings under the Etruscan dynasty.

In 67 AD, the Roman general Pompeii went on an expedition to do away with pirates in Asia Minor. We know that Pompeii there adopted the religion of Asia Minor. In fact, Mithraism became the official religion of the Roman legions. Franz Cumont who spent the better part of a lifetime studying the religion of the Roman Empire states the following about the phenomenal growth of Mithraism in Rome:

“All the original rites that characterized the Mithraic cult of the Romans unquestionably go back to Asiatic origins. . . . The principal agent of its diffusion was undoubtedly the army. The Mithraic religion is predominantly a religion of soldiers, and it was not without good reason that the name of milites was given to a certain grade of initiates. . . .” (Franz Cumont, **The Mysteries of Mithra** (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), pp. 30, 40)

Significantly, Cumont says that *‘the original home of Mithra was not infrequently placed on the banks of the Euphrates [Babylon]. . . .’* and then he explains: *‘Very early the Magi had crossed Mesopotamia and penetrated to the heart of Asia Minor.’* (Franz Cumont, **The Mysteries of Mithra**, pp. 10-11)

That is to say, **Asia Minor became the link between ancient Babylon and pagan Rome.** This is a pivotal point which we will come back to in a few moments.

According to Cumont:

“It can be proved that all our representations of the tauroctonous Mithra, the hieratic figure of which was fixed before the propagation of the Mysteries in the Occident, are more or less faithful replicas of a type created by a sculptor of the school of Pergamum, in imitation of the

sacrificing Victory which adorned the balustrade of the temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis.”
(Franz Cumont, ***The Mysteries of Mithra*** (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), p 210

Furthermore, it is often overlooked that Pergamum was the only one of the four Macedonian kingdoms which Rome did not have to fight to overcome. The kingdom of Pergamum was willed to the Roman Senate by king Attalus III in the year 133 B. C. (See, ***Encyclopedia Britannica***, article, ‘Pergamum’). This not only gave Rome a foothold in Asia Minor from which it could conquer the nations of the East, but it also became the bridge which made it possible for Rome to come in contact with God’s covenant people, Israel. In this way, the fulfillment of Daniel 8 was made possible. The strategic importance of Asia Minor is described by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

‘The role played by Asia Minor in Western culture was: primarily determined by its geographical position. Whereas all the Mediterranean peninsulas—Iberian, Italian, Greek—extend from north to south, Asia Minor, alone stretching from east to west forms a unique bridge. It was this which caused the civilizations arising in the East in general, and on its territory in particular, to orient themselves towards the West, by way of the Aegean islands.’
(<http://www.ptr.co.nz/turkey/pergamum.htm>)

So far we have traced the ‘journey’ of Babylonian idolatrous religion from Babylon to Asia Minor to pagan Rome. But there is more to this story. Pergamum is also the link between pagan Rome and papal Rome. And, how is this? In order to answer this question, we must turn to Revelation two and three where the story of the seven churches is told.

It is generally accepted by Bible students that the seven churches depict seven epochs in the history of the Christian Church. Regarding this, Ellen G. White affirms:

“The names of the seven churches are symbolic of the church in different periods of the Christian Era. The number 7 indicates completeness, and is symbolic of the fact that the messages extend to the end of time, while the symbols used reveal the condition of the church at different periods in the history of the world.” Ellen G. White, ***The Acts of the Apostles***, p. 585.

Ellen White is not alone in this assessment. In a sermon preached by Ray C. Stedman on November 19, 1989, we find the following statement:

“The entire church age is brought before us in the purview of these letters.” Ray C. Stedman, ‘Smyrna and Pergamum: The Pressured Church and the Compromising Church,’ <http://www.pbc.org/dp/stedman/revelation/4191.html>.

A careful study of the first three churches—Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum—clearly indicates a progression from the apostolic church to the compromising church. Ephesus symbolizes the Apostolic Church. Smyrna is symbolic of the persecuted church during the dominion of pagan Rome. This is clearly indicated by the constant ‘death language’ used with reference to this church (see, **Revelation 2:8-11**). Stedman comments about this period:

“Prophetically viewed, this church [Smyrna] is a picture of the period in history from about 160 A. D. to 320 A. D., the rise of Constantine, the first so-called Christian emperor. The whole period has been termed the ‘Age of Martyrs’.”

According to Stedman the church of Pergamum represents the period when the church compromised with the world in the days of Constantine. With respect to this, Stedman remarks:

“Prophetically, this is the period from the accession of Constantine in 320 A. D. to the rise of the papacy in the 6th century. During that period of time were held the great councils of the church. But it was also the time of the wedding of the church and the world under Constantine. . . Constantine was not really a true Christian. He adopted many pagan practices and brought them into the church where they were accepted. Christianity was popular in those days and many pagan practices were incorporated into it. This began when the church was viewed as a worldly kingdom, like any other kingdom.”

Ellen G. White concurs with this interpretation. In **The Great Controversy**, pp. 49-50 she states:

“The nominal conversion of Constantine in the early part of the fourth century, caused great rejoicing; and the world, cloaked with a form of righteousness, walked into the church. Now the work of corruption rapidly progressed. Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror. Her spirit controlled the church. Her doctrines, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ.”

Let’s take a closer look at the church of Pergamum. We will begin with Revelation 2:13. Here we are told that Pergamum is the place where Satan’s throne is found. A king sits on a throne so we must conclude that Pergamum is the ‘See’ of Satan’s kingdom. Before we proceed further with this thought, we must take a look at another expression in Christ’s message to the church of Pergamum. We are told that this church holds ‘the doctrine of Balaam’ (**Revelation 2:14**). What could this expression possibly mean? To find the answer, we must go back to the original source, Numbers 22-24.

Numbers 21:10ff informs us that Israel had gained signal victories over their enemies. They had wiped out the Ammonites and the Moabites were afraid that they were next. For this reason, Balak, king of the Moabites, attempted to persuade Balaam to curse Israel. But Israel was in a strong covenant relationship with the Lord at this time and Balaam could not curse them as long as they remained faithful. (**Numbers 22:6, 12, 18; 23:8-10, 20-23; 24:5, 9**) [We are reminded that according to Ellen White, Balaam originally belonged to the group of faithful Magi but he later sold himself to a group of idolatrous Moabite priests who were experts in the art of divination (**Numbers 22:7; 23:23**). We find here, very early in the history of Israel, the two types of Magi which will reappear in Nebuchadnezzar’s Babylon and in the kingdom of Medo-Persia].

When Balaam was unsuccessful in cursing Israel, he suggested a demonic plan. Why not get the Israelite women to commit literal fornication with the daughters of Moab and to celebrate their idolatrous rites? If he could procure this, God would forsake Israel and they would be an easy

prey. This is exactly what Balaam did according to Numbers 25:1-3 (**Revelation 2:14** indicates that this plan was suggested by Balaam). When Israel forsook the Lord, the Lord withdrew His protection and Israel lost 24,000 men. Not everyone apostatized, though. Numbers 25:6-8 tells the triumphant story of how Phinehas exalted God's honor.

Let us now turn to Revelation 12:1-5, 7-9. The dragon in this passage is symbolic of Rome and Rome is where Satan's throne is. And how do we know this? Because in Revelation 13:2 we find that this dragon (symbolic of Satan working through Rome) gave the beast (the papacy) his power, and throne and great authority. And where was Satan's throne at this time? It was symbolically in Pergamum (**Revelation 2:13**) Why is all this important?

The message of the apostolic church (Ephesus) spread like grassfire. Satan responded by persecuting the church (Smyrna). But the more the church was persecuted, the more it grew. So Satan decided to change his strategy. Not able to destroy the church from outside by persecution, Satan decided to infiltrate the church. In 313 A. D. persecution ended. Constantine the Great, an avowed worshiper of the sun-god Mithra proclaimed a decree of toleration. Constantine became a 'Christian' and proclaimed the first civil Sunday law, calling it 'the Venerable Day of the Sun'. In fact, Constantine had a coin minted with the inscription, *Deus Sol Invictus* ('to the invincible sun'). The entire empire now became 'Christian'. Regarding this, Ellen White remarks:

*"The great adversary now endeavored to gain by artifice what he had failed to secure by force. Persecution ceased, and in its stead were substituted the dangerous allurements of temporal prosperity and worldly honor. Idolaters were led to receive part of the Christian faith, while they rejected other essential truths. . . . Under a cloak of pretended Christianity, Satan was insinuating himself into the church, to corrupt their faith and turn their minds from the word of truth." @ Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 42, 43.*

In this way the church committed spiritual fornication by abandoning Jesus and joining the world. It is no coincidence that the church of Pergamum is followed by the church of Thyatira which is a clear depiction of the papal church (see **Revelation 2:20-23**)

In this way, spiritual Pergamum became the link between pagan Rome and papal Rome. We have previously seen that papal Rome, though in some ways a separate kingdom, was a continuation of pagan Rome (see, the document, '*Why Papal Rome is a Continuation of Pagan Rome*'). Amazingly, we have seen that the literal kingdom of Pergamum was the link between ancient Babylon and pagan Rome. And spiritual Pergamum also linked pagan Rome to papal Rome. Thus we discern an unbroken chain between ancient Babylon and papal Rome. But there is more to this story. The papacy passed on many of its errors to apostate Protestantism, including the observance of Sunday. Astoundingly, the conflict which took place in the Valley of Dura will once again take place on a world-wide scale (**Revelation 13:11-18**). Once again the beast will build an image and command all to worship it. Whoever refuses to worship will be condemned to death. In the days of Daniel the number 666 was hidden in the dimensions of the image and at the end the number of the beast will be 666. The image was a solar symbol

and at the end, the world will be commanded to worship on the Sunday. As in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, God will have a faithful remnant whom He will deliver from certain death.

In conclusion, in a very real sense, pagan Rome grew out of Pergamum (**Daniel 8**) and papal Rome grew out of spiritual Pergamum (**Revelation 2:13; Daniel 7:8-9**).

As we compare the little horn of Daniel 7 with the little horn of Daniel 8 there can be no doubt that they both refer to the same power. William Shea has provided eleven parallels between the little horn of Daniel 7 and the little horn in Daniel 8:

- Both are identified with the same symbol: a horn (7:8; 8:9). Remarkably, even though Daniel 7 was written in Aramaic and Daniel 8 in Hebrew, both employ the same word for 'horn' (*qeren*)
- Both are described as 'little' at the outset (7:8; 8:9)
- Both are described as becoming 'great' later on (7:20; 8:9ff)
- Both are described as persecuting powers (7:21, 25; 8:10, 24)
- Both have the same target group as the object of their persecution (7:21, 25, 27; 8:24). Both chapters call the persecuted ones 'the people of the saints' (7:27; 8:24)
- Both are described as self-exalting and blasphemous powers (7:8, 11, 20, 25; 8:10-12, 25)
- Both are described as exercising a crafty intelligence (7:8: 'eyes of a man'; 8:23-25: 'understands riddles, cunning and deceit')
- Both represent the final and greatest anti-God climax of their visions (7:8-9, 21-22; 25-26; 8:12-14, 25).
- Both have aspects of their work delimited by prophetic time (7:25; 8:14)
- The activities of both extend to the time of the end (7:25-26; cf. 12:7-9; 8:17, 19)
- Both are to be supernaturally destroyed (7:11, 26; 8:25)

Shea summarizes the evidence:

*"If the prophet had desired to represent different powers in this final position, he could easily have used different symbols to do so. But instead he used the same symbol of a little horn at the end of the vision in chapter 8 as he did at the end of the vision in chapter 7. This commonality of representation suggests that the same symbol has been used to refer to the same power in both cases." William Shea, **Symposium on Daniel**, p. 187*

It seems that the emphasis of Daniel 7 falls upon giving the orderly sequence of powers from the day of Daniel until Christ sets up His everlasting kingdom. The emphasis of chapter 8 on the other hand is to highlight and amplify the origin of Rome in its two stages. Both stages of Rome originated with Pergamum, both have ruled from the same geographical center and both have performed many of the same actions (see **Revelation 13:2**).

Exposition of verse Nine

Several items are important in this verse. Notice, first of all, that the ram 'waxed **great**' (8:4), the he-goat 'waxed **very great**' (8:8), but the little horn 'waxed **exceeding great**' (8:9). The expression 'came forth a little horn' could be better translated 'came forth a horn from littleness.' From small beginnings, the horn was to grow until it reached gigantic proportions. That is to say, the little horn would become more powerful than the ram or the he-goat. This is simply not true of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was nothing compared to Medo-Persia and the Greece of Alexander the Great!!

The ram and the he-goat fought each other **geographically or horizontally**. The first conquests of the little horn were also geographical. But then, suddenly, this battle changes to the **cosmic vertical** plane. In other words, at first, all the conquests are on earth. The controversy is with earthly powers. Verse 9 is referring to the conquests of the pagan Roman Empire. Rome did indeed conquer to the south (Egypt), to the east (Greece, Asia Minor, Syria), and to the Glory (a euphemism for the land of Israel).

Remarks on Verse Ten

The little horn which had been conquering horizontally on earth now began an onslaught vertically against heaven. The sense of the first part of verse 10 is: 'the horn grew geographically, yes, even vertically into heaven.' The horn grows great, even to the host of heaven and hurls down some of the host of the stars to the ground and tramples upon them. Whenever the expression 'grow great' (*gadal*) is used in the Old Testament of human beings, without exception, it refers to one who takes power illegally, presumptuously and arrogantly. In the Old Testament the word 'host' is used in the majority of the cases to describe 'armies'.

The question is, "What is meant by the 'host' or army of heaven?" There are three possibilities:

- 1) The hosts or stars of heaven can refer to **angels (Nehemiah 9:6; Judges 5:20; Job 38:7; Revelation 12:7-9; 19:11)**
- 2) The host or stars is a reference to the literal **sun, moon and stars (Deuteronomy 4:19; II Kings 17:16)**
- 3) The host or the stars represents **God's people on earth (Exodus 7:4; 12:41; I Samuel 17:45; Revelation 1:20; Daniel 12:2-3).**

The explanation at the end of chapter 8 leaves no doubt as to the identity of the host of heaven upon which the little horn tramples: 'And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall destroy the mighty and **holy people**' (Daniel 8:24). The explanation portion of the vision of Daniel 8 follows the identical order as the vision itself.

In the vision you have a ram with two horns (verses 3-4), a he-goat with a notable horn which is broken and succeeded by four horns (verses 5-8). And then the little horn attacks the host (verse 10) and finally the Prince of the host (verse 11). The angel interpreter at the end of the vision explains that the two-horned ram represents the Medes and Persians (verse 20). He then states that the he-goat represents Greece and its notable horn its first king (verse 21). Next he

informs us that the four horns represent the divisions of Greece after the death of its first king (verse 22). Finally he explains that a king will arise (verse 23) who will 'destroy the mighty and the holy people' (verse 24) and stand up against the Prince of princes (verse 25). Even a passing glance at Daniel 8 will indicate that 'the host and the stars of heaven' in the **vision** stands in the same identical spot as 'the mighty and holy people' in the **explanation** of the vision.

It is clear, then, that the host represents God's people. In the New Testament, the Apostle Paul even uses military terminology to describe the armor and the warfare of God's people against Satan's kingdom (**Ephesians 6:11-18; Romans 13:12-14; II Corinthians 6:7; I Thessalonians 5:8; II Corinthians 10:3-4**).

Notice that in the explanation of the vision, the little horn more specifically called 'the king of the north.' The use of the word 'king' need not mean that the Antichrist will be a single individual person. And why is this? In the Bible, the singular word 'priest' with the definite article can mean a succession of priests (see, **Numbers 35:25-28** and compare with **Hebrews 9:7**). Likewise, the word 'king' with the definite article can mean a succession of kings (see, for example, **I Samuel 8:11**). Even the word 'man' with the definite article can mean Christians of all time (**II Timothy 3:17**). When Jesus said: 'The Sabbath was made for man,' (**Mark 2:27**), He obviously did not mean that it was made for only one man but rather for **mankind**. This helps us understand why Paul called the Antichrist 'the Man of Sin' and why the beast has the 'number of man' (**Revelation 13:18**). The singular word, 'woman' with the definite article can also refer to the church of all ages (see, **Revelation 12:4, 6, 13, 14-17**). So it is clear that the word 'king' in Daniel 8 can refer to a succession of kings in a dynasty.

Comments on Verse Eleven

As if it wasn't enough to war against the **host**, the little horn now attacks the **Prince** of the host, the '**daily**' which belongs to the Prince, and the place of the Prince's **sanctuary**. First of all, let's identify the Prince.

The word 'Prince' is used several times in the book of Daniel (10:13, 21; 12:1-3; 8:11, 25; 11:22; 9:25, 26). Who is this person? The only other place in the entire Bible where the specific name 'Prince of the host' (*sar tsaba*) is used is in Joshua 5:13-15. Even a cursory look at this passage reveals that the Prince of the host is God (compare **Exodus 3:14; John 8:58**). There can be no doubt that the Son of Man, Michael, the Angel of the Lord, the Angel of His Presence, all refer to the same being (**Jude 9; Revelation 12:7-9; I Thessalonians 4:16**). It is of more than passing interest to realize that the high priest in the Old Testament was occasionally called 'prince' (see **I Chronicles 24:5; Ezra 8:24, 29**)

Notice that the Prince is the Prince **of the host**. If the host is composed of the saints of the Most High, then the Prince of the host must be the Commander of those saints. And, who is the Commander of God's people on earth? Jesus is the Head of the church. The church receives its marching orders from Him. Notice that those who belong to God's people are called 'saints' in both Testaments (**Daniel 7:25; Psalm 30:4; 149:1; Ephesians 1:1; Philippians 1:1; Colossians 1:2; Jude 3**, etc.).

Let's talk now about the 'daily' (*tamid*). What does this strange word mean? There is presently an intense debate about the meaning of this word. Some think it refers to paganism which was taken out of the way in order to give way to the papacy. Others believe that it refers to the removal by the papacy of the continual ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.

The problem in this verse is that the word 'daily' is an adjective which stands alone and has no noun to qualify. The question which begs to be answered is the following: The little horn takes away the daily what? The meaning of the word is simply 'something which goes on continuously without interruption.' But what is it that 'goes on continuously without interruption'? It is important to keep in mind that this word is accompanied by the definite article. It is **THE** daily (*hatamid*) which the little horn takes away (see also **Daniel 11:31; 12:11**). The **King James Version** adds the word 'sacrifice,' thinking that *tamid* refers to the morning and evening sacrifice. But this is a wrong assumption. There is a Hebrew expression for this sacrifice, it is *olat tamid*.

What, then, does this word mean? Let's take a closer look (at this point, study the material by Pastor Stephen P. Bohr, '*What is the Daily that the Little Horn Took Away?*'). The Old Testament makes it abundantly clear that this word refers to the **daily ministration of the priest in the court and in the holy place of the sanctuary**. In other words, the little horn was going to attempt to take away from the Prince of the host His ministration in the court and in the holy place of the sanctuary. Never is this word used to describe the most holy place ministry.

In order to comprehend how the little horn did this, we need to answer two fundamental questions:

- 1) In which sanctuary is the Prince ministering at this point in the vision?
- 2) What do each of the pieces of furniture in the court and in the holy place represent? In other words, what was the meaning of the altar of sacrifice, the candlestick, the table of showbread and the altar of incense? If we are able to determine the answer to these questions then we will know also what the little horn attempted to take away from the Prince and when.

Let's answer the first question. There can be no doubt that in this vision the Prince is ministering in the **heavenly sanctuary**. We have identified the Prince as Jesus. And where does Jesus minister today? We are told in Matthew 21:12-13 that at the end of the Triumphal Entry Jesus entered the **temple of God** and called it **My Father's house**. However, just a few days later Jesus announced to the Jewish leaders: '**Your house** is left unto you desolate.' (**Matthew 23:38**) The Jerusalem Temple was no longer the Father's house nor the temple of God because it had been forsaken by the presence of Jesus. This is what the rending of veil meant. The system of earthly types and shadows had come to an end (**Matthew 27:51**). In A. D. 70 the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed (**Luke 19:41-44**) and has never been rebuilt. For this reason alone it is impossible to conclude that the sanctuary which the little horn trampled upon was the Jerusalem Temple. During the Christian dispensation when the little horn did its work, there was no earthly Jerusalem Temple in existence!!

The question suggests itself: If the little horn did not trample upon the earthly Jerusalem Temple, then which one? The answer is two-fold. Upon His ascension, Jesus began His ministry as High Priest in the literal heavenly sanctuary physically (**Hebrews 8:1-2**). He is the High Priest who ministers in the literal heavenly temple on the heavenly Mt. Zion in the literal heavenly Jerusalem. He is the minister of a better covenant because He presents before His Father His own better blood. He is the living Shekinah in the heavenly temple.

But there is more. He is also the minister of the spiritual temple on earth and that spiritual temple is the Church. This spiritual temple has spiritual foundations, a spiritual Cornerstone, spiritual stones and a spiritual Shekinah (the Holy Spirit) which entered it on the Day of Pentecost (see, **Ephesians 2:20-22**; **I Peter 2:1-10**; **I Corinthians 3:16-17**; **II Corinthians 6:14-18**; **II Thessalonians 2:3-4**). In other words, Jesus ministers in two places at the same time: Physically in heaven and spiritually on earth through the ministry of the Holy Spirit. His heavenly hosts are the angels and His earthly hosts are His faithful followers.

So then, what is meant by the little horn taking away the 'daily' from the Prince and killing His hosts? It cannot mean that the little horn literally and personally traveled to heaven and deposed the Prince and destroyed the angels. This idea would be preposterous. What, then, does it mean? The answer is found in Daniel 8:11 where we are told that the little horn cast down the **place** of the Prince's sanctuary. We have already shown that the place of the Prince's sanctuary is in the literal heavenly Temple and in His church on earth.

The word 'place' (*makon*) here is unusual. There are some very common Hebrew words for 'place' in the Old Testament but this is not one of them. The word *makon* is used only 17 times in the Hebrew Bible and in 16 of those references the word denotes the **heavenly sanctuary** as God's dwelling place (**Exodus 15:17**). Perhaps it would be a good idea to look at a few of those references. In I Kings 8:39, 41, 43, 49 (and parallel passages in **II Chronicles 6:30, 33, 39**; study also **Psalms 89:14; 97:2** where *makon* is translated, 'habitation') we are informed that God hears our prayers, forgives our sins, saves us and metes out justice from His heavenly **place** (*makon*).

Interestingly, the prayers of God's people are uttered toward or in the earthly temple but they are heard by God in heaven. Solomon prayed to the Lord upon the dedication of the Temple:

*'Hear the plea of your servant and of your people Israel when they pray toward **this place**: O hear **in heaven** your dwelling place, hear and forgive.'* (**I Kings 8:30**; see also **Daniel 6:10**)

Thus there is an intimate connection between the earthly and heavenly temples. In a sense, God dwells in both!! For our purposes here, it is important to remember that when Nebuchadnezzar came and destroyed the Jerusalem Temple, he was not able to touch the heavenly temple!! In the same way, the little horn is able to take over the functions of the Prince and kill His hosts on earth but it is not able to usurp from the heavenly Prince his functions in heaven nor destroy His angels.

The act of casting down the place of the Prince's sanctuary does not mean that the little horn is demolishing the mortar and stones of the heavenly sanctuary. What it does mean is that the

little horn usurps on earth the daily ministrations of the heavenly Prince. What belongs to the Prince in heaven, the little horn usurps and sets up on earth. The place of the sanctuary is removed from heaven and set up on earth. The central issue in this whole matter is: Who will control the sanctuary service in the court and in the holy place [significantly, at this point in the flow of church history, the little horn only tries to interfere with the ministry of the Prince in the court and in the holy place. This is understandable in that during the Middle Ages Jesus had not yet entered the most holy place] the Prince or the little horn? And why is control of the sanctuary such a vital issue?

At this point we must return to our second question above: What was the meaning of the ministrations of the priest at the altar of sacrifice, the candlestick, the table of showbread and the altar of incense? Let us examine each of these separately.

The Altar of Sacrifice

Morning and evening a lamb was offered upon this altar for the sins of Israel. As long as the Hebrew sanctuary and temple stood, there was never a time when the fire was not burning. This was the **daily** burnt offering (**Exodus 29:39**). The sacrifice of the lamb, of course, represented the death of Jesus Christ on the cross (**John 1:29; I Peter 1:19; Revelation 13:8**). The fact that the sacrifice was offered **daily**, morning and evening, indicates that Jesus died **once and for all and never needs to die again!** The benefits of His one and only sacrifice is brought out clearly in Hebrews 7:27 where the old Hebrew system is contrasted with the ministry of Christ: *'Who needeth not **daily**, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did **once** when he offered up himself.'* And again in Hebrews 9:25-28: *'Not yet that he should offer himself **often**, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others;²⁶ for then must he **often** have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now **once** in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. ²⁷ And as it is appointed unto men **once** to die, but after this the judgment: ²⁸ So Christ was **once** offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.'*

The teaching of the once-for-all death of Jesus is counterfeited in the Roman Catholic sacrifice of the mass. In the mass the once-for-all sacrifice of Jesus is repeated over and over again. Instead of looking to the Lamb of God in heaven, Roman Catholic believers are taught to look at the wafer host where the body of Jesus in its totality (ubiquity) is supposedly found. Instead of coming boldly to Jesus at the throne of grace **in heaven** believers are taught that they are being nourished by feeding on the literal body of Jesus **on earth**. In fact, the host is stored in a flower-like artifact called the Tabernacle. At the center of the artifact is the round wafer-like host and coming forth from the host are the rays of the sun. When the tabernacle is brought forth before the congregation, the faithful are taught to bow and worship the host. This is simply a refined system of sun-worship.

Furthermore, the Roman Catholic priest on earth takes over the power and prerogatives of Jesus when he pronounces the words of consecration *hoc est corpus meum*. Roman Catholic theology teaches that when these words are pronounced, the earthly priest has the power to

transubstantiate the wafer into the real body of Jesus. In other words, the earthly priest has the power to **create the Creator!!** This is blasphemy to the fullest degree.

The Table of Showbread

The table of the showbread contained two stacks of unleavened bread each with six loaves. In other words, there were twelve loaves of bread. By this, God wanted to teach that there was sufficient bread to feed each and every one of the twelve tribes of Israel. This bread was called (**Numbers 4:7**) the '**continual bread**' (*tamid*) because it was available continually to satisfy the spiritual needs of Israel.

What did this bread represent? In the Bible, bread is consistently used as a symbol of the Word of God. In Isaiah 55:10-11 we are told:

*"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither; but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and **bread** to the eater: ¹¹ **So shall my word be** that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."*

When Jesus was tempted by the devil to change stones into bread, He replied: 'Man shall not live by **bread** alone, but by every **word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' (**Matthew 4:4; see also Deuteronomy 8:3-4**).

After Jesus fed 5000 men with only five loaves of bread and two fishes He made a very controversial remark: '*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*' (**John 6:53**). Was Jesus teaching that we are to eat his literal flesh and drink His literal blood like Roman Catholic theology teaches? Absolutely not! Notice how Jesus explained His own controversial remark: '*It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the **words** that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*' (**John 6:63**). That is to say, the words of Jesus have power to nourish the spiritual life. As literal bread sustains physical life, the Word of God sustains spiritual life. Spiritually speaking, when we study the Word we assimilate Jesus and he becomes flesh of our flesh and bone of our bones.

It is the ingrafted Word of God which cleanses our life and gives us the victory over sin. David understood this when he exclaimed: '*Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy **word** . . . Thy **word** have I hid in mine heart that I might not sin against thee*' (**Psalms 119:9, 11**).

Jesus agreed with David when He said to His disciples: '*Now ye are clean through the **word** which I have spoken unto you*' (**John 15:3**). And the apostle Paul adds his testimony when he states that the church is sanctified and cleansed '*with the washing of the water by the **word***' (**Ephesians 5:26**)

What have we discovered so far about the showbread? First of all, it represents Jesus as He is contained in the written Word of God. Secondly, it is continually available to all of God's people. And thirdly, if assimilated, it will nourish the life spiritually and provide victory over sin.

In what sense, then, did the little horn cast down the meaning of the table of the showbread? The answer is easy to find. Roman Catholicism substituted the traditions of men in place of the Word of God. The word of a supposedly infallible magisterium was placed above a 'thus saith the Lord'. The number of unbiblical (or shall we say, anti-biblical?) traditions is legion: Purgatory, limbo, celibacy, auricular confession, an eternally burning hell, lent, processions, the mass, relics, canonization of saints, the rosary, bowing before images, the immaculate conception, the assumption of Mary, baptism of infants by aspersion, novenas, the observance of Sunday, etc. And what was the end result of these traditions replacing the Word of God? Spiritual malnutrition and a moral laxity which would make the pagan Romans look like saints!

It is no coincidence that the third and fourth seals of Revelation describe this period as one of famine for the Word of God (see, **Revelation 6:5-8**). In effect, the third horse (the period of Constantine) brings in the unbiblical teachings and practices of the pagans and the result under the fourth horse (the 1260 years of papal dominion) is a life threatening scarcity of bread! famine!! This is also the period of the fourth church of Revelation. Under this church, Jezebel the harlot is in control. During this period of 1260 years there is no dew or rain and as a result there is famine for the word of God. (**Revelation 2:20; 11:3, 6; 12:6, 14; cf. Amos 8:11-12**)

The Candlestick

Leviticus 24:1-4 explains that one of the tasks of the High Priest was to trim the wicks and replenish the oil in the seven-branched candlestick of the holy place. In this way he would make sure that the light of the candlestick burned continually (*tamid*).

What was represented by the candlestick? Let's interpret the symbols. Seven represents totality and oil represents the Holy Spirit. But, what does the candlestick itself represent? Revelation 1 gives us the clear answer. The seven-branched candlestick represents seven stages in the history of the Christian church from the days of the apostles till the end of time. At times, it looked like the light of the church was about to be extinguished. Particularly during the period of Thyatira the light burned dim. This is why the period of papal oppression is known as the 'dark ages.'

The Golden Altar of Incense

The incense which was offered upon this altar was called the 'perpetual (*tamid*) incense' because it was to be burned on the altar morning and evening continually. What did the incense represent? The incense upon the altar is connected with the **prayers** of the congregation. For example, in Luke 1:9-11 we are told that when Zacharias went into the temple to offer incense, the people were praying to God outside the holy place. In Psalm 141:2 David exclaims: '**Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense. . .**' Even more explicitly, Revelation 8:3-4 explains the meaning of this altar:

*'And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it **with the prayers** of all saints upon the golden*

*altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, **ascended up before God** out of the angel's hand."*

It appears from this passage that the incense represents the merits of Jesus which are mixed with the prayers of God's people. In other words, the incense which was placed upon the golden altar represents the prayers of God's people which are mingled with the precious merits of Christ's blood and therefore are acceptable before the Father.

It is no coincidence that directly in back of the altar was the veil which divided the holy from the most holy and behind the veil stood the ark of covenant, a symbol of the throne of God. When incense was offered on the golden altar, the smoke ascended up the curtain and entered the presence of God beyond the veil. This is why there were angels embroidered upon the curtain. The angels take our prayers to Jesus and by the merits of Jesus those prayers enter the very presence of God. This is the meaning of the ladder which Jacob saw in his dream (see, **Genesis 28:11-12 and John 1:51**).

In what sense did the little horn take away this function from the Prince? Roman Catholicism has established a counterfeit priesthood to whom the faithful confess their sins. That is to say, instead of people directing their prayers to Jesus in heaven for forgiveness, they utter them to a human priest on earth who cannot forgive. In this way, the intercessory ministry of Jesus is cast down from heaven and placed on earth!! Furthermore, the faithful in Roman Catholicism offer their petitions to Mary and the saints instead of to Jesus. In consequence, the eyes of people are taken off of Jesus who can truly hear their petitions and forgive their sins.

The Bible is crystal clear that there is '**one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus**' (**I Timothy 2:5**). Jesus tells us: '*I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the father but **by me***' (**John 14:6**). In Romans 8:34 the apostle Paul explains that it is Jesus who '*makes intercession for us.*' And in words which are impossible to misunderstand, the book of Hebrews explicitly tells that Jesus '*is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them*' (**Hebrews 7:25**).

Why do we need mere human intermediaries when we can come boldly to the throne of grace through Jesus, the God-Man? The confessional in Roman Catholicism focuses the attention of people upon a man on earth instead of directing them to Christ in heaven.

Summarizing, then, there are two princes that are struggling for the souls of human beings. One of them performs a continual ministry of salvation in the heavenly sanctuary by pleading the blood of His one and only sacrifice before the Father (the altar of sacrifice). He feeds His people with the Word of God (the table of showbread), keeps the light of the church burning by the power of the Holy Spirit (the candlestick) and forgives those who come to Him in penitence and prayer (the golden altar of incense).

The other prince, unable to usurp the heavenly ministry of the Prince, establishes a counterfeit continual ministry (the mass, tradition, the confessional, the pope) in the earthly temple—the church (see **II Thessalonians 2:3-4**). By getting people on earth to focus on his counterfeit ministry, he casts down the place of the sanctuary and deprives human beings from discerning

the saving work of Christ! Without being able to discern the saving work of Christ, souls perish in sin!

Remarks on Verse Twelve

We previously found that the Prince has his host. Now we discover that the little horn is also given a host to war against the daily. So the battle is between the Prince and His host and the little horn and his host. A comparison of verse 12 with Daniel 11:31 clearly indicates that the little horn's host is composed of his armies, the secular power. Notice that the little horn's host helps fight against the daily by reason of transgression. The word 'transgression' (*pasa*) is the strongest in the Old Testament for sin. It really means 'rebellion' or 'revolt'. The little horn and his host are not simply sinning; they are revolting or openly rebelling against the Prince, the daily and the place of the sanctuary. The little horn in Daniel 7:25, the king of the north in Daniel 11:36 and the man of sin of 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4 all manifest the same attitude: open and willful rebellion against the Prince, the daily and the place of the sanctuary.

Amazingly, in all these passages we are told that the little horn and his host prosper in their endeavor, at least for a while. Daniel 7:21 tells us that the little horn '*made war with the saints, and prevailed against them.*' Daniel 11:36 informs us that the king of the north '*shall do according to his will.*' And II Thessalonians 2:3-4 is followed by a description of an extended period when the man of sin and the mystery of iniquity do their doleful work.

This same idea is found in the book of Revelation where the saints are mowed down by Babylon and they cry out for justice (**Revelation 6:9-11**). Eventually their pleas will be answered (**Revelation 19:2-3; 11:1-2, 18; 15:1; 22:11**) but there is a period during which Babylon prevails over them. In other words, for a period, the little horn and his host gain the ascendancy over the Prince and His host. This is what necessitates the judgment. The purpose of the judgment in this specific context is to reverse the little horn's work. This is really the culmination of what began when Cain killed Abel—the blood of Abel cried out for justice (**Genesis 4:10**). The judgment will vindicate God's faithful martyrs who have been mowed down in the course of history by those who claimed to be followers of God! In a few moments we will come back to this theme.

Exposition of Verses Thirteen and Fourteen

Now the video portion of the vision suddenly goes blank but the audio portion continues. Daniel hears two heavenly beings speaking to each other. One of them asks the other: '**How long shall be the vision. . .**' A better translation would be: '**Until when shall be the vision. . .**' The difference between these two translations is subtle but important. The proper emphasis is on when the vision **ends**, not on **how long** it lasts. In other words, it is the **termination** of the vision which is in view, not its **duration**. This can clearly be seen when we compare the question with the answer. '*Until when?*' asks one angel. The other answers: '*Until two thousand and three hundred days; then shall be sanctuary by cleansed.*' The word '*then*' clearly refers to the termination point.

It is most important to realize that up to this point in Daniel 8 the word for 'vision' has uniformly been the Hebrew word *chazon*. In fact, everything Daniel has seen up to this point is part of the *chazon* (the word is used 3 times in verses one and two). Thus, the vision (*chazon*) includes Medo-Persia, Greece, pagan Rome and papal Rome.

The King James Version of Daniel 8:13 reads as follows:

"How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?"

This reading leaves one with the impression that **the vision** includes only the portion that has to do with the removal of the daily, the transgression of desolation and the trampling of the sanctuary and the host. Actually the King James translation is wrong on two counts. The original Hebrew text does not contain the word 'concerning' nor does it contain the word 'sacrifice'. The Hebrew literally reads:

"Until when the vision [chazon], the daily [tahmid], and the rebellion that causes desolation to give both the sanctuary and the host a trampling?"

Thus when the angel asks the question: *'Until when shall be the vision (chazon). . .'* he is not merely referring to the portion of the vision that describes the work of the little horn but rather to the total vision which began in verse 1.

This proves that we must apply the year/day principle to the 2300 days. Two thousand three hundred literal days would cover a period of about six and one half years, a time span far too short to include the kingdoms of Medo-Persia, Greece, pagan and papal Rome. Thus the use of the word *chazon* in the angelic question requires that the 2300 days be understood as years!!

The use of the word *chazon* in the angel's question also helps us understand why the vision of Daniel 8 (*contra* **Daniel 7**) begins with the kingdom of Medo-Persia and not with the kingdom of Babylon. The reason is simple: The prophecy of the 2300 days begins during the period of the Medo-Persian Empire (457 b. c.) and not during the reign of Babylon. If Daniel had started the *chazon* with Babylon he would have given the distinct impression that the prophecy of the 2300 days was to begin during the reign of Babylon!! Thus the vision begins with Medo-Persia because the 2300 days/years begin during the reign of Medo-Persia (see the chart at the end of this material).

Daniel 8:14 constitutes the climax of the vision and immediately precedes the angelic explanation. There are several key considerations which must be taken into account as we analyze this all-important verse.

First of all, it has been suggested that the 2300 days should really be understood as 1150 days. And how is this? Liberal scholars who see the little horn as a symbol for Antiochus Epiphanes offer the following convoluted interpretation: The 2300 evenings and mornings are really referring to 2300 evening and morning sacrifices.

If this idea were true, the end result would be: 1150 days x 2 sacrifices per day (morning and evening) = 2300 sacrifices! The reason why liberal scholars offer this novel interpretation is because they think they can make 1150 literal days fit much better with their Antiochus Epiphanes interpretation.

Three main considerations make this interpretation unacceptable:

1) The expression in Daniel 8 is not *'evening and morning sacrifices'*. The translation 'daily sacrifice' for the word *tamid* is an unacceptable reading. There is a Hebrew expression for 'daily sacrifice' (*olat tamid*) but this is not the expression used in Daniel 8 (see **Exodus 29:38-42**)

2) The daily sacrifices were not called 'evening and morning' sacrifices but, rather, 'morning and evening sacrifices' (**Exodus 29:39**). There is no exception to this order of words!

3) The Hebrew of Daniel 8:14 literally reads: *'Until evening-morning twenty three hundred. . .'* This precise order and terminology is used in Genesis one where, after each of the first six days of creation, we are told *'it was the evening and morning of the first day, second day, third day'*, etc. Here evening-morning is in the singular which is a clear indication that we are dealing with single unit composed of an evening and a morning. You cannot reduce the six days of creation to three anymore than you can reduce the 2300 days to 1150!!

Which sanctuary is being spoken of here? The word 'sanctuary' is used twice in verses 1-13 (8:11, 13). We have already shown that in these first two references the little horn interfered with the ministry of Christ in the court and in the holy place. Therefore there cannot be any doubt, contextually, that the same sanctuary is being spoken of here. However, there is an important terminological nuance which is missed in the English translation. In the first two references to the sanctuary the Hebrew word *miqdas* is used. But in Daniel 8:14 the word for 'sanctuary' is suddenly changed. Instead of *miqdas* the word *qodes* is used. Why the sudden and unexpected shift in terms? The change must be intentional or else, why would the word be changed? Could this mean that Daniel is now going to deal with a different apartment of the sanctuary, namely the most holy place? I believe the answer to this question is a definite yes! It is of more than passing significance that the word for 'sanctuary' in Leviticus 16 is *qodes*, not *miqdas*. This is a clear indication that the angel wishes to connect Daniel 8 with Leviticus 16. In both Daniel 8 and Leviticus 16 it is the **sanctuary** which is in view, not the individual believer. We shall see, though, that the individual believer is **indirectly** involved in the work of the Day of Atonement.

Another extremely important nuance which is glossed over in the English translation is a change in the word 'vision'. In verses 1-15 Daniel has uniformly used the word *chazon* for 'vision' (once in verse 1, twice in verse 2, once in verse 13, once in verse 15). But when Gabriel is commanded to explain the vision to Daniel, the word *mareh* is used. The impact of this change can be seen more clearly by placing the question about the vision and the command to explain it together:

'Until when shall be the *chazon* . . . I, Daniel had seen the *chazon*. . . Gabriel, make this man understand the *mareh*.'

Why is the Hebrew word 'vision' suddenly changed in verse 16? Surely there must be a good reason, and there is!

A careful examination of the occurrence of the words *chazon* and *mareh* in Daniel 8-12 clearly reveals that while *chazon* refers to the total vision from Medo-Persia till the cleansing of the sanctuary, *mareh* refers in a narrower sense to the question the angel asked about when the vision would come to an end. The *chazon* has to do with the totality of the vision of Daniel 8 while the *mareh* has to do with the apparition of the two heavenly beings and the audition which follows. That is to say, the word *mareh* has to do directly with the time element of the *chazon*. For those who wish to study this further, we will now provide a list of all the occurrences of *chazon* and *mareh* in Daniel 8-12:

Chazon

Daniel 8:1: "a **vision** appeared to me"

Daniel 8:2: "I saw in the **vision**. . . I saw in the **vision**"

Daniel 8:13: "How long will the **vision** be"

Daniel 8:15: "had seen the **vision**"

Daniel 8:17: "the **vision** refers to the time of the end"

Daniel 8:26: "therefore seal up the **vision**"

Daniel 9:21: "whom I had seen in the **vision** at the beginning"

Daniel 9:24: "to seal up **vision**"

Daniel 10:14: "for the **vision** refers to many days yet to come"

Daniel 11:14: "in fulfillment of the **vision**"

Mareh

Daniel 8:16: "make this man understand the **vision**"

Daniel 8:26: "the **vision** of the evenings and mornings"

Daniel 8:27: "astonished at the **vision**, but no one understood it"

Daniel 9:23: "and understand the **vision**"

Daniel 10:1: "had understanding of the **vision**"

Daniel 10:6: "his face was like the **appearance** of lightning"

Daniel 10:18: "having the **likeness** of a man"

Of special significance is the reference to *mareh* in 8:26. There *mareh* is clearly linked with the evening and morning aspect of the 2300 day prophecy. It is clear that the *mareh* has to do specifically with the time factor of the *chazon*. We will find later in our study that while the *chazon* was explained in Daniel 8, the *mareh* was left unexplained. This made it necessary for the angel to return in Daniel 9 to elucidate the time portion which was not clear to Daniel.

We must now dedicate some time to a translation problem in Daniel 8:14. The **King James Version** translates: '*the sanctuary shall be **cleansed***'. Desmond Ford, among others, has

protested that the word 'cleansed' is a mistranslation in the KJV. In fact, most modern translations avoid the use of the word 'cleansed' (even though the Geneva Bible, the Bishop's Bible, the Great Bible, Tyndale's Bible, Wycliffe's Bible, the Coptic version, the Syriac version, the Latin Vulgate all have the translation 'cleansed'). Instead they employ translations such as 'shall be justified,' 'shall emerge victorious,' 'shall be vindicated,' and 'shall be restored to its rightful state'. What is the proper translation? On the surface, Desmond Ford appears to have a point. The word 'cleansed' does not appear in the Hebrew but is based rather on the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Old Testament) which uses *katharizo* (whose basic meaning is to 'cleanse' or 'purge'. Incidentally, this is where we get the word 'catharsis' from). Thus the **King James Version** translation is based on another translation and not on the original Hebrew. What, then, is the Hebrew word in Daniel 8:14?

The original (though we do not have the autograph) Hebrew verb is *sadaq* in its passive form. And what is the meaning of *sadaq*? Let's take a look. The Hebrew root *sdq* is used some 500 times in the Old Testament. Of those 500 uses, 41 are verbal forms. Twenty-two of those verbs are in the active voice and only one is in the passive voice, the one we are analyzing. According to the Hebrew lexicons, the word *sadaq* means 'to be justified,' 'to be vindicated from wrongs,' 'to be brought back to its rights.' It is not a word which is connected with the **ritual** of the sanctuary but rather is a **legal** term used in the context of a court of law. Its basic emphasis is on the vindication of an innocent party who has been falsely accused. The vindication process is performed in a court of law where the judge employs all the powers at his disposal to make sure that the injured party is vindicated. We will provide only one example from Deuteronomy 25:1:

"If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify (sadaq) the righteous, and condemn the wicked."

In this context it is interesting to note that the Psalmist envied the wicked until he went into the sanctuary and saw their final end (**Psalm 73:3 17**) This seems to indicate that the sanctuary is not only the means of salvation for the righteous but is a source of condemnation for the wicked.

So it appears that the best translation would indeed be 'vindicated' or 'justified' rather than 'cleansed'. But sometimes appearances can be deceiving and we must beware of jumping to hasty conclusions before a thorough study has been undertaken. This we must now do.

Before we explain why the translation 'cleansed' is a good one, we need to mention another problem. The Seventh-day Adventist pioneers were very much convinced that Daniel 8:14 needed to be linked with Leviticus 16. They did this by connecting the word 'cleansed' in Daniel 8:14 with the word 'cleanse' in Leviticus 16. The problem with this procedure is that the Hebrew word in Daniel is *sadaq* while the word in Leviticus is *taher*. (Even worse, as we have seen, the **King James Version** is not even based on the Hebrew but on the Greek Septuagint.) The words in Hebrew are simply different. *Sadaq* is a **legal** term whose basic meaning is 'to vindicate' and *taher* is a **ritual** term whose basic meaning is 'to cleanse'. How do we solve this

apparent impasse? The answer is that we must understand the historical period in which Daniel was written.

Before the Babylonian captivity (605-536 B. C.), the Israelites employed Hebrew as their written and spoken language. But those who were taken captive to Babylon soon adopted Aramaic as their spoken and written language (to use an analogy, Aramaic is similar to Hebrew like Spanish is similar to Portuguese today). Daniel E. Augsburg in an unpublished master's thesis ('The Good News of Daniel 8:14', Andrews University, 1980) refers to a scholarly article by Frank Zimmerman ('The Aramaic Original of Daniel 8-12,' Journal of Biblical Literature 57 (September 1938): 255-272) and remarks about the custom of the post-exilic rabbis:

"It is important to note . . . that certain words used in the Hebrew Bible regarding particular events and places would be changed to another word in Aramaic, even though the original Hebrew word also existed in Aramaic. Likewise, some of these new Aramaic 'synonyms' would have multiple meanings, which when translated back into Hebrew or Greek, would be written with new words"

Augsburger makes a significant point. The post-exilic Jews, having lost to a great degree the use of Hebrew as their *lingua franca*, needed the rabbis to provide them with an Aramaic interpretation they could understand. This the rabbis did by composing the *targums* which were Aramaic translations and explanations of the Hebrew text. It is to these *targums* which Augsburg is making reference above. We must also remember that the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the Septuagint or LXX) was prepared in an environment where Aramaic had become the language of the people. Thus there can be no doubt that Aramaic had a profound influence on the translators of the Septuagint.

Why have we dedicated so much space to this issue of the historical context? Simply because it has a powerful bearing on the issue we are dealing with. You see, both the Aramaic *targums* and the LXX frequently translate the Hebrew word *sadaq*, not with a word which means 'to justify' or 'to vindicate,' but rather with an Aramaic or Greek word with the basic meaning of 'cleanse' or 'purify'. W. E. Read ('Further Observations on SADAQ,' Andrews University Seminary Studies 4 [1966]: 29-36) has shown that in the Aramaic *Targums* the Hebrew word *sadaq* is changed 40% of the time to the word *zakah* (which means 'cleanse' or 'purify'). More significantly, he found that in 35 of the 38 verbal uses of the word *sadaq* the rabbis substituted the word *zakah* in place of *sadaq*. And to top it all off, Read discovered that when the word *sadaq* is used in the context of the sanctuary, in 100% of the cases, the rabbis supplied the word *zakah* in the places where the Hebrew had *sadaq*!

By way of examples we can provide the following: In Genesis 6:9 we are told that Noah was a *sadaq* ('just') man but the Aramaic *Targum* tells us that Noah was a *zakah* ('pure') man. In Job 40:8 the Hebrew word *sadaq* is once again translated *zakah* in the *Targum*. The same happens in Jeremiah 12:1. These examples and others show clearly that in the minds of the rabbis, *sadaq* and *zakah* were cognate terms. The question is: Are we to trust the rabbis who lived in the Aramaic period for the proper meaning of words or should we trust Desmond Ford twenty four centuries removed from this period? We leave it with the reader to answer this question!

But we are not left to depend on the Aramaic *targums* to prove that *sadaq* is very closely related to Hebrew words which mean 'cleansing.' In the Hebrew Old Testament itself, the word *sadaq* is frequently coupled in synonymous parallelism with three Hebrew words whose basic meaning is 'clean' or 'pure' (*zakah, bor, taher*). Let's provide some examples:

Job 4:17: 'Just' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'pure' (*taher*)

Job 15:14: 'Clean' (*zakah*) is coupled with 'righteous' (*sadaq*)

Job 17:9: 'Righteous' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'clean' (*taher*)

Job 25:4: 'Justified' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'clean' (*zakah*)

It is noteworthy that these four examples are taken from the oldest book in the Bible. Ellen White tells us that Moses wrote this book while he was in the desert of Midian tending Jethro's sheep. This places us at about 1500 B. C. But, wait a minute. Moses is quoting Job and his friends who lived around 500 years earlier. This means that as early as 2000 B. C., *sadaq, zakah, and taher* were understood as cognate terms!! But let's look at a few references from other Old Testament books:

Psalms 19:9: 'Clean' (*taher*) is coupled with 'righteous' (*sadaq*)

Psalms 51:4: 'Justified' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'blameless' (*zakah*)

Proverbs 20:7-9: 'Righteous' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'clean' (*zakah*)

Ecclesiastes 9:2: 'Righteous' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'clean' (*taher*)

Psalms 18:20: 'Righteousness' (*sadaq*) is coupled with 'blameless' (*bor*). It is interesting that the LXX translates *bor* with *katharioneta* ('cleansed').

It is interesting to note that in Job 22:3 the word 'righteous' in the Hebrew is *sadaq* but in the Greek translation it is rendered with *amemptos* which means 'blameless' or 'faultless'. In Psalm 51:4 the word 'justified' is the Hebrew *sadaq* but the word *zakah* ('cleanse') is rendered in the LXX as *nikao* which means 'to conquer, to overcome, to win the verdict'. It is clear from these examples that Hebrew and Greek words have many shades of meaning and none of these meanings is mutually exclusive of others.

Let's examine some additional passages from both the Old and New Testaments. In Psalm 14:3 and 53:3 David speaks of fools with the following words: '*they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.*' It is obvious that being filthy is the same as '*not doing good*'. In Romans 3:10 the apostle Paul quotes these Psalms in the following manner: '*As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one. . . .*' As we compare the words of David with the rendering by Paul, we discover that being **filthy** means not being **righteous**. But the simple law of deduction we could also say that the opposite is also true: To be **clean** means to be **righteous**.

In Isaiah 64:6 the prophet equates our **own righteousness** with being **unclean** and wearing filthy rags. Once again, the idea of righteousness is coupled with the idea of purity.

Several ideas from Isaiah 4:3-5 must be brought to the fore. In this very important passage we have several important ideas which bear a close relationship with the book of Revelation. There

is a **remnant** which is **left** in **Zion** and in **Jerusalem** after a devastating destruction. These are called **holy** and are found **written** among the living. The Lord has **washed** away their **filth**. This word, 'filth' is *rhupos* in the LXX. It means 'to issue' (as in menstruation) and in classical Greek it refers to a foul greasy and viscous juice like ear wax. Don't forget this word because we will come back to it later. Notice also in this passage that the blood of Jerusalem is **purged** (Greek: *ekkathariei*, the same root word for cleansed as in **Daniel 8:14**) by the spirit of **judgment** and by the spirit of burning. Don't forget that in this passage the remnant is washed, purged and made holy as a result of the judgment. Later on we will see that Revelation 22:11 adds the idea of the remnant being 'righteous'.

Another important passage is that found in Zechariah 3:1-5. Here we find a clear **judicial or court** proceeding. There is an accuser (Satan), a defendant (Joshua: Symbolic of Israel), and a defender (the Angel of the Lord). There is no doubt that a trial is taking place in this passage and that the trial is a **sanctuary** setting. And how do we know this? For two reasons: Because Joshua is described as the high priest and because later on in the passage a clean mitre is placed on his forehead. The high priest in Israel wore a mitre which was inscribed with the words: 'HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD'.

Notice that Joshua is clothed with filthy garments. Isaiah 61:10 explicitly explains that clean garments represent righteousness. Filthy garments must then represent unrighteousness (by the way, the word 'filthy' here is the same root word *rhupos*). Notice that in this judicial proceeding, the filthy garments are removed and Joshua is clothed with clean garments. God explains the meaning of this: *'I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee'* (verse 4). After this, Joshua is looked upon as holy. Once again, the idea of being **cleansed**, made **holy** and clothed with **righteousness** are used interchangeably. It is significant also that God removes this iniquity in one day (verse 9) which is undoubtedly a reference to the Day of Atonement. Significant also is that in the LXX what is removed is identified as *anomias* ('transgression of the law') and *adikias* ('iniquity').

Now we must turn to three main passages from the book of Revelation. The first is 6:9-11. Here the martyrs are crying out to God *'How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?'* It is clear in this passage that God's reputation is being smeared by the death of His saints. Things are going well for the persecutors and the saints are being mowed down. The question is: When will God vindicate His Name and His saints? (don't miss the connection with what the little horn does in Daniel 7 and 8). The answer is that God gives his martyred saints robes made white in the blood of the lamb (**Revelation 7:13-14**) and tells them to rest until the number of martyrs is complete. In other words, there were martyrs in the past and there will be martyrs in the future. When the martyrs have all died, then God will intervene to reward them all at the same time. But meanwhile they are given white robes (found worthy by virtue of Christ's righteousness) in the pre-advent judgment.

The answer to the question of the martyrs is found in Revelation 19:2-3. After the seven last plagues have been poured out a great multitude of redeemed people is heard singing in heaven (19:1). They exclaim: *'true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great*

where, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath **avenged** the blood of his servants at her hand.’ (19:2) Even a cursory glance at this verse reveals its relationship with Revelation 6:9-11. This is the answer to the question which was asked by the martyrs. God has now revealed his truth and righteousness by the act of judging the harlot who shed the blood of His people. God’s people are now exhibited as arrayed in fine linen, clean and white which is identified as the ‘*righteousness of saints*’ (19:8). Notice that God’s people are now **righteous** and **clean**. These two ideas coalesce.

We must now turn to Revelation 22:11. This verse is found in the epilog of the book (for a complete study of this verse in its context, listen to pastor Stephen P. Bohr’s audio tape: ‘*Revelation’s Life or Death Message*’) After the angel tells John not to seal the book (22:10: Because the door of probation is still open), he then speaks of a time when the declaration will be made: ‘He that is **unjust** (*adikon*), let him be unjust still: and he which is **filthy** (*rhupon*), let him be filthy still: and he that is **righteous** (*dikaaios*), let him be righteous still: and he that is **holy** (*jaguios*), let him be holy still’ (probation has closed). Then Jesus comes quickly to reward every one according to their works (22:12) A look at the words in bold shows that there is a very close relationship between the idea of being unjust (in Greek: ‘unrighteous’) and the idea of being filthy (yes, in Greek: *rhupoo*). On the other hand, God’s people are ‘*righteous*’ and ‘*holy*’ (notice in II Chronicles 29:5 that being filthy and being holy are presented as opposites). Incidentally, in Revelation 17:4 the harlot is represented as ‘*filthy*’. A close look at Revelation reveals that all the ideas we studied in Isaiah 4 are present there also. At this point we do not have time or space to trace this parallel. Perhaps this would be a good assignment for those who are in this class today!!

In the light of what we have studied above, we must ask one final question: If Daniel 8:14 is dealing with the cleansing of the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement, then why didn’t Daniel use the Hebrew word *taher* which is the word for ‘*cleansing*’ in Leviticus 16? Why did he use the word *sadaq* instead? The reason is very simple The Hebrew word *taher* is a technical term with a very restricted and narrow meaning. It is used over 50 times in the book of Leviticus to describe cultic/ritual/ceremonial cleansing in connection with the earthly sanctuary service. The use of this term in Daniel 8:14 would have left the impression that the sanctuary to be cleansed was the earthly typological sanctuary. But Daniel 8:14 deals with the cleansing, not of the Old Testament shadow/ type but of the heavenly reality/original! Therefore a broader term needed to be used.

As we have shown, the Hebrew word *sadaq* has a broad range of meaning which includes vindication, setting things right, restoring things to the way they originally were, and cleansing. Thus the word *sadaq* is like a diamond with many edges—it is one word with many nuances. Perhaps an analogy from the English language might help us understand. When legal proceedings are undertaken against an innocent person in our system of jurisprudence, it becomes necessary for this person to be vindicated. The record must be set straight and the person must be justified from all charges. When this is done and the person is found innocent, the charges are **expunged**. This is a legal word whose meaning is ‘to remove completely, blot out, erase, to cancel, to delete.’ Thus the result of the judgment includes justification, vindication, restoration and giving the person a clean slate because the charges have been

erased! It would be absurd to say that vindication does not include blotting out (or cleansing, if you please) the charges!! The fact is that in Daniel 8 the reputation of God and his people has been **smear**ed by the little horn. A judicial proceeding in the heavenly sanctuary must set the record straight, must vindicate, must justify and must expunge the false accusations!! Daniel 7 presents a similar scenario. The little horn has killed the saints, changed the times, changed the law, blasphemed God and things have gone well for it. The record must be set straight and this is done by opening the books and judging the ostentatious little horn. At the end of the judgment, the kingdom is given once again to the Son of Man (who is the same person as the Prince of the host) and to the saints of the Most High to whom it belonged in the first place!!

There is a remarkable parallel between the thematic sequence of Daniel 8 and Leviticus 1-16. In Daniel 8:1-12 we find the little horn interfering with the **daily** ministrations of the Prince of the host. But in Daniel 8:13-14 the focus shifts to the **yearly** ministrations—the justification or cleansing of the sanctuary. This is the same sequence we find in Leviticus 1-16. In chapters 1-15 we find the emphasis on the **daily** ministrations in the court and in the holy place in favor of the **individual** Israelites. But in chapter 16 the focus shifts from the individual Israelite to the cleansing of the **sanctuary**.

Some scholars have argued that Daniel 8:14 cannot be connected with Leviticus 16 because in Daniel 8:14 it is an **apostate power** which defiles the sanctuary while in Leviticus 16 it is the confessed sins of **God's people** which have defiled it. Are these two emphases mutually exclusive or are they complementary? Is the sanctuary polluted only by the confessed sins of God's people or is it also defiled by the sins of those who profess to be God's people and yet are impostors? Let's take a few moments to study just one passage from the Old Testament to answer these questions

The book of Zephaniah is fascinating. Though the book deals with God's judgment upon Israel at the Babylonian captivity, the language makes it very clear that this judgment prefigures God's great judgment at the end of time. We are particularly concerned here with chapter 3 and verses 1-7:

*"Woe to her that is **filthy and polluted**, to the oppressing city! ² She obeyed not the voice; she received not correction; she trusted not in the Lord; she drew not near to her God. ³ Her princes within her are roaring lions; her judges are evening wolves; they gnaw not the bones till the morrow. ⁴ Her prophets are light and treacherous persons: her priests have **polluted the sanctuary**, they have done **violence to the law**. ⁵ The just Lord is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity: every morning doth he bring his judgment to light, he faileth not; but the **unjust** knoweth no shame. ⁶ I have cut off the nations: their towers are desolate; I made their streets waste, that none passeth by: their cities are destroyed, so that there is no man, that there is none inhabitant. ⁷ I said: 'Surely thou wilt fear me, thou wilt receive instruction; so their dwelling should not be cut off, howsoever I punished them: but they rose early, and corrupted all their doings.'"*

Here God calls Jerusalem (the city where His own people dwell) 'filthy' and 'polluted' (verse 1). In verse 5 the filthy and polluted ones are called 'unjust'. Once again we find a link between the

idea of being filthy and being unjust or unrighteous. God's own people are accused of not obeying His voice (verse 2). Then the religious leaders are singled out in this apostasy—the princes, the judges, the prophets and the priests (verses 3 and 4). Of particular significance is the declaration in verse 4 that 'her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law.' So it is possible for apostate priests who claim to serve God to pollute the sanctuary! (See also Ezekiel 8). For this reason God promises to come in judgment against those who profess to be His own people. Verse 8 makes it very clear that this judgment has much more than Israel in view. It is a judgment of the whole world at the end of time. The rest of the chapter is composed of promises of restoration for those who remain faithful to God. Of particular significance is verse 13 which is parallel to Revelation 14 where the 144,000 are described.

Comments on Verses 26, 27

In verse 26 Daniel is told that the chazon (the entire vision of **Daniel 8**) is for many days and that he should shut it up. It is very important to realize that up to this point (in the first seven chapters of Daniel), God has not told Daniel to shut up anything. It is only starting in chapter 8 that the vision is sealed. This is clear evidence that the little sealed book of Daniel 12:4 and Revelation 10 is composed only of the portion of Daniel which deals with the 2300 days.

Verse 27 will not only mark the conclusion to chapter 8 but will also provide the introduction to chapter 9. This verse is of the utmost importance. When the angel told Daniel that the vision was for 'many days' and that he should seal it, he Daniel got sick and was faint for several days. Why did this happen to Daniel? He explains: *"I was astonished at the vision (mareh) but none understood it."*

Daniel was confused about the mareh portion of the chazon. Even though God had explained the meaning of the ram, the he-goat and the little horn (the chazon), he was still confused about the mareh. The only element left unexplained in chapter 8 was the time aspect, the 2300 days. In chapter 8 there is no beginning point for the 2300 days and God had not explained how the 2300 days were related to the 70 week prophecy of Jeremiah. In chapter 9 God will fill in the missing information so that Daniel can understand!

LESSON #22 – NOTES ON DANIEL 9

Overview of Daniel 9 and its Historical Context (538 BC)

As chapter 9 begins, Jerusalem was in ruins and the prophet was diligently studying the seventy year prophecy of Jeremiah 25:9-13. There was a specific reason why Daniel was studying this particular prophecy. Through Jeremiah, God had promised that the captivity of Israel would last only seventy years. But eleven years earlier, God had seemed to indicate that the sanctuary and the people would be trampled underfoot for 2300 years (**Daniel 8:14**). This apparent discrepancy perplexed Daniel. He could not comprehend how the prophecy of Jeremiah 25 could be reconciled with the one in Daniel 8:14.

Daniel then uttered one of the most deeply spiritual prayers in the Bible. He first **confessed** his sin and that of his people (verses 4-11). Next he described the **results** of his sin and that of his people (verses 11-14), and finally he **interceded** before God, asking Him to restore Israel to its land (verses 15-19). The urgency of Daniel's prayer was directly related to the vision he had received eleven years earlier (**Daniel 8**). He seemed to surmise that perhaps God now intended to prolong the seventy years to 2300 because of the covenant unfaithfulness of Israel. Obviously, Daniel did not want the seventy years to be extended to 2300, so he poured out his heart to God, pleading for forgiveness.

In response to Daniel's plea, God sent Gabriel to inform him that his prayer had been accepted and that an explanation would be given (9:20-23). The desolation of Jerusalem in Daniel 9:2 **motivated** Daniel's prayer and the promise of Jerusalem's restoration and rebuilding was the answer to his prayer.

In verses 24-27 Gabriel explained that the city of Jerusalem and its people would be given another opportunity. The city, temple and walls would be rebuilt according to the schedule of Jeremiah's prophecy. Seventy weeks (490 years) would be given Israel to redeem her past failures. At the very end of this period, God would even send Messiah the Prince who would make a final urgent appeal to Israel. But this appeal would fall upon deaf ears and as a result the theocracy would come to an end, Jerusalem would be destroyed, the temple demolished and the people scattered among the nations.

Links between Daniel 8 and 9

Almost all Protestant and Roman Catholic scholars fail to link Daniel 8 with Daniel 9. This is puzzling in that there are multiple textual and contextual reasons to link the two chapters. Let's take a look at several reasons why these two chapters must be connected:

In Daniel 8 contains a **vision** (*chazon*) in verses 1-12 and an **audition** (that is, two angels speaking to each other) in verses 13-14. Gabriel then explains the vision in verses 19-26. A close examination of this chapter reveals that while all the elements of the **vision** proper were explained, the **audition** was left unexplained. This was presumably due to the fact that Daniel got ill and Gabriel was not able to finish his explanation (**Daniel 8:27**). It appears that Daniel's illness was caused by his inability to reconcile the meaning of Jeremiah's seventy year prophecy with the prophecy of the 2300 days. After all, how could God's people be restored to their land after seventy years, if their city and temple were to be trampled upon by the little horn for 2300 years?

When Daniel received the vision of chapter 8 in 550 B. C., Babylon had not yet fallen. On the other hand, when the events of Daniel 9 transpired in 538 B. C., Babylon had just fallen and Medo-Persia had taken over the kingdom (see, **Daniel 5**). Daniel knew that the fall of Babylon was the harbinger that Israel would soon be released from bondage. And yet nothing could be seen on the horizon to indicate that such a release was imminent. Daniel knew that Jeremiah's seventy years had begun in 605 B. C., when he and his three friends had been taken to Babylon. Therefore he also understood that the release of Israel must take place around the year 536 B C

There can be little doubt that the prophecy of the 2300 days/years haunted Daniel at this point in time. He surmised that Israel's unfaithfulness was so great, that God had decided to prolong Israel's captivity from seventy years to 2300. This is the reason why, at the start of chapter 9, Daniel was studying Jeremiah's seventy year prophecy (**Daniel 9:1-2**). He wanted to know how this prophecy was related to the 2300 days/years.

Daniel's prayer, which immediately follows his study of Jeremiah's prophecy, includes a confession of Israel's sin and an appeal to God's mercy. The word 'defer' at the climax of his prayer has profound significance (verse 19). The Hebrew *achar* is variously translated in the Old Testament. It can mean 'to loiter, to delay, to procrastinate, to hinder, to tarry, to slacken.' In Exodus 22:29 it is translated 'delay.' In Genesis 24:56 it is rendered 'hinder.' In Deuteronomy 23:21 uses 'slack.' Judges 5:28 translates 'tarry' as does Habakkuk 2:3 and Proverbs 23:30. Daniel feared that God would delay the release of Israel beyond the seventy years and so he poured out his heart in prayer appealing to God's covenant loyalty and faithfulness.

The **very same angel** who had explained the vision of Daniel 8 came back to explain the time element which had been left unexplained (**Daniel 8:16-17, 26; 9:21-23**). To put it differently, the angel came back to finish in Daniel 9 what he had started in Daniel 8. Thus these two chapters are linked by the very same angel, Gabriel!

Furthermore, it is of more than passing interest that the unexplained time element of Daniel 8 was later explained in Daniel 9 by the **same angel** who began his explanation with a time

prophecy!! That is to say, the unexplained **time element** of Daniel 8 was explained with a **time prophecy** in Daniel 9.

Gabriel told Daniel: *'Seventy weeks are **determined** upon thy people and upon thy holy city.'* (**Daniel 9:24**, KJV). The word 'determined' in the Hebrew is *chatak*. It can mean 'to cut, to decide, to decree, to ordain, to appoint.' The New English Bible translates it 'marked out.' The word appears only this time in the Hebrew Bible but in Mishnaic Hebrew it is frequently used in a literal sense to describe the act of **cutting off** parts of animals for the sacrificial service, the **cutting off** of the foreskin in circumcision, the **cutting off** of a lamp wick and a miner **cutting out** ore from a mountain. Figuratively, the word is also used to describe the act of cutting or dividing a Bible verse into two parts for study.

The root meaning of this word, then, appears to be 'cut off.' Now, when something is cut off, it must be cut off from something! For example, if you are going to cut a branch off a tree there must be a tree to cut it off from!! This being the case, we must ask: 'From what are the seventy weeks cut off?' The answer is simple: It must have been cut off from the larger prophecy of the 2300 days/years.

A close inspection of Daniel 8 and 9 shows that both chapters share a common central theme. Both chapters deal with the trampling of the city, the people, the sanctuary and the Prince (compare **Daniel 8:11-14, 25** with **Daniel 9:3-19, 25-26**). However, (we shall study this in more detail when we deal with **Daniel 11**) while Daniel 8 focuses primarily on the trampling of spiritual Israel by the papacy (see, **Daniel 8:13; Revelation 11:2; Daniel 11:31; Revelation 17:1-5; Matthew 24:15**), Daniel 9 has to do with the trampling of literal Israel by Rome (see, **Daniel 9:26-27; Luke 21:20; Matthew 24:15**).

It is obvious that Daniel did not clearly comprehend the shift from literal Israel to spiritual Israel. If he had understood this, he would have realized that the seventy weeks apply to the literal Jews in literal Jerusalem with a literal temple while the 2300 days have to do with spiritual Israel in spiritual Jerusalem with a spiritual temple. Daniel's failure to comprehend this distinction led him to believe that the 2300 days applied to literal Israel, an idea he could not reconcile with Jeremiah's seventy year prophecy.

Succinctly, Daniel 8 refers to both pagan and papal Rome. Daniel 9 then picks up on the destruction of literal Jerusalem by pagan Rome and Daniel 10-12 take us further ahead to the destruction of spiritual Jerusalem by papal Rome. Perhaps this is the reason why Daniel 8 provides only one little horn to represent both imperial and papal Rome. Daniel 9 then explains the role of pagan Rome in the desolation of literal Israel while Daniel 10-12 expounds upon the role of papal Rome in the trampling of spiritual Israel.

After God gave Daniel the vision of chapter 8, Gabriel was commanded (the verb is imperative) to help Daniel understand (*bin*) it (8:16; see also 8:15-17, 23). Gabriel then undertook the task of explaining the meaning of the ram, the he-goat and the little horn (8:19-25). Yet at the end of chapter 8 we are informed that Daniel was *'astonished at the vision, but none understood (bin)'* (8:27). It becomes obvious that if Daniel did not understand the vision at the end of the

chapter, then Gabriel had not completed his commanded mission! We would therefore expect Gabriel to come back at some time to complete his mission. Did he come back?

In Daniel 9:2 we are told that Daniel understood (*bin*) that Jeremiah's prophecy was to be fulfilled at the end of the seventy years. But, as we have seen, there were many things which Daniel still did not understand. Therefore, in Daniel 9:22-23 we find Gabriel returning to speak with Daniel. He told Daniel that he had come to give him understanding (verse 22, *bin*) and then, in the imperative, he commands Daniel: 'understand (*bin*) the matter, and consider (*bin*) the vision (*mareh*).' The question which begs to be asked at this point is: 'Understand **which** vision?' To this point in Daniel 9 there has been no vision, only a prayer. This must mean that Gabriel returned to explain the vision of the previous chapter. Significantly, after Gabriel gave his added explanation in Daniel 9 we are told that Daniel 'understood (*bin*) the thing, and had understanding (*bin*) in the vision' (**Daniel 10:1**; *mareh*). Obviously, the further explanation of Daniel 9 cleared up many misconceptions which Daniel had entertained after the vision of Daniel 8.

Another clear link between the two chapters is Daniel's remark: '*Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.*' (**Daniel 9:21**). The expression '*whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning*' clearly echoes back to Daniel 8:16. It bears repeating that there was no new vision in Daniel 9 so Daniel must be referring to the vision given in Daniel 8. This is irrefutable evidence that the vision spoken of by Gabriel in Daniel 9 is the same as the one which had given in Daniel 8.

Even though the vision of Daniel 8 was given during the reign of Babylon (8:1), Daniel was already in Shusan, the capital of the Medo-Persian kingdom. It is noteworthy that God began the vision with Medo-Persia and not with Babylon! The prayer and explanation in Daniel 9 also occur within the time frame of the Medo-Persian kingdom (**Daniel 8:2, 20; 9:1**). Though Media will be dropped in chapters 10-12 and only Persia will be referred to, the fact still remains that all the visions and explanations of Daniel 8-12 are given within the time frame of the Medo-Persian kingdom. This would seem to indicate that all these chapters deal with the same subject matter.

A structural matter will also help us discern the relationship between the two chapters. A close look at the great chain prophecies of the book of Daniel reveals that each has a vision and its corresponding explanation, except for Daniel 11. Notice the following:

Daniel 2: Has a dream or vision and an auditory explanation

Daniel 7: Has a dream and an auditory explanation

Daniel 8: Has a vision and an auditory explanation

Daniel 9: Has only an auditory explanation

Daniel 10-12: Have only auditory explanations but no new vision

The fact that the last vision of Daniel is in chapter 8 (with the exception of the personal theophany of Jesus in chapter 10) would seem to indicate that the rest of the book is simply an

auditory explanation of this chapter. This means that there is no new material of substance given after Daniel 8. Chapters 9-12 simply explain and amplify the vision and audition already given in chapter 8. This would seem to prove that Daniel 8-12 is a book within a book, that is to say, the sealed book of Daniel 12:4.

Comments on Verse 23

In response to Daniel’s prayer (verses 3-19), Gabriel arrived to **further explain** the vision of Daniel 8. It is significant that he not only came to explain the *mareh* or audition, but also the *chazon* or vision. In other words, he began his explanation in Daniel 9 at the very same point where he had begun his explanation of Daniel 8, that is, with Persia. This he must do in order to indicate that the 2300 days would begin within the historical time frame of Persia. Gabriel said: *‘I am come to shew thee; for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand (bin) the matter; and consider (bin) the vision (chazon).’* Then Gabriel undertook the task of explaining the seventy weeks. To this we must now turn our attention.

Remarks on the Literary Structure of Daniel 9:24-27

The prophecy of the 70 weeks appears to be, in a literary sense, a disorganized mumbo jumbo. Yet a careful study of the literary structure reveals a beautiful symmetry. Notice in the following chart that the description alternates between the city and people on the one hand and Messiah the Prince on the other:

Introduction: ‘Going Forth of the Word’	
City and People	Messiah the Prince
‘Restore and build Jerusalem’	‘Messiah the Prince’
‘seven weeks’	‘sixty-two weeks’
‘the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times’	‘after the sixty two-weeks shall Messiah be cut off’
‘the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and the end thereof shall be with a flood’	‘He [the Prince] shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease’

Conclusion: *‘and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate’.*

The Accomplishments of the Seventy Weeks

According to Daniel 9:24 six major accomplishments would be completed within the Seventy Week period. Let's take a look at them.

- 1) **'Finish the transgression.'** The word 'transgression' here is the strongest word for sin in the Old Testament. It literally means 'rebellion' or 'revolt.' This was not rebellion in general terms. The use of the definite article indicates that this was a specific rebellion. In other words, the Seventy Weeks would bring an end to the revolt of the Jewish nation. As we shall see in our detailed study of the Seventy Weeks which follows, their rebellion against God could come to an end in one of two ways: **1)** They could receive the Messiah and thus bring their constant rebellion to an end, or, **2)** they could irrevocably revolt against the Messiah and thus bring the theocracy to an end. This prophecy clearly indicates that they would choose the second option.

- 2) **'To make an end of sins.'** Notice that we are not told that the seventy weeks would bring *sinning* to an end but rather *sins* to an end! Jesus made an end of sins by bearing them on the cross. Jesus, legally, took away the **sin** of the world (**John 1:29**). Hebrews 1:3 tells us that when Jesus '*had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.*' In Hebrews 9:28 we are told that '*Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. . .*' In Hebrews 9:26 we are unequivocally told that Jesus, '*once in the end of the world hath appeared to **put away sin** by the sacrifice of Himself.*' And in Hebrews 10:12 we are told that '*this man, [Jesus] after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God.*'

- 3) **'To make reconciliation for iniquity.'** Jesus reconciled man to God by His sacrifice. In the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah 53 we are told that the Messiah would bring peace through His work: '*But He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our **peace** was upon him: and with his stripes we are healed.*' In Romans 5:10 we are told why man needed peace: '*For if, when we were enemies, we were **reconciled** to God by the death of his Son, much more, being **reconciled**, we shall be saved by his life.*' In II Corinthians 5:18-21 the apostle Paul amplifies the idea of reconciliation through Christ: '*To wit, that God was in Christ, **reconciling** the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. . . . For he [the Father] hath made him [Jesus] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*'

- 4) **'To bring in everlasting righteousness.'** In Jeremiah 23:6 we are told that one of the names of Jesus is, '*The Lord our Righteousness.*' And in the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah

53:11 we are told: *'by his knowledge shall my **righteous** servant **justify** many; for he shall bear their iniquities.'* This thought is developed in the New Testament on repeated occasions. For example, in Romans 3 and 4 the apostle Paul fully expounds this idea of Christ our righteousness. By living a sinless life, Jesus wove a perfect robe of His righteousness which He is willing to impute to all who believe. This righteousness is available right now in Jesus. When we receive Jesus we have His life now (**I John 5:11-12**), we are citizens of heaven (**Philippians 3:20**), we are accepted in the beloved and seated in heaven with Him (**Ephesians 1:6; 2:6**). Of course, there is an **already** and a **not yet**. We can have his imputed and imparted righteousness even now but to live in a world where only righteousness dwells empirically is still future: *'Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.'* (**II Peter 3:13**).

- 5) ***'To seal up the vision and prophecy.'*** At this point we will not say much about this phrase because we will deal with it extensively later. Suffice it to say now, that by rejecting the Messiah, the Jewish nation brought the vision and prophecy of the 70 weeks to an end. God would no longer communicate with Israel through prophets and visions. When they stoned Stephen, as he was having a vision of Christ and was fulfilling his role as a prophet, God's communications to Israel came to a final end. That is to say, Stephen received the last vision and was the last prophet which God sent to Israel.
- 6) ***'To anoint the most holy.'*** The phrase literally reads: *'to anoint the holy of holies.'* This phrase can be understood in one of two ways: 1) the 'most Holy' is a reference to the Messiah as a person (see **Hebrews 7:26**), or, 2) the 'most Holy' refers to the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary. How must we understand this anointing of the most holy?

When the Old Testament tabernacle services were inaugurated the **high priest**, as well as the **sanctuary** in its totality, (including the most holy place) were anointed. In harmony with the type, when Jesus ascended to heaven to begin His heavenly ministry, the entire heavenly sanctuary was anointed as well (including the most holy place).

But not only was the sanctuary anointed. Jesus was also anointed as priest/king to begin His work in the holy place (**Acts 2:32-36** in the light of the background given in **Leviticus 8:1-12**)

Ellen White makes this enlightening statement:

*“Christ’s ascension to heaven was the signal that His followers were to receive the promised blessing. For this they were to wait before they entered upon their work. When Christ passed within the heavenly gates, He was enthroned amidst the adoration of the angels. As soon as this ceremony was completed, the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples in rich currents, and Christ was indeed glorified, even with the glory which He had with the Father from all eternity. The Pentecostal outpouring was Heaven’s communication that the Redeemer’s inauguration was accomplished. According to His promise He had sent the Holy Spirit from heaven to His followers, as a token that He had, as Priest and King, received all authority in heaven and on earth, and was the **Anointed One** over His people.” **God’s Amazing Grace**, p. 193*

We must conclude, therefore, that the anointing of the most holy must refer to Jesus as a person as well as to the most holy place of the sanctuary. This means that the seventy week prophecy refers to all the highlights of Jesus’ mission—His baptism, death, resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God to begin His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

‘From the Going Forth of the Word’

We find the following words at the beginning of Gabriel’s explanation of the seventy weeks:

‘ . . . from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem. . . ’ (Daniel 9:25) There are two issues we wish to settle as we study the meaning of this expression: 1) How should ‘word’ (*dabar*) be translated, and, 2) When was this ‘word’ given?

Regarding the first issue, the word *dabar* is very common in the Old Testament. Its usual and proper translation is ‘word’. But is this the best translation in the context of Daniel 9? There are several instances in the Old Testament where *dabar* should be translated in the sense of a royal ‘decree’ or ‘command’. For instance, in Isaiah 45:23 the word *dabar* is used in conjunction with an oath. A word with an oath takes on the form of a royal decree. In Esther 1:19 the word is used in the sense of a royal commandment to be incorporated into the law code of the Medes and Persians to the effect that Vashti would never again appear before the king. In Ezra 7:13 Artaxerxes Longanimus gives a royal decree (*dabar*) which authorizes the Jews to return to Jerusalem. These two references in Esther and Ezra are particularly significant because, as we shall see, they are found in sources which are directly related to the historical context of Daniel 9.

Besides Daniel 9:25, the word *dabar* also appears two verses earlier in 9:23. There, Gabriel is given a command (*dabar*) by God to explain the 70 weeks to Daniel. Thus, in Daniel 9:25 we have a horizontal royal command (Artaxerxes to the Jews) and in Daniel 9:23 we have a vertical command or decree (God to Gabriel).

The formula 'from. . . unto' in verse 25 also proves that the 70 weeks' time period is not merely some general, unspecific time period. This formula clearly indicates that the 70 weeks have a specific, discernible, starting and ending point.

Four Possible Decrees

Four dates have been suggested as the fulfillment of the decree to restore and build Jerusalem. At this point make reference to the chart at the end of the notes on Daniel 9.

- 1) The decree of Cyrus the Great in 536 BC:** This cannot be the date for the beginning of the 70 weeks for two reasons:

First of all, a beginning date of 536 BC makes it impossible for the 70 weeks to be fulfilled in the Messiah. Four hundred and eighty three years after 536 B. C., would take us to the year 53 B. C., a date far too early for the coming of the Messiah.

Secondly, both Ezra 1:2-4 and II Chronicles 36:23 make it crystal clear that Cyrus' decree did not authorize the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem. It only gave permission to rebuild the temple. How then do we explain Isaiah 44:28 and 45:13? Don't these texts say that Cyrus would give a decree to rebuild the city? These verses in Isaiah are to be understood as Cyrus beginning the process which would **ultimately** lead to the rebuilding of the city. They are not to be taken to mean that he would give a command to rebuild the city.

Both Ezra and II Chronicles give us the actual decree and nothing is said there about the rebuilding of the city. Finally, for the sake of argument, even if Cyrus had given a decree to rebuild the city (which he clearly did not) this would still not fulfill the specifications of the prophecy of Daniel 9:25. This prophecy requires a decree not only to **rebuild** Jerusalem but also to **restore** it. As we shall see later, restoring and building are two separate, though related, ideas.

- 2) The Confirmatory Decree of Darius I (Darius the Persian) in 520:** This decree does not fulfill the specifications of Daniel 9:25 either.

The extant Biblical evidence indicates that when Cyrus gave his decree, many of God's people returned to Jerusalem with great enthusiasm to rebuild the temple (**Ezra 2**). The foundation of the temple was quickly laid but then Samaritan opposition halted the work. As a result of this Samaritan opposition (**Ezra 4:1-5**), the people ceased building the temple and focused on their own personal affairs. This sad condition is described in Haggai 1:1-11. For over 15 years the temple remained with only the foundation laid. But

then, in 520, Darius I reaffirmed the decree which had been given in 536 by Cyrus (**Ezra 6:1-13**). Even a cursory reading of this decree reveals that it was simply a reconfirmation of the decree which had been given previously by Cyrus. It gave only permission to rebuild the temple, not the city.

This decree led Zerubbabel, Joshua, Zechariah and Haggai to encourage the people to awaken from their slumber and continue the work of rebuilding the temple. The book of Haggai describes the renewed enthusiasm of the people. As a result of Darius' decree and the leadership of Zerubbabel, Joshua, Zechariah and Haggai, the temple was finished in only five years (**Nehemiah 6:15**)!

3) The Decree of Artaxerxes I in 457:

The Biblical evidence indicates that this is the only decree which fulfills the specifications of Daniel 9:25. As we have already seen, neither of the previous two decrees gave permission for the Jews to rebuild and restore the city. On the other hand, this decree of Artaxerxes says nothing about the actual rebuilding of the temple. It only states that Artaxerxes gave gifts for the temple which had already been rebuilt! The book of Ezra leaves no doubt that this was the third decree given by Persian kings (**Ezra 6:14-15**). We have noted previously that the first two do not meet the specifications of Daniel 9:25 so we must take a closer look at this third decree which is found in Ezra 7:11-26 (see also, **Prophets and Kings**, p. 610)

But before we scrutinize the decree as such, it would be well to underline that Artaxerxes' decree was given in the year 457 B. C. This date can be derived from Ezra 7:7-8 where we are told that the decree was given in the fall of the seventh year of Artaxerxes. The year 457 B. C., as the seventh year of king Artaxerxes, is one of the most firmly rooted dates in ancient history. The work of Siegfried Horn and Kenneth Wood, **The Chronology of Ezra 7**, is definitive in settling the reliability of this date.

Regarding this date, Old Testament scholar Angel Manuel Rodriguez states:

“The seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes (457 B.C.) is a well-established date in ancient history. According to Greek sources, Xerxes, the father of Artaxerxes, died during the last part of 465 B.C. An Egyptian astronomical texts suggests that he died between December and the Persian new year in the spring. Babylonian astronomical texts and papyrus documents found in the island of Elephantine, in Egypt, confirm the fact that Artaxerxes ascended to the throne in 465 B.C. That was his accession year; his first full year as king began in the spring of 464 B. C., when the new year started. Artaxerxes' seventh year would then be 457 B.C.

*Some have suggested that during the postexilic period the Jews used a spring-to-spring calendar and that, consequently, the seventh year of the king would be 458 B.C. The biblical evidence points to the opposite conclusion. Studies made in the Chronology of the kings of Judah indicate that the civil calendar used in Jerusalem ran from fall to fall. This was also the case during the exilic period (**Ezekiel. 1:2; 8:1; 40:1**), and during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (**Nehemiah 1:1; 2:1**). Ezra's calendar was a fall-to-fall one, making the seventh year of Artaxerxes 457 B.C." Angel Manuel Rodriguez, "The Sanctuary and its Cleansing," **Supplement to the Adventist Review**, September, 1994.*

Now let's make a few remarks about the decree. It will be noticed that Daniel 9:25 requires a decree to both **restore** and **build** Jerusalem. Nothing short of this can fulfill the specifications of the prophecy. As we shall see below, **restore** and **build**, though related, do not mean the same thing. We shall find that 'build' refers to the actual physical construction of the city, while 'restore' is a reference to the reestablishment of the governance of the city according to the specifications of the Hebrew theocracy. It is clear that the decree of Artaxerxes gave Ezra the right to reestablish the theocratic governance of Israel by appointing magistrates and judges to judge the people according to the law of God (**Ezra 7:25**). It also gave the judges and magistrates the right to punish violations or did it give permission to build the city?

In Ezra 4:7-23 (the passage, for some unexplainable reason, was inserted at this point in the book of Ezra though it is out of chronological order with what comes before and after) we are told that in the **early reign** of Artaxerxes, the returned exiles were in the process of rebuilding the city, when their enemies—Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel and the rest of their Samaritan companions—sent a letter to King Artaxerxes complaining that the Jews were *'building the rebellious and the bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations.'* (**Ezra 4:12**). They then requested that the king put a halt to the endeavor for his own good (**Ezra 4:13-16**). As a result, Artaxerxes sent a letter to the enemies of the Jews commanding them to compel the Jews to halt their work (**Ezra 4:18-23**). This they did, *pronto!* (**Ezra 4:23**). But notice that Artaxerxes left the door open because he said: *'cause these men to cease, and that this city shall not be builded, until another commandment shall be given from me.'* (**Ezra 4:21**). Though the word 'another' is not part of the Hebrew text, it is interesting the KJV translators believed that a decree had already been given once before by Artaxerxes authorizing the city to be rebuilt!

It is highly unlikely that the Jews would have begun building the city without permission from the king. I believe that the scenario is as follows: The decree of 457 B. C., was the original decree given by Artaxerxes authorizing the rebuilding of the city by the Jews. But after he gave this decree, the enemies of the Jews, alarmed by the idea that the Jews would soon function as a theocracy again, sent a slanderous letter to the king and this letter led him to suspend the decree he had given until the matter could be further reviewed. The building project was suspended and remained so until several years later. In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes we find that Jerusalem was still in ruins. In fact, Nehemiah describes the situation to king Artaxerxes: '*. . . the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire. . .*' (**Nehemiah 2:3**). The significant point here is that the city was still in ruins in 445 B. C. even though Artaxerxes had given the decree to build and restore the city in 457 B. C. And why was it still in ruins? The best explanation is that Artaxerxes had suspended his first decree because of the slanderous accusations of the Samaritans.

We shall have much more to say about this decree when we analyze the meaning of the word 'street' and 'wall' in Daniel 9:25. But now let's turn to the fourth 'decree.'

- 4) **Permission Given to Nehemiah to Rebuild the City and Walls in 445:** Why have I put the word decree in quotation marks? Simply because this was not a decree at all. It simply gave Nehemiah **personal permission** to go to Jerusalem and to lead out in the task of rebuilding the city and the walls. This was not a new decree, but rather a reinstatement of the suspended decree which was given in 457 B. C.

In Nehemiah 2-6 we find the fascinating story of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. The narration begins with Nehemiah downcast because the city of Jerusalem '*lies waste and the gates are burned with fire*' (**Nehemiah 2:3**). When Artaxerxes sees Nehemiah's grief he asks why he is so downcast. Nehemiah explains that it is because of the condition of his beloved city. The king then says to Nehemiah: '*For what dost thou make request?*' (**Nehemiah 2:4**). This was the moment Nehemiah had been waiting for. He said to the king: '*. . . send me unto Judah, unto **the city** of my fathers' sepulchres, that I may **build it.***' (**Nehemiah 2:5**). In response, the king gave Nehemiah letters of permission to return to Jerusalem to undertake the task of rebuilding and provided an escort (**Nehemiah 2:7-9**).

Chapters 2-6 describe the rebuilding of the walls and the gate in the midst of tremendous opposition from Sanballat, Tobias and Geshem. These men and their sympathizers used every stratagem in their arsenal to try and impede the work of rebuilding, but their every plot was disarmed. The result was extraordinary the wall and

gates were finished in only 52 days (**Nehemiah 6:15**; for more on this period of trial, read ***Prophets and Kings***, pp. 609, 628-29, 635-680).

But what took place after the rebuilding was finished is as important as the building itself. When the construction was finished, genealogical records were set straight (chapter 7), the book of the law was read at the feast of booths—the captivity had ended and they now dwelt in their own land (chapter 8), the history of Israel was reviewed and the covenant renewed (chapter 9, especially verse 38), the covenant ritual was restored (chapter 10), the land was restored to those who had returned (chapter 11), and various violations of the book of the law were corrected (chapter 13). All of these actions in Nehemiah 7-13 constitute a restoration of the Hebrew theocracy in harmony with the laws of God.

No doubt there were still many things which needed to be corrected (the book of Malachi describes some of these) and no doubt the enemies of Israel continued to offer opposition. But by the year 408, the city had been fully rebuilt and the theocracy's civil and religious system was in full force. The forty nine years between the giving of Artaxerxes' decree and the completion of the building and restoring of Jerusalem were certainly turbulent and troublous times.

One further point needs to be made. The permission given by Artaxerxes to Nehemiah cannot fulfill the decree of Daniel 9:25 for chronological reasons. As we shall see, the 'anointed one' was to come 483 years after the decree was given. If we begin the 483 years in 445 B. C., the Messiah would have to have been baptized in 37 A. D. No scholar that I know of ever suggests that Jesus began his public ministry in 37 A. D. This would mean that Jesus was crucified in the year 41 A. D. and Stephen was stoned in the year 44. This simply does not fit the historical data.

In conclusion, we have seen that there were four 'decrees' relating to the return of the Jews after the exile. Two of these decrees were 'original' and the other two were simply 'confirmatory.' Notice:

- 536:** **Original** decree of Cyrus to rebuild the temple—suspended by Cambyses in 522
- 520:** Decree of Darius I **Confirmed** Cyrus' decree and revoked Cambyses' suspension.
- 457:** **Original** Decree of Artaxerxes I to restore and build Jerusalem—suspended by Artaxerxes himself early in his reign when the Samaritans complained.
- 445:** 'Decree' of Artaxerxes I—revoked the previous suspension and **confirmed** his original decree to Nehemiah.

‘To Restore and Build Jerusalem’

Many have overlooked the fact that in order for Daniel 9:25 to be fulfilled, a decree must be given to both **restore** and **build** Jerusalem, in that order. Some commentators have simply assumed that both of these words mean basically the same thing. But is this the case?

In order to understand what it means to restore and build Jerusalem we must first comprehend what ‘Jerusalem’ means. Frequently, when the Bible speaks of ‘Jerusalem’ it is not merely referring to the physical city but rather to the city as a *polis*, that is, as a living social, religious and political entity composed of people, commerce, rulers, magistrates, judges and civil and religious laws. In order for the city to function as a *polis* it must have self-governance as well as legal sovereignty over the land.

The captivity of Jerusalem involved far more than the destruction of the physical city. In fact, Jerusalem lost its governance before the city was destroyed. In Daniel 1:1-3 we are told that Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem in 605 and besieged it. He took king Jehoiakim captive as well as the royal seed and the princes. Thus Jerusalem lost her political autonomy or right to self-governance. She became subservient to Babylon. Even though the physical city of Jerusalem was not destroyed at this time, the seventy year captivity of Jerusalem did begin.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the captivity of Jerusalem began 19 years before the physical city was actually destroyed! Of course we know that in 586, the city itself was finally destroyed (**II Chronicles 36:17-20**). At that time the land was laid waste, the religious cultus came to an end, and the remaining political and military leaders were removed. Now Jerusalem had a double whammy: She had lost her political/religious autonomy and the physical city was in ruins. This two-fold idea is expressed clearly in Jeremiah 25:11 where we are told that the whole **land** was to be a desolation and astonishment and the nations [including Israel] would **serve** the king of Babylon for 70 years. II Kings 24 describes the actual destruction of the city and the temple. We are told in II Kings 24:14-15:

*“And he [Nebuchadnezzar] **carried away all Jerusalem**, and all the **princes**, and all the **mighty men of valor**, even ten thousand captives, and all the **craftsmen and smiths**: none remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land. And he carried away **Jehoiachin** to Babylon. . . .”*

Obviously, Nebuchadnezzar did not carry away the physical city of Jerusalem. ‘Jerusalem’ here refers to a socio/political entity composed of king, officers, military men and craftsmen (in actual fact, Daniel himself attributes the loss of self-governance and the destruction of the city to the apostasy of the kings, princes, fathers and judges [**Daniel 9:6, 8, 12**])

Now, in order for Jerusalem to be reestablished in her previous position after the captivity, two things must happen: Her political/religious self-determination must be **restored** and the physical city must be **built**. These two tasks, though related, are not identical. The word ‘build’ refers to the reconstruction of the physical city. But what does the word ‘restore’ mean? The word ‘restore’ means ‘to give back to’ or ‘to return to a condition which existed before.’

In Judges 11:13 the king of the children of Ammon complains to Jephthah: 'Israel **took away** my land, when they came out of Egypt.' He then makes the appeal: 'now therefore **restore** those lands again peaceably.' In II Samuel 9:7, David promised Mephibosheth: 'I will **restore** thee all the land of Saul thy father.' In both of these texts the emphasis falls on legally giving back land to an original owner.

In 2 Kings 14:22 we have the same two words which appear in Daniel 9:25. There we are told that Azariah '**built** Elath and **restored** it to Judah.' This text makes it clear that 'build' and 'restore,' though related, are not identical. What the text means is that the physical city of Elath was built and then governance over it was given to Judah.

In I Kings 12:21 we are told that Rehoboam came to Jerusalem and laid plans to '*fight against the house of Israel, to bring the kingdom again [literally, to **restore** the kingdom] to Rehoboam the son of Solomon.*' In II Samuel 8:3 we are informed that David went on a military campaign to '*recover [**restore**] his border at the river Euphrates.*'

None of the examples presented above have to do with the physical rebuilding of a city. The central idea is to legally restore land, to legally restore political governance or to restore the legitimate borders of the kingdom. We therefore must conclude that 'restore' in Daniel 9:25 does not have to do so much with the physical rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem as such, but rather with the legal restoration of the land to its original owner and a giving back of the right to political self-governance according to the laws of God. The actual building of the city then follows. As we have previously seen, only the decree of Artaxerxes meets the criteria necessary to fulfill Daniel 9:25. Only the decree of Artaxerxes officially authorized the restoration of the Hebrew civil order and the right of Israel to govern herself according to the law of God (see, **Ezra 7:25-26**; also **Nehemiah 8-13**). And only the decree of Artaxerxes authorized the physical rebuilding of the city (review pages 9-11 above). Below we will provide further corroborating evidence for this.

'Unto the Messiah the Prince'

There is almost universal agreement among conservative Bible scholars that the Messiah the Prince in verse 25 is Jesus Christ. There are four issues we wish to address in this section: First, what is the meaning of the word 'Messiah'? **Second**, which event marked the anointing of Jesus? **Third**, in what season of the year was Jesus anointed? Finally, is the Prince of verse 26 the same person as the Messiah the Prince of verse 25??

- 1) The word 'messiah' is relatively common in the Old Testament. It means, 'to anoint' or 'to smear.' It is used, for example, to describe the act of anointing David (**I Samuel 16:13**) Significantly, David received the Holy Spirit at the same moment that he was anointed) and Aaron (**Exodus 29:7**), among others. The emphasis in Daniel 9:25, however, is not on the **act** of anointing but rather on the **person** who is anointed. The phrase can be translated 'unto the Anointed One, the Prince.'
- 2) An examination of the Biblical testimony clearly reveals that Jesus was anointed at the moment of His baptism. Let us examine the evidence from John's Gospel first. In John

1:19 we are informed that a group of Pharisees were sent to John with the purpose of asking him who he was. John was quick in his response: 'I am not the Christ.' It would be well to remember that the word 'Christ' in Greek (we still use the word 'christened' to refer to an anointing) means the same thing as the word 'Messiah' in Hebrew. In other words, John the Baptist was saying: 'I am not the Messiah.'

A little later in the chapter we are told that John baptized Jesus and introduced Him as the Lamb of God (**John 1:29**). At the moment of the baptism the Holy Spirit fell upon Jesus (**John 1:32-33**). And just a short while later, Andrew told his brother Simon Peter: '*We have found the **Messias**, which is, being interpreted, the **Christ**.'* (**John 1:41**). And the following day, Nathanael said to Jesus: '*thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.*' (**John 1:49**)

The gospel of Mark adds details which are not found in John. Mark 1:9-11 describes the baptism of Jesus. We are told that as He came up out of the water, the Holy Spirit fell upon Him. After being tempted of the devil, Jesus then began His public ministry in Galilee (**Mark 1:14**) with the words: '*The **time is fulfilled** and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel.*' (**Mark 1:15**; see also, **Galatians 4:4**). To which time prophecy was Jesus referring when He said, '*The **time is fulfilled?***' The only Old Testament prophecy which pinpoints the precise time for the beginning of Christ's ministry is the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

The same scenario is found in Luke. There we are told that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit at the moment of His baptism. Next He went to the wilderness to be tempted (**Luke 4:1-13**) Finally He returned to Galilee 'in the power of the Spirit' (**Luke 4:14**) to officially begin His public ministry. Significantly, he began His preaching in the synagogue of Nazareth with the words: '*The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He **hath anointed** me to preach the gospel. . .'* (**Luke 4:18**). In the light of Luke's testimony, can there be any doubt that Jesus was anointed by the Holy Spirit at His baptism?

In Acts 10:37, 38 we are distinctly told that Jesus was **anointed** with the Holy Spirit. As we have seen previously, the Holy Spirit fell upon Jesus at the moment of His baptism. Notice the words of Peter on the day of Pentecost:

*'That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; How God **anointed** Jesus of Nazareth **with the Holy Ghost** and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.'*

Furthermore, we are told in Daniel 9 that the seventy weeks were cut off specifically for the Jewish nation. This is the reason why Jesus told His disciples: '*Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*' (**Matthew 10:5-6**). Before the seventy weeks came to an end, the mission of Jesus as Messiah was confined to Israel.

- 3) As to the date of Messiah's anointing, Luke 3:1-2 provides many chronological clues:

"Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate [26—36 AD] being governor of Judaea, and Herod [Antipas: 4 BC—39 AD] being tetrarch in Galilee, and his brother Philip [4 BC—33/34 AD] tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias [dates not known] the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas [6-14 AD] and Caiphas being high priests, the Word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness."

The prophecy of the 70 weeks specifies that Messiah was to come 'seven weeks and threescore and two weeks' after the decree of Artaxerxes. Beginning in 457 BC and going forward 483 years we arrive at 27 AD as the date for the manifestation of the Messiah (remember that there is no year "0" so only one year transpires between 1 BC and 1 AD). We know that Christ was cut off or killed in the middle of the last week, at springtime (Passover). This must mean that Messiah was manifested to Israel three and a half years earlier, in the fall (incidentally, this also means that Artaxerxes' decree was given in the fall).

- 4) Notice that the Messiah is also called the Prince. No serious Bible scholar questions the fact that the Prince of verse 25 is the same person as the Messiah. This same person is called 'the Prince of the Host' in Daniel 8:11 (see **Joshua 5:13-15** for the only other occurrence of this title in the Old Testament), the 'Prince of the Covenant' in Daniel 11:22, and 'Michael that Great Prince' in Daniel 12:1. There can be no doubt that this title belongs to Jesus. In the great messianic prophecy of Isaiah 9:6 Jesus is called 'the Prince of Peace.' And Peter calls Jesus 'Prince' twice in the book of Acts (**Acts 3:15; 5:31**)

'Seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks'

Why does Gabriel refer to this period as 'seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks' when he could have simply said, 'sixty nine weeks'? In other words, why did he separate the seven weeks from the other sixty two weeks? As we look at the literary structure (see page 5) the answer becomes obvious. The seven weeks have to do with the city and people at the beginning of the seventy weeks, while the sixty two weeks take us to the time of Messiah the Prince at the end of the seventy weeks.

'The street shall be built again'

There are several issues we must address under this heading, among them: What is the meaning of 'street' and 'wall'? The differing translations of these words in our English versions suggests that they are not easy to translate. Among the renditions are:

New International Version: 'streets and trench'

Revised Standard Version: 'squares and moat'

New American Standard: 'plaza and moat'

New English Bible: 'streets and conduits'

Jerusalem Bible: 'squares and ramparts'

King James: 'street and wall'

Let's examine the meaning of the word 'street'. The question suggests itself: What would be so significant about the rebuilding of one street (in singular) in Jerusalem after the captivity? No doubt there were many streets in Jerusalem after the rebuilding was finished. Why does Gabriel refer to just one street being rebuilt in troublous times?

'and the wall, even in troublous times'

The simple fact is that the Hebrew word *rachab* literally means 'broaden, make room, broad expanse and broad roomy place.' The word simply means 'a broad, open space in a town or village.' The evidence from the Old Testament seems to indicate that it could just as well have been translated 'town square' or 'plaza.'

The first time this word is used in the Bible is Genesis 19:2. In this text, Lot invited two angels to lodge in his house for the night but one of the angels replied: *'Nay, but we will abide in **the street** all night.'* In Deuteronomy 13:16 Moses told the Israelites that when they conquered a city, they were to *'gather all the spoil of it into the midst of **the street** thereof'* and to *'burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof every whit. . .'* Here the town plaza would seem to fit far better than a particular street. In Esther 4:6 we are informed that the street of the city was in front of the king's gate and in Esther 6:9, 11 we are told that Mordecai was paraded through the street of the city on the king's horse and in royal apparel. Once again, the town square seems to be a more likely place for this to occur than on a singular street.

There are two references in 2 Chronicles which bear a direct relationship to our study. In 2 Chronicles 29:4 we are told that Hezekiah gathered the priests and Levites in the east street to give them special instructions. II Chronicles 32:6 explains that Hezekiah *'set captains of war over the people, and gathered them together to him in the street of the gate of the city.'* We see here military leaders gathering in the town square for a pep talk. Once again, in both of these texts from Chronicles, the town square is a more likely meeting place than the street.

But the two references which are of signal interest are found in Ezra and Nehemiah, the very books which describe the restoring and building of Jerusalem after the captivity. Ezra 10:9-10 describes a general assembly of the people of Jerusalem at the **street** to receive instructions on the danger of mixed marriages. It is inconceivable that everyone in the city was able to gather in one particular street. It is more likely that they gathered at the town square. In Nehemiah 8:1-3 we are told that as soon as the wall of the city was finished, the whole city gathered *'as one man into the street that was before the water gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the Law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel.'* Here in **the street**, the covenant between God and Israel was renewed. The theocracy was officially restored by the reading of the Book of the Covenant.

Having lived in Latin America, I can understand the critical importance of the town square or plaza. Even though modernization has diluted many traditions, small towns can still be found where official proclamations are made at the plaza or town square. It is there that city hall is found. The town cathedral is there. It is there that parades begin and end. It is there that people gather for social events and to hear civic announcements. In the past, even judicial decisions were reached there. In short, the city square is the center of public civil, social and religious life.

What Daniel 9:25 is telling us, then, is that the town square was rebuilt in order to facilitate the establishment of social, political and religious life. This is precisely what is contemplated in the command to 'restore' Jerusalem. By rebuilding the town square, God's people were able to use it once again for civil and religious governance.

What about the word 'wall'? As we have seen, this word is variously translated in modern versions as, 'wall,' 'trench,' 'moat,' 'rampart,' and 'conduit.' But is this what the word really means?

The Hebrew word *harus* literally means 'to cut,' 'to sharpen,' or 'to decide.' Except for Daniel 9:25 the word is never translated 'wall.' Why, then, is the word translated 'wall' in this solitary instance? It seems there are two reasons. First of all, the building of the wall by Nehemiah after the captivity seems to have influenced the translators. Secondly, the LXX translates the Hebrew *harus* with *teichos* which clearly means 'wall' in Greek. And Jerome's Latin Vulgate picked up on the Greek translation by rendering the word *muri* ('walls'). Notice that Jerome changed the Hebrew singular to a plural to better fit the work of Nehemiah.

Let's take a closer look at the meaning of the word in the Old Testament. In I Kings 20:40 king Ahab tells a certain prophet: 'So shall thy judgment be; thyself hast **decided** (*harus*) it.' Here the word *harus* is properly translated 'decided'. Significant is the fact that the concept of decision is coupled with the idea of judgment. In Job 14:5, the patriarch tells us how man's existence is under God's control: '*his days are **determined** (*harus*), the number of his months are with thee, thou hast **appointed** his bounds that he cannot pass.*' The idea here is that God **decides** how long man shall live. In Isaiah 10:22, 23 God promised Israel that a remnant of Israel would return after the captivity. This had been '**decreed**' (*harus*) or '**determined**' (*harus*) beforehand. In Isaiah 28:22 we are told that God had '**determined**' (*harus*) a consumption upon the whole earth. Again, God makes a decision before it is implemented. In Joel 3:14 we are told that the nations are gathered in the Valley of Jehoshaphat and there God will make His **decision** regarding them. The decision is clearly linked with the idea of judgment (**Joel 3:9-13**).

Significantly, the word *harus* is used in two other places in Daniel 9, and in both the basic idea is that of an execution of a judgment which had previously been decreed or decided by God. In verse 26 we are told that the desolations of Jerusalem had previously been **determined**, a thought which is repeated in verse 27. The key question is: Why is *harus* translated 'wall' in verse 25 while it is translated 'determined' in verses 26 and 27? Would it not be more

consistent to translate it 'decision' in all three instances? In short: Why is the word *harus* translated 'wall' only in this one instance?

The simple answer to this question is that the word 'decision' does not seem to fit in verse 25. What sense can be made out of a translation which reads: 'the **decision** shall be built again?' How can a decision be built again? In order to answer this question, we must ask another: What does the town square have to do with the making of decisions? That is to say, if the expression 'the street shall be built again, and the wall' should be translated 'the square shall be built again and the decision,' how does the building of the **square** relate to the ability to make **decisions**? The answer to this question is found in the fact that the **city gate** which led to the **square** was the place where judicial, military, civic and religious **decisions** were made. In order for decisions to be made at the gate of the square, the square had to be rebuilt. Let's notice several texts on the importance of the gate of the square.

The book of Lamentations describes the aftermath of Jerusalem's destruction by Nebuchadnezzar. One of the results was that the elders had '**ceased from the gate**,' where they were accustomed to meet to counsel the people and to render judicial decisions (**Lamentations 5:14**). We know that in antiquity every city had a council of elders whose task was to hear cases which were brought before them at the gate of the town square. We find an example of this in Jeremiah 26:8-24 where we are told that the trial of Jeremiah took place 'in the **entry of the new gate** of the Lord's house' where the princes of Judah had gathered to render their decision (verse 10).

In II Samuel 15:1-3 we are told the fascinating story of how Absalom, David's son, '*rose up early, and stood beside **the way of the gate**; and it was so, that when any man that had a controversy came to the king for judgment, then Absalom called unto him, and said: 'Of what city art thou,' and he said: 'Thy servant is of one of the tribes of Israel.'*' And Absalom said unto him: '*See, thy matters are good and right; but there is no man deputed of the king to hear thee.*'" (Verses 2-3) Significant here is the fact that Absalom usurped the king's position **at the gate** to render judicial decisions.

In the days of Amos, we are told that the judges had become so corrupt that they had turned '*judgment to wormwood*' and left '*off righteousness in the earth.*' (**Amos 5:7**). This total lack of justice was reflected in the fact that the judges afflicted the just and took bribes and turned '*aside the poor **in the gate** from their right*' (**Amos 5:12**). Once again we find that justice was to be dispensed **at the gate**.

As we have already noted, immediately after the wall was finished in the days of Nehemiah, the people '*gathered themselves together as one man into the **street** [city square?] that was before the water **gate***' (**Nehemiah 8:13**). There Nehemiah renewed the Covenant and the theocracy was restored. Among other things, the Book of the Law was read, the benevolent acts of God were recited, the Feast of Tabernacles was kept, the Levitical priesthood was reorganized, and the laws of marriage, tithing and Sabbath observance were renewed. Even a cursory reading of Nehemiah 8-13 reveals that Israel was reestablishing self-governance according to the laws of God at the water gate in the street [city square].

Let us summarize, then, the meaning of Daniel 9:25:

- 1) The decree in this verse must meet two specifications: It must be a decree to **restore** and **build** Jerusalem. While the restoration refers primarily to the reestablishment of self-governance in harmony with the laws of the theocracy, the building has to do with the actual reconstruction of the physical city: Its walls, its gates, its city square, etc.
- 2) The physical rebuilding of the **city square** (*rachab*) is of prime importance because there judicial, religious, civic and military **decisions** will be made in the reestablished theocracy. This is the reason why the square (*rachab*) and decision making (*harus*) are paired together in Daniel 9:25.
- 3) Because the KJV translators mistranslated the word *rachab* (as 'street'), they also mistranslated the word *harus* (as 'wall'). Once we realize that *rachab* means the 'city square' and *harus* means 'the ability to make decisions,' the sense of Daniel 9:25 becomes crystal clear!
- 4) Especially significant is the fact that Artaxerxes' decree of 457 B. C. gave Israel the right to appoint judges and magistrates and to decide cases which were brought to them in harmony with the laws of God (see, **Ezra 7:25-26**).
- 5) The 'troublous times' were due to the fact that the Samaritans and other people of the land did not want Israel to rebuild the city and reestablish self-governance. They did all in their power to prevent the rebuilding and restoration, even to the point of accusing Israel of sedition against the Persian government. The period between 457 and 408 B.C. can certainly be described as 'troublous times.'

'after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself'

All the events we have described in the previous section take place within the time frame of the first 7 weeks (49 years). But then, 62 weeks (434 years) later, the Messiah was to be cut off. What is meant by the 'cutting off' of the Messiah? And for whom was he cut off? The clearest answer to these questions is found in the parallel messianic prophecy of Isaiah 53. There are several parallel terms in Daniel 9 and Isaiah 53 among which are the following:

- Transgression (**Daniel 9:24; Isaiah 53:5, 8**)
- Sin (**Daniel 9:5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 24; Isaiah 53:12**)
- Iniquity (**Daniel 9:24; Isaiah 53:5, 6**)
- People (**Daniel 9:6, 24, 26; Isaiah 53:8**)
- Righteousness (**Daniel 9:7, 14, 18, 24; Isaiah 53:11**)
- Cut off (**Daniel 9:26; Isaiah 53:8**)

More specifically, let's notice verse 8: *'He [the suffering servant] was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was **cut off** [notice that in Daniel and Isaiah the verb is passive which means that someone else cut him off] out of the land of the*

living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.' It is clear here that the expression 'cut off' means killed. And the prophecy makes it clear that he did this for his people and not for himself. This second fact is underlined in several other verses of Isaiah 53 as well: *'he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,' 'he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed,' 'the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,' 'he shall bear their iniquities,' 'he was numbered with transgressors and he bare the sin of many'* (verses 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12). Isaiah 53 makes it crystal clear that the Messiah would be **killed** and that his death would be **vicarious**.

'And the people of the prince that shall come'

Who is this 'prince who is to come' and who are his people? There seem to be three main views: **1)** The people are the Romans and the prince is Titus; **2)** The prince is the future Antichrist and the people will be his wicked followers; **3)** The people are the Jews and the prince is Jesus Christ. Which of these views is correct?

We will concern ourselves here only with options one and three because, as we shall see, when we understand these, the second option takes care of itself. Historicists in general and Seventh-day Adventists in particular, have traditionally taught that the prince was Titus and the people of the prince were the Romans who attacked and destroyed Jerusalem in the year 70 A. D. Though this view is tempting, it does not really fit the literary structure of Daniel 9:24-27. Notice the following structural consideration:

Messiah (verse 25)	Prince
+	+
Messiah (verse 26)	Prince

There is no reason to believe that the Messiah the Prince of verse 25 is not the same Messiah and Prince of verse 26. In fact, the reference to Messiah and Prince in verse 26 provides a literary balance with the reference to Messiah the Prince in verse 25.

Another problem with the view that the prince is Titus and the people are the Romans is the fact that it is incongruous with the three personal pronouns in verse 27. In verse 27 we are told: *'And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate. . .'* The context clearly indicates that the three 'he's of verse 27 refer to the same person as the 'he' of verse 26. In other words the prince of the people of verse 26 is the same person who confirms the covenant for one week causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease and makes the city and sanctuary desolate.

It is true that Titus literally caused the sacrificial system to come to an end when he and his armies destroyed the Jerusalem temple. But it is not true that Titus made a strong covenant with Israel for one week. Seventh-day Adventists have traditionally believed that it was Jesus

who brought the sacrificial system to an end when he died on the cross (as we shall see later, this view is corroborated by **Matthew 27:51** as well as the book of Hebrews). Seventh-day Adventists have also believed that Jesus confirmed the covenant with Israel for one week, that is, during the last of the seventy weeks. It is clear that the antecedent to all three ‘he’s’ in verse 27 is the prince of verse 26. Let us put it this way: *‘the people of the **prince** that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary . . . and **he** [the prince] shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week **he** [the prince] shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and for the overspreading of abominations **he** [the prince] shall make desolate. . . .’*

Of course, if the prince of verse 26 is Jesus, then the **people** of the prince must be the Jews (remember that the word ‘people’ throughout Daniel 9 always denotes Israel—see verses 15, 16, 19, 20, 24). The ten thousand dollar question then becomes: Did the Jews destroy their own city and sanctuary? At first sight this possibility would seem absurd. The Jews did not destroy their own city and sanctuary (Titus and the Romans did!!), or did they? In order to answer this question we must take a look at the reason for the first destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

Who destroyed Jerusalem the first time? Was it **God** or **Nebuchadnezzar** or **Israel**? Daniel 9:14 explicitly states that **God** destroyed Jerusalem. II Chronicles 36:17-20 states that **Nebuchadnezzar** (whom God calls ‘my servant’ in **Jeremiah 27:6**) destroyed the city and the temple. But **Daniel 9:11, 14, 15** explains that **Israel’s sins** brought about the destruction of the city and the temple. In fact, the prophet Jeremiah told Israel: If you do not submit to the king of Babylon *‘**thou shalt cause this city to be burned with fire.**’* (**Jeremiah 38:23**; notice also verses 17-18). We can put it this way: Because of Israel’s sins, God employed His servant Nebuchadnezzar to destroy the city and the temple. But God would not have used Nebuchadnezzar to destroy had it not been for the sins of the people. In other words, Israel, because of her own sinful choices, brought destruction upon herself. Now let’s take a look at the second destruction of Jerusalem.

One thing becomes absolutely clear in Daniel 9 and it is this: The destiny of Jerusalem is inseparably linked with what happened to Messiah the Prince. Twice in the literary structure what happened to the Messiah is followed by the destruction of Jerusalem. In verse 26, after Messiah was cut off, Jerusalem was destroyed. And in verse 27, Jerusalem was destroyed after the Prince caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease! The critical question at this juncture is, does the New Testament shed any light on how the destiny of the Messiah is linked to the fate of the second city and temple? The answer is a resounding yes!

On the Sunday before the crucifixion, Jesus entered Jerusalem triumphantly on a donkey. At the conclusion of this majestic event, Jesus entered the temple and cast out the money changers. At this point the temple was referred to by Matthew as the ‘temple of God’ and Jesus called it ‘My house’ (**Matthew 21:12-13**). Jesus then told a series of parables in which He underlined that the Jewish nation was about to make the terrible mistake of rejecting him (see, for example, **Matthew 21:33-45; 22:1-14; 23:29-39**).

Of particular significance is the parable of Matthew 21:33-44 where Jesus reviewed the history of Israel in five stages:

- **Stage #1:** God sent servants to Israel to gather fruit in harvest season but Israel rejected God's messengers (verses 34-35).
- **Stage #2:** God then sent more servants and Israel did the same with them (verse 36).
- **Stage #3:** God then sent them His own Son and they killed Him (verses 37-39).
- **Stage #4:** The wicked men who killed the Son were destroyed (verse 41).
- **Stage #5:** The kingdom was taken from Israel and given to the Gentiles (verse 43; Acts 13:46-47).

These five stages of Israel's history as described in Matthew 21:33-44 parallel very closely the same stages of Israel's history as described in Daniel 9:

Stage #1:

After God released Israel from Egypt, he sent them messengers but they mocked and rejected them (**Daniel 9:6; II Chronicles 36:15, 16**)

Stage #2:

After the Babylonian captivity God gave Israel another chance. The city and temple were rebuilt and God gave Israel another opportunity to bear fruit (**Daniel 9:24**). In order to help, God sent Israel many messengers: Haggai, Zechariah, Zerubbabel, Joshua, Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi, John the Baptist, etc. But they rejected these messengers as well.

Stage #3:

At the very end of the seventy weeks, God even sent Messiah the Prince; but instead of receiving Him, they cut Him off (**Daniel 9:26**).

Stage #4:

As a result Jerusalem was destroyed by the Roman armies (**Daniel 9:26-27**).

Stage #5:

The Gentiles now became God's new nation (this is implicit in the fact that probation was to last only 70 weeks for the Jewish nation. We shall also find that when Stephen was stoned, the theocracy came to an end and the gospel went to the Gentiles).

The striking parallel between Daniel 9:26-27 and Matthew 21:33-44 clearly reveals that the rejection of the Son by Israel resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem and the grafting in of the Gentiles as God's chosen nation. When Jesus left the temple He pronounced the ominous words: *'Behold, **your** house is left unto you **desolate**'* (**Matthew 23:38**). Two words immediately arrest our attention. First of all, the temple was no longer the 'temple of **God**.' Jesus now referred to it as '**your** house.' Secondly, notice the key word, 'desolate.' This is the very word which is used in Daniel 9 to describe the fate of Jerusalem. Three times we are told there that Jerusalem would be left desolate (verses 26, 27). Significantly, as soon as Jesus pronounced these chilling words, He left the temple and spoke about the destruction of the city and the temple (**Matthew 24:1-3**). Certainly no one can miss the connection between the rejection of

the Messiah and the destruction of Jerusalem! Only a willful and unexplainable blindness could fail to see how the rejection of Messiah the Prince led to the destruction of the city and temple!!

This link can also be discerned in Luke 19:41-44: *'And when he was come near, he beheld the city and wept over it, saying: 'If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in **this thy day**, the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that **thine enemies** shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; **because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation.**'* Can there be any doubt in this passage that the fate of Jerusalem is linked with the rejection of the Messiah? (For further information on the role the Jews played in the death of the Messiah, see, **Acts 3:14, 15; 7:52; Acts 2:22, 23**).

To end this section, I would like to make a few remarks about the parable of Matthew 22 because it explains why Jerusalem was destroyed the second time. Like in the parable of Matthew 21:33-46 God sent servants to Israel in order to prepare them for the marriage of his son (verses 2-3). This stage represents the Old Testament period when God sent prophets to prepare Israel for the coming of the Messiah. These messages were rejected. Then, after Christ was sacrificed (verse 4), further servants (Peter, Stephen, Paul, etc.) were sent to the same people (Israel) but these messages were also rejected (verses 5-6). In verse 7 we are told the king's reaction: *'But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth; and he sent forth **his** armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up **their** city.'* Notice how three ideas coalesce in this verse. **God** used the **Roman armies** (spoken of as his armies) to destroy **those** murderers and to burn their city. Once again we clearly see that the people, by rejecting the Messiah, brought destruction upon their own city (see also, **Hosea 13:9**). Though the destruction was carried out by God through the instrumentality of Titus and the Roman armies, it was the choice of the Jewish nation which really determined its fate. Ellen White concurs with this scenario:

*"The Jews had forged **their own fetters**; they had filled for **themselves** the cup of vengeance. In the utter destruction that befell them as a nation, and in all the woes that followed them in their dispersion, they were but reaping the harvest which **their own hands** had sown. Says the prophet: 'O Israel, **thou hast destroyed thyself**;' 'for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity.' Hosea 13:9; 14:1. Their sufferings are often represented as a punishment visited upon them by the direct decree of God. It is thus that the great deceiver seeks to conceal his own work. By stubborn rejection of divine love and mercy, **the Jews had caused** the protection of God to be withdrawn from them, and Satan was permitted to rule them according to his will." **The Great Controversy**, pp. 35-36*

We must now make a few remarks about the phrase, 'the prince **that shall come**.' The question suggests itself: When, in the chronology of the 70 weeks, was this prince to come? The context clearly indicates that he was to come at the conclusion of the first 69 weeks. Both futurists and historicists agree on this point. But while historicists believe, as we have seen, that the prince

that shall come was fulfilled in Jesus or Titus, futurists teach that the prince will be a future world dictator. Which view is correct?

Once again, as in the case of the vicarious death of the Messiah, the key which unlocks the true meaning of this phrase is found in a messianic prophecy, Psalm 118. Psalm 118:26 reads: *'Blessed is **he that cometh** in the name of the Lord: we have blessed you out of the house of the Lord.'*

In Luke 13:35 Jesus applied to Himself (at His second coming) the phrase, *'blessed is **he that cometh** in the name of the Lord.'* But this messianic prophecy was also fulfilled at triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Notice how Luke 19:37-44 outlines three events in their precise chronological sequence:

- 1) Jesus entered Jerusalem on a colt, and the multitudes sang: *'Blessed be the King **that cometh** in the name of the Lord. . .'* (Verses 37-38)
- 2) Jesus then spoke about **his rejection** by the Jewish nation (verses 39-42; see also **Matthew 23:29-39**)
- 3) Finally Jesus spoke about the ensuing **destruction of Jerusalem** (verses 43-44; see also **Matthew 24:1-3**)

One cannot help but notice how this same threefold sequence is found in Daniel 9:26:

- 1) The prince comes.
- 2) He is cut off.
- 3) The city and temple are destroyed.

Psalm 118:22 makes it abundantly clear that the one who comes in the name of the Lord is also *'the stone which the builders refused [and] is become the head of the corner.'* Jesus identified Himself as this Stone (see **Matthew 21:42** and the context in which it appears). Thus, after announcing that not one stone would be left upon another in the literal Jerusalem temple, Jesus affirmed that He was about to become the head cornerstone of a new spiritual temple, the church (see also, **Ephesians 2:19-22**). It is worthy of note that the word 'head' in the Old Testament is used interchangeably with the word 'prince' (**Isaiah 19:13**; **Judges 20:2** and **1 Samuel 14:38** where the word *pinnah* (head) is used in the sense of 'chief, ruler or leader').

'Shall destroy the city and the sanctuary'

The **temple**, which had been rebuilt as a result of the decrees of Cyrus the Great and Darius the Persian, and the **city**, which had been restored and rebuilt as a result of the decrees of Artaxerxes, were to be destroyed once again due to the unfaithfulness of the people in rejecting the Messiah:

'The end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the **war** desolations are determined'

The word 'thereof' has the city and the sanctuary as antecedents. That is, the end of the city and the sanctuary would be with a flood. In the Bible, a military invasion is occasionally compared to an overwhelming flood (see **Isaiah 8:7-8; Jeremiah 46:6-7; Revelation 12:15-16; Daniel 11:22, 40; Revelation 16:12** compared with **Revelation 17:1-5, 15**). We have here a vivid description of the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by Titus and the Roman armies. Anyone who has read Josephus' description of the destruction of Jerusalem in *Wars of the Jews* (notice that this event is called 'the war' in Daniel 9:26) will concur that the invasion of Jerusalem by the Roman armies was as an overwhelming and devastating flood. A vivid description of the destruction of Jerusalem is given by Ellen G. White in the first chapter of *The Great Controversy*.

Significant is the word 'desolations'. One is reminded of the words of Jesus to the Jewish leaders: 'Behold, your house is left unto you **desolate**' (**Matthew 23:38**) immediately after which Jesus spoke of the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple (**Matthew 24:1-3**). We shall have occasion to say more about this word when we study the last half of Daniel 9:27.

It is of the utmost importance to realize that even though the destruction of Jerusalem falls outside the chronological time period of the seventy weeks (because the seventy weeks ended in the year 34 A. D. but Jerusalem was not destroyed until the year 70 A. D.) yet it is inseparably linked with events which occurred within that time period. This is reflected in the last phrase of Daniel 9:26 (as well as in the last phrase of Daniel 9:27): 'desolations are determined.' As we have previously noted, the word 'determined' refers to an event which has been decreed or decided before it actually occurs. That is to say, the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple had already been determined by events which took place during the time frame of the seventy weeks—particularly the last week!

'And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week'

Several questions must be asked at this point. Who is the 'he' in this verse? What does the word 'confirm' mean and which 'covenant' is being spoken of? Who are the 'many' with whom the covenant is confirmed? Is this week the last of the seventy?

The entire meaning of verse 27 revolves around the identity of the person who confirms the covenant for one week. The all important question therefore becomes, who is this person? Futurists believe this person is a future Roman Antichrist who will make a seven year pact of peace with the literal Jews only to break it in the middle of the week. According to this view, this vile person will halt the sacrificial system in a rebuilt Jerusalem temple and impose a reign of terror for three and a half literal years.

There are ample reasons, however, to believe that this person is the same as the Messiah who was cut off in verse 26. There is no contextual or syntactical reason to insert the Antichrist into this verse. As we have seen in our discussion above, Jesus Christ fits this prophecy perfectly. This will become even clearer as we answer the other questions at the beginning of this section.

What does the expression ‘he shall confirm **the** covenant with many for one week’ mean? It is a matter of record that every single time the word ‘covenant’ is used in the book of Daniel, it refers to God’s covenant with His people. In other words, the word ‘covenant’ in Daniel is never employed to describe a secular political covenant. For instance, Daniel 9:4 speaks of God who keeps ‘*the covenant and mercy to them that love him*’; Daniel 11:22 refers to Jesus as ‘*the prince of the covenant*’ [notice how prince and covenant are linked in this verse just like in **Daniel 9:27**]; Daniel 11:28, 30 speaks of the ‘*holy covenant*’; and Daniel 11:32 describes those who ‘*do wickedly against the covenant*.’ It should be noted that the word covenant in Daniel 9:27 has the definite article. In other words, it is not **a** covenant but **the** covenant which is confirmed. Significant also is the fact that Daniel 9 is the only chapter where the covenant name ‘Yahweh’ appears. This name is God’s covenant name throughout the Old Testament.

The expression ‘he shall **confirm** the covenant’ is better translated ‘he shall **make strong** the covenant.’ The Hebrew word *gabar* is used some 328 times in the Old Testament and the basic meaning is ‘strong,’ ‘mighty’ (for example, in **Isaiah 9:6** *gabar* is translated ‘mighty’) The sense here seems to be the act of putting the covenant on a firm footing or ratifying it. The question is: Why did the covenant need to be made strong? Was it weak in the first place?

The answer to these queries lies in the fact that the old covenant was ratified with the blood of animals which could not take away sin. On the other hand, the new covenant is better and stronger because it is based on better blood, a better priesthood, a better covenant, better promises, better sacrifice and a better sanctuary. The old covenant could not truly remove sin but the new covenant does (see, **John 1:29; Hebrews 7:22; 8:6, 13; 9:12-27; 10:1-4**). That is to say, the old covenant was weak because it could not legally save because ‘*the blood of bulls and goats cannot remove sin*’. The function of the old covenant was to reveal the Savior who was to come.

And who are the ‘many’ with whom this covenant is made strong? In our analysis of verse 26 we saw that the ‘*cutting off*’ of the Messiah was a vicarious sacrifice. This fact is underlined also in the meaning of the word ‘many’. In the parallel messianic passage of Isaiah 53 we find the following declaration: ‘*by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify **many**; for he shall **bear** their iniquities.*’ This prophecy is picked up in the New Testament as well.

In Mark 10:45 we are told that Jesus came ‘*not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for **many**.*’ Once again the word ‘many’ is linked with the idea of a vicarious sacrifice. In Hebrews 9:28 we find the same idea: ‘*So Christ was once offered **to bear** the sins of **many**. . . .*’ But by far the most important verse for our understanding of the word ‘many’ is found in Matthew 26:28 (see also, **I Corinthians 11:25**). When Jesus instituted the Lord’s Supper in the Upper Room to commemorate His death until He comes, He stated: ‘*this is the blood of the new **testament** [the word ‘testament’ here is the Greek word which is also translated ‘covenant’ in the New Testament—*diatheke*], which is shed **for many** for the remission of sins.*’

All of the above texts are linked by a common idea: A vicarious sacrifice for ‘many.’ It can hardly be coincidental that the statement in Daniel 9:26 to the effect that the Messiah was **cut**

off but not for himself was picked up by three New Testament writers and applied to Jesus! And the fact that Jesus Himself, in Matthew 26:28 not only connected His vicarious sacrifice with the word 'many' but also with the word 'covenant' is compelling evidence that the New Testament holds the key which unlocks the meaning of the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

We must now move on to one final consideration in this section: To which 'week' is Gabriel referring when he states: *'And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one **week**'*? The context makes it very clear that this is the last week of the seventy. No scholar I know of has questioned this. Yet an important fact has escaped many commentators and that is that the chronological progression of Messiah's career is repeated in chiasmic fashion twice in Daniel 9:25-27 ending each time with the destruction of Jerusalem. Notice the progression in verses 25-26:

- A. Anointing of the Messiah begins **70th week** →
- B. Messiah 'cut off' (at some unspecified point **during the 70th week**) →
- C. Messiah's death leads to **Jerusalem's destruction** in 70 A. D. →

A similar sequence of events is repeated in verse 27:

- A. Messiah makes the covenant strong for **70th week** →
- B. Messiah causes the sacrifice to cease in the **middle of the 70th week** →
- C. **Jerusalem destroyed** because Messiah was killed in the middle of the week →

A comparison of the structure of verses 25-26 with verse 27 reveals that verses 25-27 cannot be read in a linear fashion as if one event followed the other in a neat chronological sequence. The fact is that the same material is repeated twice in chiasmic fashion. The 'A' in verse 25 pinpoints the date for the initiation of Messiah's ministry during the 70th week while the 'A' in verse 27 emphasizes that Messiah made strong the covenant during the 70th week. The 'B' in verse 26 describes the death of the Messiah at some point during the 70th week but does not specify the exact time. The corresponding 'B' in verse 27 pinpoints the precise time of Messiah's death: it was in the middle of the 70th week. The 'C' of verse 26 describes the destruction of Jerusalem as does the 'C' of verse 27. This beautiful literary symmetry is further evidence that the Messiah the Prince of verse 25 is the same person as the Messiah and the Prince of verse 26.

'And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease'

This sentence answers three questions: Question: **What** was to cease? Answer: The sacrifice and the oblation. Question: **Who** was to cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease? Answer: The prince. Question: **When** were they to cease? Answer: In the middle of the last week.

First of all, what is meant by the expression *'the sacrifice and the oblation'*? The word *'sacrifice'* (*zebach*) is a common one in the Old Testament and is used to describe the animal sacrifices performed in the sanctuary (**Leviticus 7:11-20**, etc). The word *'oblation'* (*minchah*) is used to describe the drink and meal offerings which accompanied these sacrifices (**Numbers 28:5, 7**, etc).

Notice that it was the prince (who is the subject of the sentence) who caused the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. The literary structure of Daniel 9:25-27 clearly indicates that the cutting off of the Messiah would lead to the cessation of the sacrifice and the oblation. Synonyms for 'cease' are, 'bring to an end,' 'stop,' and 'discontinue.' Thus Daniel 9 not only explains that the prince would cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease but it also tells us **how this would happen**: The Messiah would be cut off from the land of the living! The Gospels strikingly reveal how Daniel 9:25-27 was fulfilled in Jesus. Let's see.

In John 19:30 we are told that the last words of Jesus on the cross were: *'It is finished.'* As soon as these words were pronounced, Matthew explains that *'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks were rent.'* (**Matthew 27:51**). Not only was the veil torn from top to bottom, but something else happened which has profound significance. Ellen White vividly describes what happened at the very moment the priest was about to offer the sacrifice and the oblation:

"When the loud cry, 'It is finished,' came from the lips of Christ, the priests were officiating in the temple. It was the hour of the evening sacrifice. The lamb representing Christ had been brought to be slain. Clothed in his significant and beautiful dress, the priest stood with lifted knife, as did Abraham when he was about to slay his son. With intense interest the people were looking on. But the earth trembles and quakes; for the Lord Himself draws near. With a rending noise the inner veil of the temple is torn from top to bottom by an unseen hand, throwing open to the gaze of the multitude a place once filled with the presence of God. In this place the Shekinah had dwelt. . . .

*"All is terror and confusion. The priest is about to slay the victim; but the knife drops from his nerveless hand, and **the lamb escapes**. Type has met antitype in the death of God's Son. The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Savior was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens." **The Desire of Ages**, pp. 756-757, emphasis supplied*

Notice that there was no sacrifice or oblation the day Jesus died. Christ literally made these ceremonies cease on the day of His crucifixion!! If the Jews had understood what this meant, they would have shut down the sacrifices and the oblations on that very day once and for all! So, in three ways God indicated that the sacrifice and the oblation had come to an end: **1)** By Jesus crying out: *'It is finished,'* **2)** By the rending of the veil, **3)** By the lamb's escape from the hands of the priest.

Yes, someone might object, but the sacrifices and oblations were resumed shortly thereafter and continued until the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. True enough. But these ceremonies no longer had any significance. The shadows had given way to the substance (see, **Colossians 2:14-17; Hebrews 10:1-9, 11-12, 18**).

Notice that the prince caused the sacrifice and the oblation to cease in the **middle of the 70th week**. This would be three and one half years after Messiah's baptism. Now, if we can determine in which season of the year the death of the Messiah took place, then we will also be able to specify in which season Messiah was baptized and also in which season the 70th week ended. We know for a fact that Jesus was crucified during the Passover season in the spring of the year (**I Corinthians 5:7-8**). But if he was crucified in the spring of the year 31, then he must have been baptized in the fall of the year 27, three and one half years earlier. This also means that probation must have closed for the Jewish nation in the fall of the year 34. Furthermore, Artaxerxes' decree must also have been given in the fall. Thus when we have the central pillar of the 70th week in the proper place all the other dates also fall into line.

'And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate'

It must be noted that the prince is still the subject. It is the prince who makes Jerusalem desolate. But didn't we say above that the Jews destroyed their own city and temple? Yes, but as we saw in Jeremiah, God destroyed Jerusalem by the people's choice.

We are now told what would happen as a result of the death of the Messiah: Jerusalem was to be destroyed. The word 'overspreading' is often translated 'wings' in the Old Testament. It is used, for example, to describe the invasion of Assyria into Israel (**Isaiah 8:7-8**). The picture is of a river which is at flood stage. When the river goes over its banks, it spreads out its wings (see also, **Nahum 1:8**).

The word 'abominations' here merits special attention because of its connection with Matthew 24:15 and Luke 21:20. In Matthew 24:15-16 Jesus warned His disciples: *'When ye therefore shall see the **abomination of desolation**, spoken of by **Daniel the prophet**, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand), then let them which be in Judaea flee to the mountains. . . .'* Extremely important here is the appeal Jesus made to the prophecy of Daniel 9:26-27. He explicitly tells us that the **abomination** of desolation was spoken of by Daniel the prophet.

And what was this abomination of desolation? First let's talk about the **abomination**. When the Roman armies surrounded Jerusalem, they put their standards into the ground and worshiped them. The Roman standards had an eagle surrounded by a golden wreath. Under the eagle and the wreath was a solar disk, which represented the sun-god Mithra. Says Josephus about the order in which the Roman armies marched:

*“Then came the ensigns encompassing the eagle, which is at the head of every Roman legion, the king and the strongest of birds, which seems to them a signal of domination, and an omen that they shall conquer all against whom they march.” **Wars of the Jews**, 3:6:2*

Ellen White echoes the view of Josephus:

*“When the idolatrous standards of the Romans should be set up in the holy ground, which extended some furlongs outside the city walls, then the followers of Christ were to find safety in flight.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 21*

Both Josephus (**Wars of the Jews** 2:19:7: ‘. . . . without having received any disgrace, he [Cestius] retired from the city, without any reason in the world.’) and Ellen White, (**The Great Controversy**, p. 30: ‘After the Romans under Cestius had surrounded the city, they unexpectedly abandoned the siege when everything seemed favorable for an immediate attack.’) explain that when Cestius unexpectedly withdrew the Roman armies, the Christians within the city saw this as a sign to flee, and as a result, ‘not one Christian perished in the destruction of Jerusalem.’ (**The Great Controversy**, p. 30) Luke 21:20, in unequivocal language, offers an explanation of what the abomination was: ‘And when ye shall see Jerusalem **compassed by armies**. . . .’ A comparison of Matthew 24:15 and Luke 21:20 clearly indicate that the abomination consisted in the incursion of the Roman armies onto the holy ground which surrounded Jerusalem.

But what is meant by the word ‘desolation’? It is noteworthy that Daniel 9:27 employs the word ‘desolate’ two times. Jesus picked up on this when he said to the Jewish leaders as He left the temple: ‘Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.’ (**Matthew 23:38**). Luke 21:20 explains that the abomination was an omen that the desolation of Jerusalem was near. In other words, the best translation of Matthew 24:15 is: ‘When ye therefore shall see the abomination which **maketh desolate**.’ That is to say, the abominable standards of the Romans were a sign that the desolation of Jerusalem was at the doors.

As we compare Daniel 9:25-27 with the Gospels we can reach the following conclusions:

- 1) The abomination of desolation of Daniel 9:25-27 represents the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies in the year 70 A. D. This can be seen by the similarity in terminology between the Gospels and Daniel 9:26-27 (**Matthew 23:28; Luke 21:20** compared with **Matthew 24:15**).
- 2) The reason for the destruction of Jerusalem was the rejection of the Messiah by the Jewish nation. This is true in Daniel 9:26-27 where twice the destruction of Jerusalem is spoken of as coming after the death of the Messiah. It is also true in Luke 19:41-44 (as well as other passages) where the destruction of Jerusalem is linked with the rejection of Jesus.

The expression ‘until the consummation’ means ‘until the full end’. We have already found this word once before in verse 26. The root meaning of the Hebrew word *kala* (‘consummation’) means ‘to bring a process to completion’ or ‘to finish a process.’ This means that when Jerusalem was destroyed, God was finished with the Jewish theocracy. Coupled with this idea

of consummation is the expression poured out. The question is what was poured out upon the desolate until the end? In this context the answer is: the wrath of God.

One cannot help but think of the analogous events of the book of Revelation. There, we are told that because of the iniquity in the world in the last days, God will **pour out** seven last plagues for in them the wrath of God is **filled up**. The expression 'filled up' could very well be translated 'consummated' or 'complete.' In fact the Reina-Valera Spanish version uses the word '*consumada*.' Significantly, as soon as all the cups have been poured out, the words are heard from the heavenly temple, '*It is **done***.' (**Revelation 15:1; 17:17**). Putting all these concepts together we have: The cup of the iniquity of the wicked will be filled to the brim (see **Genesis 15:16**) and then God will pour out upon them the plagues and these will bring to an end the wrath of God.

Noteworthy is the fact that in his indictment of the Jewish leaders, Jesus employed the symbolism of the cup: '*Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers*.' (**Matthew 23:32**). In other words, there was no longer any room for mercy. When God poured out His wrath upon them He was finished with them. They drank the dregs of the wrath of God. For this reason the apostle Paul says that the wrath of God had fallen upon the Jews '*to the uttermost*.' (**I Thessalonians 2:16**).

At the end of verse 27 we find once again that this outpouring of the unmitigated wrath of God had already been determined beforehand. This is clearly indicated by the expression: '*that **determined** shall be **poured out** upon the desolate*.' This is clear evidence that even though the city and temple were destroyed in the year 70 A. D., the sentence had already been determined previously, in the year 34 A. D. It is common in the Bible for the door of mercy to close sometime before destruction falls. Two monumental examples are: The flood where the door of mercy closed seven days before the destruction of the world and the end of the world when the door of probation will close before the Second coming (**Revelation 22:11-12**).

Did Probation end in 31 AD?

This brings us to our last point and it is this: Why do we choose 34 A. D. as the ending point of the seventy week prophecy? Didn't Jesus say that probation closed when He left the temple for the last time in the middle of the last week? (**Matthew 23:38**). It would seem so. However, several things must be taken into consideration:

- 1) In the prophecy of Daniel 9 God promised Israel seventy full weeks of probation. If their probation ended in the year 31 A. D., then they did not get the full 70 weeks as God had promised.
- 2) More than once during His ministry, Jesus stated that He was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. That is to say, His mission was limited to the Jewish nation. At first sight this appears to be a rather calloused statement but upon closer scrutiny we can understand what Jesus meant. His mission involved only the Jews at this point because the probationary period of the Jewish nation had not yet come to a full end.

Though the Jews cried out at His trial: *'We have no king but Caesar,' 'His blood be upon us and our children'* and *'release unto us Barabbas,'* probation did not close for the Jewish nation at that time. After the ascension, Peter explained that Jesus sat down at the right hand of God in order *'to give repentance unto Israel.'* (**Acts 5:31**) Furthermore, in the first seven chapters of the book of Acts the gospel was preached only to the Jews. It was not till chapter 10 that the gospel was preached to the Gentiles. This indicates that the door of mercy was still open to the Jewish nation even after the ascension of Jesus.

- 3) In Matthew 23:32-38 we find further evidence that probation did not close for the Jewish nation when Jesus was crucified. In these verses Jesus reached the climax of his indictment against the Jewish leaders. In verses 34-36 Jesus stated:

*"Therefore, indeed, I send you prophets, wise men, and scribes: some of them you **will** kill and crucify, and some of them you **will** scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city, **that on you may come all the righteous blood that has been shed on the earth**, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, son of Berechiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar. Assuredly, I say to you, all these things will come upon this generation."*

Don't miss the point of this passage. Even though these words were spoken by Jesus three days before his crucifixion, He still promised to send (the verbs are in the future tense) Israel prophets, wise men, and scribes. And who were these prophets, wise men and scribes? We can glean some clues from what Jesus said would be done to them. According to Jesus, some would be **killed**, others **scourged** in the synagogues and still others persecuted from **city to city**. Acts 5:40-41 tells us that Peter and John were scourged in the synagogue. Saul of Tarsus was guilty of killing many, the most notable of which was Stephen (**Acts 26:10-11; 7:58**). Noteworthy also is the fact that Saul of Tarsus later recounted that he persecuted many from city to city (**Acts 8:3; 26:11**). Acts 6:3 explains that the seven deacons were wise men. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost was a prophetic sermon and his ability to read the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira also reveals that he possessed the prophetic gift. And we shall see shortly that Stephen was the last prophet who ever spoke to literal Israel.

Jesus also made it crystal clear in this passage that the cup of Israel's iniquity did not fill up until they rejected the messengers which were sent by Jesus to them after His

crucifixion. Only then was the blood of all the martyrs demanded of that generation (verse 35).

Matthew 22:1-10 also provides evidence that probation did not close for the Jewish nation when Jesus was crucified. In this parable, after the oxen and fatted cattle had been killed (symbolizing the death of Jesus), God sent out messengers to invite the Jews to His Son's wedding supper (verse 4). But the messengers were ignored, seized, treated spitefully and killed (verse 6). As a result, God sent out His armies to destroy those murderers and their city (verse 7). The gospel then went to those in the highways and byways, that is to say, to the Gentiles (verses 8-10). Particularly important here is the fact that the Father sent out messengers to the Jewish nation even after the death of Jesus. It was only after the Jews rejected the calls of these messengers that the Father decided to destroy them and their city.

4) In Ezekiel 11:22-23 we find a picture of God's lingering mercy for Old Testament Jerusalem. Even though at this point, Jerusalem had been judged and Nebuchadnezzar was on his way to destroy the city, we are told that the Shekinah left the temple and lingered on the Mount of Olives, as if loath to leave! In the same way, when Jesus left the temple, and pronounced the awesome words: *'Behold, your house is left unto you desolate,'* he was loath to leave. We can almost hear Him say: 'How can I give you up, oh Israel?' Mercy lingered on for three and a half years.

5) Ellen White concurs with our assessment of the Biblical evidence:

*"Through the preaching of the **apostles and their associates**, God would cause light to shine upon them; they would be permitted to see how prophecy had been fulfilled, not only in the birth and life of Christ, but in His death and resurrection. The children were not condemned for the sins of the parents; but when, with a knowledge of all the light given to their parents, the children rejected the additional light granted to themselves, they became partakers of the parents' sins, and filled up the measure of their iniquity."*

The Great Controversy, p. 28

Ending Date for the Seventy Weeks

Many have been perplexed by the apparent absence of a clearly defined ending event for the prophecy of the seventy weeks. But is such an event really missing in Daniel 9? Seventh-day Adventists have consistently believed that the stoning of Stephen marked the conclusion of the seventy weeks. But, are we justified in believing this? I believe the Biblical evidence fully vindicates the Adventist point of view. And why is this?

In our study of Daniel 9:24 we saw that six things would be accomplished during the time period of the seventy weeks. One of these was *'to seal up vision and prophecy.'* What does this

expression mean? The same expression, 'to seal up' (*hatam*) is used earlier in this verse and is translated, 'to **make an end** of sins.' In other words, one of the accomplishments of the seventy weeks was to bring prophecy and vision to an end for the Jewish nation. How and when did this happen?

A careful examination of Acts 6 and 7 reveals that Stephen was the last prophet who was given a vision for Israel. Let's take a look at the evidence.

In order to comprehend the significance of the events in Acts 6-7 we must first understand the covenant pattern in the Old Testament. Due principally to the studies of George Mendenhall and Meredith Kline scholars now know that God's covenant with Israel in the Old Testament follows the same basic pattern as the secular suzerainty treaties of the Late Bronze Age (1550-1200 B. C.). We will use Joshua 24 (which describes the covenant renewal just before Israel entered the Promised Land) to exemplify the basic components of the Old Testament covenant between God and Israel:

- Preamble (24:1-2)
- **Historical prologue** (24:2-13)
- Covenant stipulations (24:15)
- Covenant blessings and curses (24:16-20)
- Oath of obedience (24:21)
- Witnesses (24:22)
- Covenant ratification (24:23-25)
- Arrangements for covenant perpetuation (24:26)
- Covenant notarized (24:27)

When Israel broke the covenant, God sent them prophets to bring legal proceedings against them. It is important to keep in mind that the prophets were God's lawyers bringing a lawsuit against Israel. The proceeding has come to be known as a covenant lawsuit (*rib*). Though there are several examples of this in the Old Testament, we will take Micah 6 as our example (the word *rib* is there translated 'contend' and 'controversy').

- Call to the witnesses to give ear to the proceedings (6:1-2)
- Introductory statement of the case at issue (6:2)
- **Recital of God's benevolent acts** (6:3-5)
- The indictment (6:6-7)
- The sentence (6:8)

As will be noticed above, the **recital of God's benevolent acts** toward Israel was fundamental both to the establishment of the covenant and to the covenant lawsuit. Something which has perplexed scholars is the inordinately long historical discourse which Stephen gave before the Sanhedrin. The members of the Sanhedrin were the *intelligentsia* of Israel. Why would Stephen

presumably waste his time and theirs with a history they knew all too well? The answer lies in the fact that Stephen was God's prophet bringing God's covenant lawsuit against Israel. And as we shall see below, this would be God's final lawsuit.

There is an amazing parallel between the trial of Christ and the trial of Stephen. Let's notice a few similarities:

- Both were taken before the Sanhedrin (**Matthew 26:59; Mark 14:55; Acts 6:12, 15**)
- Both were accused by false witnesses (**Mark 14:55; Acts 6:11, 13-14**)
- Both reviewed the history of the Jewish nation. Both spoke about God sending the prophets and finally sending His own son (**Matthew 23:32; 21:33-44; Acts 7**)
- In both, money was paid as a bribe to the false witnesses (**Matthew 26:60; Acts 6:11**)
- Both were accused of speaking against Moses and the temple (**Matthew 27:40; John 11:50-52 Acts 6:13-14**)
- Both accused the Jewish leaders of shutting their ears to the truth about the Messiah (**Matthew 23:29-36; Acts 7:51-54**)
- Both prayed for God to forgive the sin of their enemies (**Luke 23:34; Acts 7:60**)
- Both were killed outside the city (**Hebrews 13:12; Acts 7:58**). The innocence of both could be seen on their face (**John 19:4, 6; Acts 6:15**)
- In both there was a 'mob mentality' (**Matthew 27:24; Acts 7:57-58**)

These parallels suggest that Stephen was repeating the experience of Jesus. That is to say, what the Jewish leaders had done with Jesus they were now doing to Stephen.

Stoning of Stephen

Now we must examine more closely the trial and condemnation of Stephen. As we have already seen, God undertook many covenant lawsuits against Israel in the Old Testament. A close examination of these lawsuits reveals that they were not final and irrevocable. In fact, the prophets usually called Israel to repentance so that God, in mercy, could 'drop' his lawsuit against them. But the case of Stephen is different. There is a sense of finality in the experience of Stephen which is lacking in the previous lawsuits.

Stephen was taken before the Sanhedrin, the highest earthly authority of the Jewish nation. It was the final court of appeal, the Supreme Court, if you please. There, in fine **prophetic fashion**, and in harmony with the covenant lawsuit pattern, Stephen presented his defense by appealing to the history of Israel from the time of Abraham till the coming of the Just One (**Acts 7:2-53**). But at the end of his discourse, the accused became the accuser. The Sanhedrin presumed to indict Stephen but he ended up indicting them!! Notice the denunciation:

"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they

*have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom **ye** have been now become the betrayers and murderers: Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.” (Acts 7:51-53)*

Significantly, up to this point in his discourse, Stephen has spoken of the fathers in terms of ‘**our** fathers’ (Acts 7:11, 19, 38, 44, 45). In good **prophetic fashion**, he includes himself as part of the historical patrimony of Israel (as did Daniel when he repeatedly said in Daniel 9, ‘we have sinned’). But at the conclusion of his speech he dissociates himself from them by saying, ‘**your** fathers’ (notice that Jesus also made reference to ‘**your** fathers’ in His indictment of the Jewish leaders; **Matthew 23:32**). He could no longer in good conscience be in solidarity with literal Israel. In other words, he was distancing himself from the patrimony of literal Israel because he knew that after they killed him, they would no longer be God’s people—the theocracy would have come to an ignominious end!

Also of great importance is the fact that Stephen, unlike the prophets before him, did not make a call to repentance. This would seem to indicate that the Jewish leaders were beyond the point of repentance; they had made their final and irrevocable decision to reject the Messiah. This is indicated by the expressions Stephen used in his indictment as well as by the reaction of the Sanhedrin to his words. Notice that he called them stiff-necked and uncircumcised in hearts and ears and accused them of resisting the Holy Spirit. He also accused them of betraying and murdering Jesus and breaking the covenant. There is no mention of future messengers or opportunities.

The reaction of the leaders of the Sanhedrin is important because it reveals their incurable rejection of the Messiah. Instead of receiving the message of Stephen who spoke with the fullness of the power of the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:55), with untempered hatred they ‘gnashed on him with their teeth . . . and cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him. . .’ (Acts 7:54, 57-58) Notice that the verdict was unanimous—they were all of one accord. The apostles were of one accord on the side of Christ and the Sanhedrin was of one accord against Christ. Thus the Jewish Sanhedrin made its choice. By stoning Stephen, they silenced **the last prophet** who would ever be sent to them. Truly, prophecy came to an end for literal Israel at this time!!

But the prophecy of the seventy weeks indicated that vision (*chazon*) would also come to an end at the conclusion of the last week. Did this happen as predicted? The answer is a resounding yes!! Acts chapter seven not only indicates that Stephen was the last prophet sent to Israel but it also leaves no doubt that he received the last vision as well.

It seems that what particularly incensed the members of the Sanhedrin was the vision Stephen had of Jesus in heaven standing on the right hand of God. This was a vision for there is no evidence that anyone other than Stephen saw it! The critical question is: Did Stephen see Jesus **as** He was and **where** He was at that very moment or was he transported in vision to the future to see Jesus as He will appear when He comes again? The evidence seems to indicate that this was a **prophetic** vision where Stephen was carried to the future to see Jesus coming as the Son of Man.

As we have previously studied, Jesus taught in His parables (**Matthew 21:33-45; Matthew 22:1-10; Matthew 23:32-39**) that when the kingdom should be taken from the Jews, it would be given to the Gentiles. This being the case, we should find an event to mark the end of the seventy weeks which not only closes the door of probation for the Jewish theocracy but also opens the door for the gospel to go to the Gentiles. Does the stoning of Stephen fulfill this specification? Once again, the answer is a resounding yes!

It can hardly be a coincidence that the ringleader in the stoning of Stephen was a champion of Orthodox Judaism, Saul of Tarsus (see **Philippians 3:3-9**). At the precise moment probation was closing for the Jewish theocracy, God—irony of ironies—had already chosen His champion to the Gentiles and he was present at the stoning of Stephen! Paul later reminisced about this experience with the following words:

“And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him. And he said unto me, Depart; for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.” (**Acts 22:20-21**)

The sequence of events in Acts 1-11 clearly reveals that the stoning of Stephen was a watershed event. In Acts 1:8 Jesus had said to His disciples:

*“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in **Jerusalem**, and in all **Judaea**, and in **Samaria**, and unto the **uttermost part of the earth**.”*

Notice the ever broadening concentric circles in this verse:

- Jerusalem and Judea (**Acts 1-6**)
- Stoning of Stephen (**Acts 7**)
- Samaria (**Acts 8** especially verse 25)
- Saul’s Conversion (**Acts 9**)
- Gospel to Gentiles (Uttermost Part of the Earth) (**Acts 10-28**)

It will be noticed that the gospel went to the uttermost part of the earth only after the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. In fact, it was Paul who took the gospel to every region of the Roman Empire through his missionary journeys. Thus in Acts 7 probation closes for the Jewish theocracy and in chapter 9 the champion to the Gentiles is converted. That is to say, one door closed and shortly thereafter the other opened.

The official beginning of Paul’s ministry is described in Acts 13:1-2. There Paul and Barnabas were ordained to the gospel ministry. Paul and Barnabas then traveled to Antioch of Pisidia where Paul preached a long gospel sermon to the Jews in the synagogue (13:16-41). The Gentiles then begged Paul to preach to them (13:42-43). The next Sabbath almost the whole

city came out to hear the word of God (13:44). This provoked the jealousy of the Jews and they contradicted and blasphemed (13:45). This led Paul to say some very significant words:

*'It was necessary that the word of God should **first** have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and **judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.** For so hath the **Lord commanded us**, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.'* (13:46-47)

Notice that according to Paul the gospel was to be preached to the Jews first. And why was this? Simply because, as we have seen, seventy weeks had been measured off for the Jewish nation! But when the Jewish nation rejected the Messiah, by divine command, Paul and Barnabas turned to the Gentiles. Notice that the door of mercy did not close for individual Jews after 34 AD. This can be seen in the fact that Saul of Tarsus was converted after the year 34 AD

LESSON #23 – NOTES ON DANIEL 10

Historical Time Frame

Daniel was 88 years old when the events of Daniel 10 transpired. We know this because we are told in volume four of the Testimonies, (Ellen G. White) page 570, that Daniel was about 18 years of age when he was taken captive to Babylon (**Daniel 1:1-2**). The events of chapter 10 begin while Daniel was still in Babylon even though Cyrus had already given the decree authorizing the return of the Jews to Jerusalem. We know this because Daniel was by the great river Hiddekel, that is to say, the Tigris (10:4).

Chronological Matters

It is of the utmost importance to remember the dates which are given in Daniel chapters eight through eleven. The events of **Daniel 8** took place in the year 550 BC roughly eleven years before the fall of Babylon (in 539 BC) and fourteen years before Cyrus' decree of release (in 536 BC). **Daniel 9** bears the date 538 BC At this point Babylon had fallen but Cyrus' decree of release had not been proclaimed. The events of **chapter 10** transpire in the year 535 BC At this point Cyrus' decree had already been given and the first wave of Jews had returned to rebuild the temple. **Chapters 11 and 12** bear the same date as chapter 10 because it is the continuation of it.

Daniel 11:1 would seem to indicate that the entire chapter should be dated in the same year as Daniel 9 (538). This would mean that the events of Daniel 11 transpired before those of chapter 10. A careful analysis of Daniel 11:1, however, reveals that this verse contains a parenthetical statement inserted by Daniel between chapter 10:21 and 11:2. In other words, Daniel 11:1 is out of chronological order with what comes before and after. In 11:1 Daniel is simply explaining that he also confirmed and strengthened Darius the Mede in the first year of his rule (**Daniel 9:1-2**) In short, the text of Daniel 10:20-11:2 should look like this:

*“Knowest thou wherefore I [Gabriel] come unto thee? And now I return to fight with the prince of **Persia**: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of **Grecia** shall come. But I [Gabriel] **will shew thee** that which is noted in the **scripture of truth**: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince. (Also in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him). And now **will I shew thee the truth**. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in **Persia**; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of **Grecia**.”*

It is obvious that the words in bold both before and after Daniel's parenthetical statement bear a close relationship to each another. In both there is a reference to Persia and Grecia and in both Gabriel says to Daniel 'I will shew thee the truth.' It is safe to conclude, then, that the introductory vision of Daniel 10 is continued in chapter 11. Both chapters bear the same date. In actual fact, as we shall see, Daniel 10 is the introduction to the explanation provided by Gabriel in 11:2-12:3. Daniel 12:4-13 should then be understood as the epilogue to the book of Daniel in general and of Daniel 8-12 in particular.

Daniel 10:1

The 'thing' (*dabar*) or 'word' which Gabriel revealed to Daniel in the third year of Cyrus (535 BC) was actually the explanation we find in Daniel 11:2-12:3. Significantly, Daniel did not receive a **new vision** in this year. He merely received a word ('thing') which explained the vision (*mareh*) which had previously been given in chapter 8. For the purpose of understanding, we will quote verse 1 and provide explanatory notes in brackets and bold:

*"In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia [535 BC] a thing was revealed unto Daniel [the explanation of **Daniel 11:2-12:3**], whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing [the explanation of **Daniel 11:2-12:3**] was true, but the time appointed was long [because the explanation covers the periods of Persia, Greece, Imperial Rome, Papal Rome in its two stages, the close of probation, the time of trouble and the final deliverance of God's people]; and he understood the thing [the explanation of **Daniel 11:2-12:3**] and had understanding of the vision [mareh: **the vision of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14**]."*

Daniel 10:2-4

In these verses we find Daniel fasting and praying. Up till this point in the book we have seen Daniel as a man of intense prayer (**Daniel 2:17-18; 6:10-11; 9:3-19**). But in Daniel 10 we are informed that Daniel not only prayed but also was mourning and fasting. What grave historical circumstances led Daniel not only to pray but also to mourn and fast?

We know that Daniel's agony had nothing to do with whether the decree would be given for his people to return to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple. At this point the decree had already been given and the first wave of exiles had returned (**Ezra 1:1-4; 3:1-8; 1:1**). Neither did it have to do with whether the decree to restore and build Jerusalem would be given on schedule because this decree was still eighty years in the future. Furthermore, Daniel was not mourning because he did not understand the 'vision' (*mareh*) of Daniel 8 because we are told in verse 1 that he **did** understand it at this point in time. Why, then, was Daniel praying, mourning and fasting? There appear to be two reasons.

In the first place, three years before the events of Daniel 10, Gabriel had already explained in broad strokes the basic elements of the prophecy of the 2300 days yet there were still many details which were unclear to Daniel. This was the motivation for Daniel's prayer. The prophet

was seeking wisdom to understand the unexplained elements of the vision of Daniel 8. In response to Daniel's plea, God provided the material we find in Daniel 11:2-12:3. Daniel 10:1-12:3.

Notice the following comment by Ellen G. White:

*"Upon the occasion just described [Daniel 9], the angel Gabriel imparted to Daniel all the instruction which he was then able to receive. A few years afterward, however, the prophet desired to learn more of the subjects not yet fully explained, and again set himself to seek light and wisdom from God. 'In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all. . . .'" Ellen G. White, **The Sanctified Life**, p. 49*

Perhaps this would be a good time to examine the relationship between the prophecies of Daniel eight, nine, ten and eleven. The close relationship between these prophecies can be discerned in the continued use of the words 'vision' and 'understand'.

In Daniel 8:16 Gabriel was given the command to make Daniel **understand** the **vision** (*mareh*) but at the end of the chapter (8:26-27) we are told that Daniel did not **understand** the **vision** (*mareh*). In chapter 9:23 Gabriel came back to Daniel and told him: '**understand** the matter, and consider the **vision**' (*mareh*). After Gabriel's explanation we are informed in Daniel 10:1 that Daniel '*understood the thing, and had **understanding** in the **vision**' (*mareh*). Yet in Daniel 10:2-3, 12 we find that Daniel pleaded to God for further understanding. As a result, Gabriel came back to explain further details which were still unclear in Daniel's mind. Gabriel explained: '*Now I am come to make thee **understand** what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the **vision** (*chazon*) is for many days.*' Daniel 10:14. This further understanding was given to Daniel in chapter 11 where Gabriel provided the fullest explanation of the vision of Daniel 8.*

Significantly, as we shall see in our study of Daniel 12, the prophet did not even then understand everything (**Daniel 12:8-10**). That is to say, when the book of Daniel ended there were still many things which Daniel did not comprehend. This is why God gave the book of Revelation. Daniel 8-12 is a close knit prophecy and the Apocalypse is a Revelation or explanation of that prophecy. Regarding this Ellen White states:

*"The things revealed to Daniel were afterward complemented by the revelation made to John on the Isle of Patmos. These books should be carefully studied . . . The book of Daniel is unsealed in the revelation to John, and carries us forward to the last scenes of this earth's history." Ellen G. White, **Testimonies to Ministers**, pp. 114-115.*

The prophecies of Daniel 8-11 are also connected by the phrase, '**the time of the end.**' In **Daniel 8:17, 19** the prophet was told that the *mareh* is for the '**time of the end**'. In our previous study of Daniel 8 we noticed that the word *mareh* is used particularly to denote the events connected with the conclusion of the 2300 days. What this means is that the *mareh* would not be present truth neither would it be fully comprehended until the '**time of the end.**'

Significantly there is no reference to the time of the end in **Daniel 9** because the focus of this chapter is not on the end-time but rather on the time of probation for Daniel's literal people, that is, the Jewish nation. But in chapter **10:14** Daniel is once again informed that the vision (*chazon*) is for what will befall his people (spiritual Israel) in the **latter days** *'for yet the vision (chazon) is for many days.'* One cannot fail to notice that the word *chazon* is used for 'vision' in Daniel 10:14 instead of *mareh*. And why is this?

In order to answer this question we must keep in mind that the word *chazon* in Daniel 8 is used to describe the totality of the vision from the time of Persia until the cleansing of the sanctuary at the conclusion of the 2300 days. On the other hand the word *mareh* is used in a more restricted sense to describe the apparition of the two heavenly messengers who explained the time element of the 2300 days (**Daniel 8:13-14**). We can now understand why Gabriel used *mareh* in Daniel 8:17 while he used *chazon* in Daniel 10:14. The reason is actually quite simple. You see, when Gabriel returned in Daniel 11, he not only explained the time element of the 2300 days but he also explained the totality of the vision of Daniel 8 once again beginning with Persia and ending with the final persecution and deliverance of God's people. In other words, he explained once again not only the *mareh* but also the total *chazon*.

Moving on to **Daniel 11:40** we find a clear description of the events which would befall Daniel's people during the 'time of the end'. After the papacy ruled the world for 1260 years (**Daniel 11:31-39**), it would be given a deadly wound in 1798 by the king of the south—France (Daniel 11:40). But then it would recover its power and overwhelm the world even to the point of attempting to annihilate Daniel's end-time people (11:40-45). But in the hour of utmost extremity, God would intervene to deliver His people (12:1). These events which begin in Daniel 11:40 are the ones which had not been explained by Gabriel in Daniel 8 and 9. Notice the excellent summary provided by Louis Were:

"In Daniel 9 the prophecy of the 2300 days was explained down to the overthrow of the Jewish nation as God's chosen people and the destruction of Jerusalem. But the prophet had not yet been told all the rest of the time belonging to the 2300 days and the final events of earth's history. He therefore prayed for light on these things, and Gabriel came explaining to Daniel the reason for his delay [more on this later]: 'But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days [the 21 days Daniel was praying]: but lo, Michael the first Prince came to help me. . . . Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days . . . and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia.' (**Daniel 10:2-20**). Louis F. Were, ***The Battle for the Kingship of the World***, pp. 12-13

When Gabriel concluded his explanation in Daniel 11:2-12:3, the prophet was told to *'shut up the words and seal up the book until the time of the end'*. In other words, Daniel chapters 8-12 would be in great measure unintelligible until 1798. But Daniel was assured that at the time of the end the book would be opened and knowledge of this prophecy would be increased (**Daniel 12:4**). This promise was fulfilled in Revelation 10 where the last half of the book of Daniel was opened during the Great Advent Awakening of the 1830's and 1840's.

Let's consider now a few things about the epilogue of Daniel's 'little book'. In this epilogue (**Daniel 12:5-13**) Gabriel gave additional chronological explanations but these proved to be too

much for Daniel's understanding (12:8-9) so the prophet was told: *'But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest and stand up in thy lot at the end of the days.'* (**Daniel 12:13**). At this point Gabriel decided to burden Daniel no more. He simply told the prophet that these things were not for his time but rather for the time of the end. The enigmatic statement, *'thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot'* could be taken to mean that Daniel was to resurrect at the end of time or that he would stand up figuratively to speak through his writings at the time of the end:

*"Honored by men with the responsibilities of state and with the secrets of kingdoms bearing universal sway, Daniel was honored by God as His ambassador, and was given many revelations of the mysteries of ages to come. His wonderful prophecies, as recorded by him in chapters 7 to 12 of the book bearing his name, were not fully understood even by the prophet himself; but before his life labors closed, he was given the blessed assurance that "at the end of the days"--in the closing period of this world's history--he would again be permitted to stand in his lot and place. It was not given him to understand all that God had revealed of the divine purpose. "Shut up the words, and seal the book," he was directed concerning his prophetic writings; these were to be sealed "even to the time of the end." "Go thy way, Daniel," the angel once more directed the faithful messenger of Jehovah; "for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. . . . Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Daniel 12:4, 9, 13 Ellen G. White, **Prophets and Kings**, p. 547)*

One final link between the prophecies of Daniel 8-11 can be found in the role performed by the angel Gabriel. In Chapter 8 Gabriel was told to explain the vision to Daniel. When Daniel failed to understand the vision, it was Gabriel who came back in Daniel 9 to explain it. And in chapters ten (10:11) and eleven (11:2), it was Gabriel who contended with the prince and the kings of Persia and it was Gabriel who gave the explanation we find in Daniel 11:2-12:3.

But there was a second and more important reason why Daniel was agonizing in prayer. As we have previously noted, the events of Daniel 10 took place in the year 535 B. C. Just one year earlier Cyrus had given a decree authorizing the rebuilding of the temple and had even provided materials to carry forward the task (**Ezra 1:1-4**). The first wave of Jews had enthusiastically returned to Jerusalem and quickly laid the foundations of the temple and the altar (**Ezra 3:8-10**). At first the Samaritans feigned to have great interest in the rebuilding of the temple and offered to help (**Ezra 4:1-2**). But when they were rebuffed by Zerubbabel (**Ezra 4:3**), the opposition began. Notice the words of Ezra:

*"Then the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building and hired counselors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius king of Persia." (**Ezra 4:4-5**)*

During the reign of Cambyses the opposition became so great that for a time the building of the temple was suspended. In the reign of Darius Hystaspes the governors of the land even came to the builders and demanded to know who had given them permission to rebuild the temple (**Ezra 5:2-4**). A letter was sent to king Darius to find out if the Jews had royal permission to rebuild the temple (**Ezra 5:7-17**). In Ezra 6:1-3 we are told that Darius searched the archives in order to ascertain if any previous decree had been given which authorized the Jews to rebuild

the temple. When Cyrus' decree was found in the archives, Darius sent a letter renewing the decree of Cyrus (**Ezra 6:7-13**). As a result of this confirmatory decree and due to the help of Zechariah and Haggai, the temple was finally finished in the year 515.

It is in the context of this opposition that we must understand Daniel's mourning in chapter 10. Daniel knew that the temple needed to be rebuilt in order for the prophecy of the seventy weeks and the 2300 days to be fulfilled. Yet the historical circumstances seemed to indicate that the temple would not be rebuilt on schedule. So Daniel poured out his heart to God in prayer pleading for the Lord to fulfill His promise.

Verses 4-6

In these verses we have a magnificent Christophany. A vision of Christ was given to Daniel and the description is virtually identical with that of the glorified Christ in Revelation 1:13-16. This seems to indicate that Daniel did not see Jesus as He was garbed at that very moment, but rather as He would be garbed upon his inauguration as High Priest after His ascension.

Verses 7-9

In these verses we find a description of the impact the vision had on those who were present with Daniel. Even though they did not see the glorified Christ, they felt the intense solemnity of the occasion. We are told that they fled to hide and thus Daniel remained alone. We are also informed that Daniel heard Christ speak to him but the words are not recorded. The word for 'appearance' here is *mareh*.

Verses 10-14

As Daniel lay on the ground, a hand touched him and set him upon his knees and the palms of his hands. The person who touched Daniel is identified as Gabriel. Some have erroneously concluded that the person whom Daniel saw in his vision (verses 5-6) is the same as the one who touched him. But there is no reason to reach this conclusion. Verse 10 marks a clear break between the personage Daniel saw in vision and the person who lifted him up. This is seen by the words: 'And, behold, a hand [*not necessarily the hand of the person he saw in vision*] touched me, which set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands.' Daniel 10:10.

As we have previously noted from the book of Ezra, the Samaritans assiduously opposed the rebuilding of the temple, even to the point of complaining to the Persian kings. As we have seen, during the reigns of Cambyses and Darius I the work on the temple was actually suspended for a time. Now, if the book of Ezra were our only source of information about this experience, we might conclude that the opposition was due to mere human factors. But Daniel 10 gives us a glimpse behind the veil of human history. Here we discern how human events in the visible earthly realm were being influenced by powers in the invisible cosmic realm. Verse 13 describes this battle between the prince of Persia and Gabriel, a battle so intense that it was finally necessary for Michael to come to Gabriel's aid:

“But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia.”

Several questions emerge as we read this verse. Who is the prince of the kingdom of Persia? Who is Michael? And what are these powers fighting about? We must first of all recognize that the prince of the kingdom of Persia is not the same as the king of Persia. There are 420 uses of the word ‘prince’ in the Old Testament and not once is the word used to denote a king. In actual fact, the word is most frequently used to describe military commanders. Daniel 10:13 makes it abundantly clear that Gabriel and Michael were working on two fronts. First, they were contending with the **prince** of the kingdom of Persia and secondly they were working with the **kings** of Persia. Thus, there is a clear cut distinction between the prince of Persia and the kings of Persia. Who is this prince of the kingdom of Persia? And who is Michael who stands watch over Daniel’s people?

Before we can answer these questions it is imperative to realize that in ancient cultures it was believed that every kingdom had its own particular ‘guardian angel’ which looked out for the interests and welfare of the nation. That being the case, the prince of the kingdom of Persia would be Persia’s guardian angel and Michael would be Israel’s guardian angel. Let’s begin by checking Michael’s ID.

Michael is a fascinating personage. In Scripture the name appears five times, always in apocalyptic passages where Michael is in conflict with Satan. Michael’s very name is a challenge to Satan. It means, ‘Who is like God?’ In Revelation 12:7-9 it is Michael who casts Satan out of heaven. It is of more than passing interest that at the beginning of the great controversy, Michael is spoken of as having **his** angels and Satan is spoken of as having **his**. At the conclusion of the great controversy, Jesus will come with **his** holy angels (**Matthew 24:31**) and Satan and **his** angels will be cast in the lake of fire (**Matthew 25:41**).

In Jude 9 Michael contends with Satan for the body of Moses. There can be no doubt that Michael had come on this occasion to resurrect Moses from the dead (see **Deuteronomy 34:5-6**; **Matthew 17:3**). In other words, Michael is the angel of the resurrection. Is it a coincidence that when Jesus comes to resurrect the dead at His second coming, he will ‘*descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of **the archangel**, and with the trump of God?*’ (**I Thessalonians 4:16**; see also **John 5:26-29** where we are told that the voice of Jesus will resurrect the dead).

The book of Daniel makes three references to Michael. Two of them are found in the chapter we are presently studying (verses 13, 21) and the other one is in Daniel 12:1. This last verse is of particular importance for two reasons. First, Michael is spoken of as the great prince who stands watch over Israel. That is to say, Michael is Israel’s guardian angel. Second, Michael is the deliverer of Israel and the one who resurrects those who sleep in the dust of the earth.

Michael must also be identified with the enigmatic personage who in the Old Testament is called the ‘Angel of the Lord’. Though the scope of our present study will not allow us to examine every reference to the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament, it is imperative that we take a look at a few key passages.

The first passage we must take a look at is Zechariah 3:1-5. This passage leaves no doubt that the Angel of the Lord in the Old Testament is the same person as Michael. In this passage the Angel of the Lord is in conflict with Satan and the issue of the conflict is Israel (verse 2). Of particular significance are the words: 'The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan' (verse 2) These are the very words which Michael uttered to Satan when He came to resurrect Moses (Jude 9). Thus, a comparison of Zechariah 3:1-5 and Jude 9 reveals, without any shadow of doubt, that the Angel of the Lord is Michael.

In Genesis 32:11, 24, 26, 30 we find Jacob praying for God to **deliver** him from the wrath of his brother, Esau. This time of anguish is known in other places of Scripture as the 'time of Jacob's trouble.' In fact, Genesis 32 is in the background of the time of trouble spoken of in Daniel 12:1. As Jacob was praying, the Angel of the Lord (see **Hosea 12:3-5**) laid hold of him and they began to struggle. The result of the story is well known. Not only did the Angel **deliver** Jacob from the wrath of his brother but he also blessed him and gave him a new name. At the conclusion of this episode, Jacob called the place Peniel—for **I have seen God face to face**, and my life has been preserved' (this word is frequently translated 'delivered' in the Old Testament). Can anyone doubt that the Angel of the Lord in this story is God?

In Exodus 14:19-20 we are told that the Angel of God led Israel in a pillar of cloud by day and in a pillar of fire by night to **protect** them from their enemies. Significantly, this Angel is identified as God in verse 24.

The episode of the burning bush is well known. The Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses and announced that he was going to **deliver** Israel (**Exodus 3:8**) from their bondage to the Egyptians. One cannot help but remember that Michael is spoken of as the end-time deliverer of Israel in Daniel 12:1. A close inspection of Exodus 3:2-14 reveals that this Angel is also God (see **John 8:58-59**).

In Joshua 5:13-15 (Amplified Bible) this same Angel is identified as the Prince of the host. As we saw in our study of Daniel 8, the name, 'Prince of the host' is found in only one other place in Scripture, Daniel 8:11 where Jesus is called 'the Prince of the host.' In fact, as we have seen before, Jesus is referred to in Daniel as 'the Prince of the host,' 'the Prince of princes,' the 'Prince of the covenant,' and 'the great Prince.'

There can be no doubt, then, that Michael is Israel's Guardian Angel. He is Israel's protector and deliverer from the power of Satan. He is God! Michael is none other than Jesus Christ!! What an appropriate name for one who is in contention with Lucifer who declared 'I will be like the Most High.' (**Isaiah 14:14**) In response to Lucifer's aspirations Jesus' name throws out the challenge: 'Who is Like God'?

We are now ready to identify the prince of the kingdom of Persia. This identification is really a no brainer. If Michael the Prince is Christ, then the prince of the kingdom of Persia must be Satan. Jesus called Satan the 'prince of the world' on at least three (**John 14:30; 12:30-33; 16:11**).

Now that we have identified the contending parties, we can discuss the reason for the battle. As we saw in our study of Daniel 9, God had promised that Israel would spend 70 years in Babylonian captivity and then would return to their land to rebuild the temple, the city and the walls. But the restoration and building of the city and walls could not take place until the temple was rebuilt. The decree of Cyrus in 536 B. C. was a great victory for God. Everything appeared to be going according to schedule. But then the opposition of the Samaritans ensued. Daniel 10 leaves no doubt that this opposition did not originate with the Samaritans. The prince of the kingdom of Persia (Satan) was working to influence the minds of the kings of Persia so that they would halt the work of rebuilding the temple. At the same time, Gabriel was doing his utmost to influence the minds of the kings of Persia so that they would authorize the continuation of the work.

For three weeks, while Daniel was mourning and praying, Gabriel struggled with the prince of Persia and with the minds of the kings of Persia. And at the very end of this period, Michael Himself came to aid Gabriel in his struggle. There is no doubt that these 21 days should be understood as literal days. However, it is tempting to understand them in a broader sense as well by applying the year/day principle. Cyrus gave his decree to rebuild the temple in the year 536 B.C. and the temple was finally finished in the year 515 B. C., exactly 21 years after the decree was given! During this whole period Gabriel was struggling with Satan and with the kings of Persia (notice the plural in **Daniel 10:13**). The book of Ezra itself explains that the work of rebuilding went on according to schedule because *‘the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews, that they [the Samaritans] could not cause them to cease. . . .’* (**Ezra 5:5**)

In short, it is as if Gabriel were telling Daniel: ‘I know you have been mourning, fasting and praying for three full weeks because you wanted a clearer understanding of the end-time elements of the vision of Daniel 8. The very moment you started to pray, I had every intention of coming immediately to answer your plea as I had done the previous time you prayed (**Daniel 9:20-23**) but this time I was delayed. You see, I was involved in this conflict with the prince of the kingdom of Persia. He was influencing the minds of the Persian kings so that they would halt the rebuilding of the temple. But at the end of the 21 days, Michael came to help me and we prevailed. The opposition you have seen by the Samaritans is really the visible manifestation of this invisible conflict. But now I have finally been able to break away and help you understand ‘what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for **yet** the vision is for *many* days.’ (Daniel 10:14).” Don’t miss the significance of the word **yet**. This word seems to imply that the vision (*chazon*) had already been partially explained in Daniel 9 (the 70 weeks) but that there were **yet** many days in the vision which had not yet been explained.

The perspective presented above is corroborated by the Spirit of Prophecy:

“Untiring in their opposition, the Samaritans ‘weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counselors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius.’ (Ezra 4:4, 5) By false reports they aroused suspicion in minds easily led to suspect. But for many years the powers of evil were held in check, and the people of Judea had liberty to continue their work.

*“While Satan was striving to influence the highest powers in the kingdom of Medo-Persia to show disfavor to God’s people, angels worked in behalf of the exiles. The controversy was one in which all heaven was interested. Through the prophet Daniel we are given a glimpse of this mighty struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil. For three weeks Gabriel wrestled with the powers of darkness, seeking to counteract the influences at work on the mind of Cyrus; and before the contest closed, Christ Himself came to Gabriel’s aid [**Daniel 10:13** is quoted]. All that heaven could do in behalf of the people of God was done. The victory was finally gained; the forces of the enemy were held in check all the days of Cyrus, and all the days of his son Cambyses, who reigned about seven and a half years.” Ellen G. White, **Prophets and Kings**, pp. 571-572*

*“The king of Persia was controlled by the highest of all evil angels. He refused, as did Pharaoh, to obey the word of the Lord. Gabriel declared, He withstood me twenty-one days by his representations against the Jews. But Michael came to his help, and then he remained with the kings of Persia, holding the powers in check, giving right counsel against evil counsel.” Ellen G. White, **Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, volume 4, p. 1173*

Verses 15-19

In response to Gabriel’s words, Daniel now bows to the ground and is left speechless. The vision (*mareh*) fills him with sorrow and his physical strength is gone. Furthermore, he is left breathless. Gabriel remedies the situation by giving back Daniel’s speech and by strengthening him.

Verses 20-21

Before further explaining the vision to Daniel in chapter 11, Gabriel informed the prophet that the battle with Satan was not over:

‘ . . . now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.’

What Gabriel is telling Daniel is this: ‘I must now return to continue my struggle with the prince of Persia (Satan). There is still work to do. I must still make sure that the decree of Artaxerxes is given on schedule to mark the beginning of the 70 weeks and the 2300 days. And when the kingdom of Persia has fallen, I must continue to do battle with the prince of Grecia (Satan in control of the Greek kingdom). But before I continue this battle, I will take the time to show you the events which will transpire from this point on. These events have already been written in the scripture of truth, that is, in God’s calendar; therefore their fulfillment is absolutely certain.’

Putting it all Together

In closing, let’s see how the prophecies of Daniel 8, 9, 10 and 11 fit together. We will begin with chapter 8 and show how each succeeding chapter builds upon the previous ones.

Daniel 8

The *chazon* (vision) has the following sequence: **Persia** (8:3-4, 20), **Greece** (8:3-8, 21), **Pagan Rome** (8:9-10), **Papal Rome** (8:11-12), and the cleansing of the sanctuary in **1844** (8:13-14). Thus Daniel 8 leads us only to the beginning of the investigative judgment. But, when will this judgment end? In Daniel 8 just a few remarks are made by Gabriel about **events to transpire after 1844** (8:19, 25). **Gabriel** was told to make Daniel **understand** the vision (*mareh*; 8:16) and Daniel was then informed that the vision (*mareh*) was for the **time of the end** (8:16). At the conclusion of Daniel 8 we are told that Daniel was astonished at the *mareh* and **did not understand it**. (8:27).

Daniel 9

Daniel was confused over the *mareh* of Daniel 8 so he studied Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years and **prayed for understanding** (9:1-19). In response to Daniel's prayer, actually, from the **beginning** of his supplications (9:23) **Gabriel** was sent to give Daniel **understanding** of the vision (*mareh*) of Daniel 8 (9:22-23). Gabriel explained that the answer was given because Daniel was a man **greatly beloved** (9:23) Gabriel then explained the first part of the prophecy of the 2300 days, that is to say, the seventy weeks. In his explanation, Gabriel emphasized that this portion of the 2300 days was for Daniel's literal city and people (9:24). There is no reference to **the time of the end** in Daniel 9 because this prophecy does not deal with end-time events but rather with the probationary period for the Jewish theocracy. Notably, the seventy weeks begin with the kingdom of **Persia** and end with **Pagan Rome**. Thus they begin with the same kingdom as Daniel 8 but only reach until the time period of Pagan Rome. But what about the event to transpire beyond the period of Pagan Rome? Obviously, we would expect Gabriel to come back at some point to explain the events beyond the period of Pagan Rome and he did!!

Daniel 10-11

Daniel 10 begins with the statement that Daniel **understood** the *mareh* (10:1). But he wanted further light so he **prayed** to God (10:2-3, 12). In response to Daniel's prayer, nay, at the **beginning** of Daniel's supplication (10:12) **Gabriel** was sent to give the prophet **understanding** (10:14) because Daniel was **greatly beloved** (10:11). The understanding which Gabriel came to give Daniel includes the totality of the *chazon* but deals particularly with the **latter days** (10:14). As he did in Daniel 8, Gabriel began his explanation with **Persia** and continued with **Greece**, **Pagan Rome**, and **Papal Rome** during its 1260 years of dominion (11:31-39). This much had already been revealed in Daniel 8. But as Gabriel very briefly insinuated in Daniel 8, there was more to Papal Rome than its 1260 year career. So in Daniel 11 Gabriel takes us far beyond 1798 and 1844. He explains that the Papacy would receive a mortal wound from France in 1798 (11:40), that the deadly wound would be healed (11:40-41), and that the Papacy would yet exercise world dominion. Also included in his explanation was the shaking, the loud cry, the death decree, the close of probation, the time of trouble, the deliverance of God's people, the special resurrection and the everlasting kingdom (Daniel 11:2-12:3). Needless to say, all these events would be further explained in the book of Revelation.

As we look at the relationship between Daniel 10 and 11-12 we see that in chapter 10, Michael is standing watch over Daniel's literal people to save them from their literal enemies as they return from their literal captivity to rebuild the literal temple. But at the end, Michael is standing watch over Daniel's spiritual people who have returned from their spiritual captivity in spiritual Babylon to rebuild the spiritual temple and who are opposed by spiritual enemies. The end of the seventy weeks marks the transition point from the literal to the spiritual. That is to say, at the center of Daniel 9 is Messiah's work for literal Israel while at the center of Daniel 10-11 is Messiah's work for spiritual Israel.

Daniel 8:14 and Daniel 12:1 mark the beginning and ending points of the investigative judgment. In Daniel 8:14 Jesus goes in to His Father to receive the kingdom and in Daniel 12:1 Jesus stands up to take over the kingdom. Thus the literary structure of Daniel 8-12 reveals, without any shadow of doubt that these chapters constitute a unified whole. They are, so to speak, a book within a book.

One final statement from the pen of Ellen White:

*"The light that Daniel received direct from God was given **especially for these last days**. The visions he saw by the banks of the Ulai [Daniel 8] and the Hiddekel [**Daniel 10-11**], the great rivers of Shinar, are now in the process of fulfillment, and all the events foretold will soon have come to pass." Ellen G. White, **The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary**, volume 4, p. 1166. Bold is mine.*

Should we not be dedicating our time to the comprehension of these extremely important chapters?

Referring to God's people in the very last remnant of time, Gabriel promises:

"Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand." (**Daniel 12:10**).

Is it not time to understand?

LESSON #24 – ELLEN WHITE’S VIEW OF DANIEL 11

Ellen White’s Use of Daniel 11

To my knowledge there are only **three primary** Ellen G. White references to Daniel 11 (except for the one in **A Word to the Little Flock Scattered Abroad** to which we will make reference later). **Two** of these references are **general** in nature but **one** is quite **specific**. Only in the specific reference does Ellen White quote any verses from the chapter. Unfortunately she never quotes nor does she even allude to the language of **verses 40-45**.

This silence on verses 40-45 has led some to conclude that Ellen White had nothing to say about them. We therefore ask: Did Ellen White have anything to say about these verses or does her silence indicate that their meaning would only be understood in the end time after her death? In this paper we will seek to answer this question.

Here are the three quotations (all bold type is mine unless specified):

*“The light that Daniel received from God was given especially for these last days. The visions he saw by the banks of the **Ulai [Daniel 8:2]** and the **Hiddekel [Daniel 10:4]**, the great rivers of Shinar, are now in **process** of fulfillment, and all the events foretold **will soon come to pass.**”* **Testimonies to Ministers**, p. 112 **Letter 57**, 1896

*“The world is stirred with the spirit of war. **The prophecy of the eleventh chapter of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment.** Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place.”* **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 9, p. 14 1909)

*“We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. **The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated.** In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that “shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.” [Verses 31-36, quoted.] **Scenes similar to those** described in these words will take place.”* **Manuscript Releases**, volume 13, p. 394 **Letter 103**, 1904

An Analysis of Ellen White's Use of Daniel 11

Several things need to be said about the three quotations above:

The quotation from Testimonies to Ministers, p. 112 (1896) provides **two key items** of information: First, the prophecies of Daniel eight and eleven are **parallel** and second, they were in the **process of fulfillment** though she does not specify at which stage the prophecy was in its fulfillment when she wrote.

The quotation in 9 Testimonies for the Church, p. 14 (1909), adds some very valuable information: When Ellen White wrote, the prophecy of Daniel 11 had **nearly reached its complete fulfillment**. This means that in 1909 the process of fulfillment of Daniel 11 was toward the end of the chapter.

The quotation from 13 Manuscript Releases, p. 394 (1904) contains some significant information not found in the other references.

Here Ellen White explains that **much of the history** that **has taken place** in the fulfillment of this chapter will be repeated.

The critical question is this: "Which history was she referring to?" Fortunately we don't have to guess because she immediately quotes verses 30-36. Then, right after she quotes verses 30-36, she again repeats the thought that **much of the history** that has occurred in fulfillment of these verses will be repeated when she says: "**Scenes similar** to those described in these words **will take place.**"

Clearly Ellen White understood that verses 30-36 (as well as verses 37-39 which she does not quote) were fulfilled in the past. It must be then that the similar scenes that will be fulfilled in the future are to be found in verses 40-45.

It is important to realize that Ellen White is **not** saying that these verses have a **dual fulfillment**. What she **is** saying is that much of **the history** that fulfilled these verses will be repeated. In other words, it is **not the prophecy** that will be fulfilled again but rather **the history** which fulfilled the prophecy.

A Repetition of History

"And why will history be repeated?" Simply because the power that is described in verses 30-39 (the Roman Catholic papacy) received a deadly wound after it ruled for 1260 years but its deadly wound will be healed (**Revelation 13:3**) and it will once again behave as it did in the past. Thus the history of the past papal oppression will be repeated in the future.

In summary: Ellen White believed that Daniel 11:30-36 **was fulfilled** in the past (and also verses 37-39 though she does not quote them). She also believed that much of **the history** described in these verses would be repeated in **similar** fashion. If verses 30-39 had already been fulfilled

in the past in Ellen White's day then the future repetition of the history of these verses must be found in verses 40-45.

Notice the following three quotations on the past and future role of the papacy:

*"The influence of Rome in the countries that once acknowledged her dominion is still far from being destroyed. And prophecy foretells a **restoration of her power**. "I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast." Verse 3. **The Great Controversy**, p. 579*

*"When our nation shall so abjure the principles of its government as to enact a Sunday law, Protestantism will in this act join hands with popery; it will be nothing else that **giving life** [which means that it must have been dead] to the tyranny which has long been eagerly watching its opportunity to **spring again** [which means that the active despotism must have existed before] into active despotism." **5 Testimonies for the Church**, p. 712*

*"When the land which the Lord provided as an asylum for his people, that they might worship him according to the dictates of their own consciences, the land over which for long years the shield of Omnipotence has been spread, the land which God has favored by making it the depository of the pure religion of Christ,--when that land shall, through its legislators, abjure the principles of Protestantism, and give countenance to Romish apostasy in tampering with God's law,--it is then that the final work of the man of sin will be revealed. Protestants will throw their whole influence and strength on the side of the Papacy; by a national act enforcing the false Sabbath, they will **give life and vigor** [which means that the corrupt faith of Rome must have been dead for a period] to the corrupt faith of Rome, **reviving** [which means that her tyranny and oppression of conscience were dead for a while] her tyranny and oppression of conscience. Then it will be time for God to work in mighty power for the vindication of his truth." **Signs of the Times**, June 12, 1893*

Ellen White's View of Daniel 12:1, 2

Though Ellen White never quoted or even alluded to the language of Daniel 11:40-45 in the book **The Great Controversy**, she did quote **Daniel 12:1**. I believe that her quotation of Daniel 12:1 contains the key which unlocks her understanding of verses 40-45.

Notice the quotation from **The Great Controversy**, p. 613:

*"At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, everyone that shall be found written in the book." Daniel 12:1. When the third angel's message closes, mercy no longer pleads for the guilty inhabitants of the earth." **The Great Controversy**, p. 613.*

Because Ellen White did not quote or allude to verses 40-45 we cannot work **inductively** to determine how she understood their meaning. What we must do then is work **deductively** from Daniel 12:1, 2 backwards.

Let's take a look at Daniel 12:1, 2:

*"At that time **Michael shall stand up**, the great prince who stands watch over the sons of your people; and there shall be a **time of trouble**, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that time. And at that time your people **shall be delivered**, everyone who is found written in the book. And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth **shall awake**, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt."*

The bold type indicates that there are **four consecutive events** described in Daniel 12:1, 2:

1. The standing up of Michael
2. The time of trouble
3. The deliverance of God's people
4. The special resurrection

Now let's notice how Ellen G. White developed these four events in **The Great Controversy** but in reverse order beginning with the special resurrection:

- **The Great Controversy**, p. 637: She quotes Daniel 12:2 on the **special resurrection**
- *"Graves are opened, and "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth. . . awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Daniel 12:2."*
- **The Great Controversy**, p. 635: She titles the chapter '**God's People Delivered**' and then states:
- *"The people of God--some in prison cells, some hidden in solitary retreats in the forests and the mountains--still plead for divine protection, while in every quarter companies of armed men, urged on by hosts of evil angels are preparing for the work of death. It is now, in the hour of utmost extremity that the God of Israel will interpose for the **deliverance of His chosen.**"*
- It will be noticed also that Ellen White concluded the previous chapter with the following words:
- *"Glorious will be the **deliverance** of those who have patiently waited for His coming and whose **names are written** in the book of life." **The Great Controversy**, p. 634*
- **The Great Controversy**, p. 616: Ellen White begins her description of the time of trouble through which God's people will go:
- *"The people of God will then be plunged into those scenes of affliction and distress described by the prophet as the **time of Jacob's trouble.**"*

- **The Great Controversy**, p. 613: Notably, Ellen White begins the chapter on the ‘Time of Trouble’ by quoting Daniel 12:1 and then amplifies the meaning of the standing up of Michael.
- *“Then Jesus **ceases His intercession** in the sanctuary above. . . When He leaves the sanctuary, darkness covers the inhabitants of the earth. In that fearful time the righteous must live in the sight of a holy God **without an intercessor.**”*

Summary of Ellen White’s Comments on Daniel 12:1, 2:

- **The Great Controversy**, p. 613: The standing up of Michael
- **The Great Controversy**, p. 616: The time of trouble
- **The Great Controversy**, p. 635: God’s people delivered
- **The Great Controversy**, p. 637: The special resurrection

It will be noticed that Ellen White develops the events of Daniel 12:1, 2 in their proper order.

Ellen White’s View of Daniel 11:40-45

It is extremely important to realize that Daniel 12:1, 2 cannot be understood independently of its context. Daniel 12:1, 2 is actually a continuation of the flow of events that transpired in the previous verses. This is clearly indicated by the fact that Daniel 12:1 begins with a time reference, “at that time.” This time reference links Daniel 12:1 with what occurred previously in verses 40-45.

Now the key question is: “Where would we expect to find Ellen White’s comments about what takes place before Daniel 12:1?” The answer is unmistakable: It must be in the pages that immediately precede the chapter on the time of trouble.

The Literary Structure of Daniel 11:44b-45 and 12:1

Now let’s look carefully at the literary structure of Daniel 11:44b-45 as it relates to Daniel 12:1 in order to ascertain to what event the expression “at that time” refers to. A comparison of these two passages reveals that they are describing the **same events** in the **same order** but with a **different terminology** and **emphasis**.

Daniel 11:44b-45:

- A. The King of the North goes out to destroy and annihilate many (11:44b)
- B. The King of the North sets up the tents of his palace between the sea and the glorious holy mountain (11:45a)
- C. The King of the North comes to his end with none to help him (11:45b)

Daniel 12:1

- A. Michael stands up to defend His people (parallel to 11:44b)
- B. A time of trouble such as never was (parallel to 11:45a)
- C. God's people delivered (parallel to 11:45b)

Daniel 11:44b-45 and 12:1 are precisely parallel but they portray a different emphasis. Whereas Daniel 11:44b-45 highlights the activities of the king of the north and its destiny for oppressing God's people, Daniel 12:1 focuses on the jeopardy of God's people at the hand of the king of the north and their deliverance by God.

Thus, when the king of the north goes *"out with great fury to destroy and annihilate many"* (11:44b), Michael will stand up to protect and defend them (12:1a). When the king of the north places the tents of his palace in a strategic location to deliver the final death blow against God's people (11:45a; vividly described in **The Great Controversy**, p. 635), they will go through a terrible time of trouble (12:1b), but the king of the north will *"come to his end with none to help him"* (11:45b) when God intervenes to deliver His people who are written in the book (12:1c). The expression *"at that time"* thus links Daniel 11:44b-45 with Daniel 12:1.

But what about Daniel 11:44a? This phrase explains the reason why the king of the north will go out and attempt to destroy and annihilate many: *"But news from the east and the north shall trouble him [the king of the north]; therefore he shall go out with great fury to destroy and annihilate many."* What is this news from the east and the north that so infuriates the king of the north? We must go to the book of Revelation for the answer.

Revelation 7:2 describes an angel who ascends **from the east** having the seal of the living God. This angel comes to seal the faithful of God upon their foreheads. In contrast, the land beast will impose the mark of the beast (**Revelation 13:15, 16**).

Revelation 18:1-5 portrays a powerful angel who descends **from heaven** (the north according to **Isaiah 14:13**) and gives a clarion call for God's people to reject the mark of the beast and to get out of Babylon before she is destroyed.

Thus the tidings from the north and from the east are identified by the book of Revelation as the message of the sealing and the call to come out of Babylon.

Ellen White concurs with this Biblical view. The chapter immediately preceding the one on the time of trouble (**The Great Controversy**, p. 613) is titled "The Final Warning." Ellen White begins this chapter in **The Great Controversy**, p. 603 by quoting Revelation 18:1, 2, 4, 5. In perfect accordance with Revelation 7:2 she describes the issue that will divide the world:

"While the observance of the false sabbath in compliance with the law of the state, contrary to the fourth commandment, will be an avowal of allegiance to a power that is in opposition to God, the keeping of the true Sabbath, in obedience to God's law, is an evidence of loyalty to the

*Creator. While one class, by accepting the sign of submission to earthly powers, receive the **mark of the beast**, the other choosing the token of allegiance to divine authority, receive the **seal of God.**" The Great Controversy, p. 605*

Ellen White then goes on to describe the anger that this message will cause in the religious world:

*"The power attending the message will only **madden** those who oppose it." The Great Controversy, p, 607*

*"The power attending the last warning has **enraged the wicked**; their **anger** is kindled against all who have received the message, and Satan will excite to still greater intensity the **spirit of hatred** and persecution." The Great Controversy, p. 614, 615*

We have covered in this paper only the events from Daniel 11:44 to Daniel 12:1. But if we continue moving backwards in The Great Controversy we will find, in reverse order, that she expounds upon each phrase of Daniel 11:40-45 ending with the chapter on "The Bible and the French Revolution" where the deadly wound of Daniel 11:40a is described The Great Controversy, p. 265-288.

Ellen G. White and Islam

It is simply amazing how Ellen White vividly describes the events of Daniel 11:40-45 without ever quoting the verses or alluding to the language. The question begs to be asked: "Why didn't she just come out and quote the verses and then comment on them?" There is a clear historical reason.

The original view of the pioneers was that the king of the north represents the Roman Catholic papacy. This is the clear view expressed in the pamphlet A Word to the Little Flock Scattered Abroad, co-authored by James and Ellen White in 1847. But in the early 1870's Uriah Smith (who was the highly respected editor of the Adventist Review and Sabbath Herald) changed the view of the pioneers by reinterpreting the king of the north as Turkey. You see, in Smith's day Turkey was prominent in the news so he changed the traditional view to fit current events.

James White was flabbergasted by Smith's new view and accused him of removing one of the landmarks of the Advent Movement. Things started getting nasty and members began taking sides. In this context, Ellen White instructed her husband to desist of his criticism. She knew that an understanding of Daniel 11:40-45 was not a matter of life and death at that time. Her main concern at the moment was to preserve the unity of the church. If Ellen White had quoted the verses of Daniel 11:40-45 and offered a view contradictory to Uriah Smith's, she would have been accused of nepotism so she commented on these verses without quoting them or alluding to the language knowing full well that someday someone would discover her view of the matter.

Significantly, in the last half of **The Great Controversy**, Ellen White does not mention Islam, even once, as fulfilling Bible prophecy in the end time. It appears that Ellen White saw no prophetic significance to the rising of radical Islam.

Ellen White's silence on the role of Islam in Bible prophecy has puzzled some Seventh-day Adventist scholars who have concluded that Ellen White simply did not have all the light on end time events. Some of these scholars have even reached the conclusion that Ellen White was wrong in her interpretation of the little horn as a symbol of the papacy and have reinterpreted it as Islam.

I am not saying that Islam might not play a role in the **precipitation** of end time events as they are described in **The Great Controversy**. It is true that Islam might **precipitate** the fulfillment of Bible prophecies concerning the United States and the papacy, but the rising power of militant Islam is not contemplated directly by prophecy itself.

That is to say, radical Islam does not fulfill any specific end time prophecy but very well could serve as the catalyst for the fulfillment of prophecy. After all, radical Islam has brought the United States to prominence, it has made the curtailing of our civil and religious liberties easier and it has also misdirected the eyes of Christians (and even a few Seventh-day Adventists) to the Middle East for the fulfillment of prophecy.

Time has proven that Uriah Smith's reinterpretation of the king of the north was wrong. Will we learn from his mistake? Will we ever learn that the best way to understand prophecy is not to read the newspapers or to watch CNN but rather to study our Bibles?

LESSON #25 – NOTES ON DANIEL 11 (a work in progress)

Brief Historical Overview of the Interpretation of Daniel 11

It is not our objective to provide a full historical overview of the interpretation of Daniel 11 in Seventh-day Adventist history. This has been done comprehensively by Donald E. Mansell in his excellent work, **Adventists and Armageddon** (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1999). Our concern here is to briefly trace how the pioneers understood this chapter, how Uriah Smith shifted this understanding in 1871, and how Seventh-day Adventists have returned to the pioneer view in recent years. Let's begin our survey with William Miller.

William Miller was not a Seventh-day Adventist. However, because of his influence on Seventh-day Adventist prophetic interpretation, it would be well to examine his view. Miller believed that Daniel 11 followed the same historical sequence as Daniel 2, 7 and 8-9. His understanding is clearly expressed in his monumental book, **Evidence from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the Year 1843**, (1836 edition) p. 73. After showing how Daniel 11 traces in chronological order the history of Persia, Greece, and Pagan Rome, Miller writes about the king of the north:

“And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished, for that, that is determined shall be done.’ The king here spoken of is the same as Daniel’s little horn, which came up among the ten horns. It is the same that blasphemed the God of heaven. It is mystical Babylon. Isa. xiv. 12-15; Rev. xiii. 5, 6. The same Paul has described in his epistle, II Thess. ii. 1-9.”

Clearly William Miller believed the king of the north to be the Roman Catholic papacy. Miller reached this conclusion by following the historicist principles which guided him in his study of Bible prophecy.

To our knowledge, the earliest reference to the king of the north in Seventh-day Adventist literature is found in a pamphlet co-authored by James and Ellen White which was published on May 30, 1847:

“Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in Chap. 11 comes to his end, and none to help him. This power is the last that treads down the true church of God: and as the true church is still trodden down, and cast out by Christendom, it follows that the last oppressive power has not ‘come to his end’; and Michael has not stood up. This last power that treads

down the saints is brought to view in Revelation v. 13:11-18. His number is 666.” (James and Ellen White, *A Word to the Little Flock Scattered Abroad*, p. 9).

It is clear that James and Ellen White agreed with Miller’s interpretation of the king of the north. As is well known, in **The Great Controversy** Ellen White clearly identifies the beast whose number is 666 as the Roman Catholic papacy.

This early view of William Miller and James and Ellen White went virtually unchallenged for twenty-five years. But in 1871 Uriah Smith shifted the traditional view of the king of the north from the Papacy to Turkey. This led James White to accuse Smith or ‘removing the landmarks fully established in the Advent Movement.’ Raymond F. Cottrell, who in the late 1940's and early 1950's did extensive research in this area, remarks:

“James White in the Review of November 29, 1877, some years after Uriah Smith had shifted from his own original position substituting Turkey for Rome . . . wrote advising caution in the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy and found Uriah Smith ‘removing the landmarks fully established in the Advent Movement’. This article leaves no doubt that the position making Rome the power of Daniel 11:45 and Revelation 16:12 had been ‘fully established’ as a ‘landmark’ in the Advent Movement prior to that time, and that it was held by the pioneers of this message, without exception down to at least 1863.” Raymond F. Cottrell, ‘The Pioneers on Daniel Eleven and Armageddon.’ Paper available at the Andrews University Heritage Room

In an article published in **The Review and Herald** on October 3, 1878, James White presented the main reason why the king of the north could not be Turkey:

“If the feet and ten toes of the metallic image are Roman, if the beast with the ten horns that was given to the burning of the flames of the great day be the Roman beast, if the little horn which stood up against the Prince of princes be Rome, and if the same field and distance are covered by these four prophetic chains, then the last power of the eleventh chapter, which is ‘to come to his end and none shall help him,’ is Rome. But if this be Turkey, as some teach, then the toes of the image of the second chapter are Turkish, the beast with the ten horns of the seventh chapter represents Turkey, and it was Turkey that stood up against the Prince of princes in the eighth chapter of Daniel.”

Though James White was probably exaggerating when he called the pioneer view of the king of the north a ‘landmark’ (the landmarks were identified by Ellen White as: The sanctuary, the law, the Sabbath, the non-immortality of the soul and the Second Advent), the fact still remains that this was the original pioneer view, a view which Uriah Smith changed in 1871. It has been well documented by Donald E. Mansell that Smith changed his view because events involving Turkey were prominently in the news around 1871. Thus Smith allowed the newspaper to dictate his interpretation of the king of the north.

It might surprise some to know that Ellen White never actually quoted any verse from Daniel 11:40-45. In fact, to my knowledge, Ellen White only referred to Daniel 11 three times (other than duplicate quotes) in her writings. One of these references is general in nature, another is indirect and general and a third is quite specific. Here is her general reference:

*“The world is stirred with the spirit of war. The prophecy of the eleventh chapter of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place.” (Ellen G. White, **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 9, p. 14)*

In her indirect and general statement Ellen White comments:

*“The light that Daniel received direct from God was given especially for these last days. The visions he saw by the banks of the Ulai [Daniel 8] and the Hiddekel [Daniel 10-11], the great rivers of Shinar, are now in the process of fulfillment, and all the events foretold will soon have come to pass.” (Ellen G. White, **Testimonies to Ministers**, pp. 112-113)*

The third reference is the only time that Ellen G. White quotes from Daniel 11:

*“Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with a spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the **history** that **has taken place** in the fulfillment of this prophecy will be **repeated**. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that ‘shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.’ [Ellen White then quotes verses 31-36]. Scenes **similar** to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them.” (Ellen G. White, **Letter** 103, 1904)*

One point must be underlined in this quotation. Ellen White saw a repetition of the scenes described in Daniel 11:30-36. But this does not necessarily mean she believed that these verses would receive a dual fulfillment. Ellen White does not say that this **prophecy** will be fulfilled a second time. What she does say is that **much** of the **history** which **fulfilled** this prophecy will be repeated. What she is saying is simply that future scenes will be **similar** to those described in these verses. And why would this be? Simply because the papacy, the power described in these verses which oppressed the saints of God for 1260 years will resurrect from its mortal wound to once again oppress them but on a much larger scale. This end-time persecution after the healing of the deadly wound is described in verses 40-45. Thus, as we shall see, verses 40-45 describe the repetition of much of the history that is depicted in verses 30-36.

It is well known that Ellen White reproved her husband for his confrontational spirit against Uriah Smith on the issue of the king of the north. Some have taken Ellen White’s scarce comments on Daniel 11 and her rebuke of James White as an indication that she sided with Smith on this issue. In actual fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Ellen White simply felt that **at that time** there were far more important issues on which to expend spiritual energy than to argue about the identity of the king of the north. A careful study of **Early Writings** and **The Great Controversy** reveals that theologically, Ellen White was on her husband’s side on this issue. On the **practical** side, however, Ellen White knew that Daniel 11 was not Present Truth at that time and so her primary interest was on keeping the peace in the church.

As we study Daniel 11 we shall see that Ellen White's view on the king of the north is absolutely clear and unequivocal. As previously noted, her earliest view held that the king of the north is the papacy, and this continued to be her understanding until at least 1911 when the present edition of **The Great Controversy** was published.

Ellen White's methodology in the exposition of Daniel 11 is masterful. Though she never actually quoted any verse from Daniel 11:40-45 and never even employed the terminology, the careful reader of **Early Writings**, pp. 269-273 and **The Great Controversy**, pp.211-236, 563-637 will see that she did indeed have much to say on the meaning of these verses. In my chart, '*The Structure of the **Great Controversy** and **Early Writings** as Compared to Daniel 11 and Revelation*' I have shown that the chronological flow of events in Ellen White is identical to that of Daniel 11:40-45. But Ellen White, instead of using Daniel's language, employs her own.

Perhaps it might be well to give an example of what I mean. Although Ellen White never actually quoted from Daniel 11:40-45, she did frequently quote from Daniel 12:1-3. This is important because the opening phrase of Daniel 12:1 (**'at that time'**) reveals that Daniel 12:1-3 is actually the continuation and conclusion of the argument of Daniel 11:40-45. That is to say, the standing up of Michael in 12:1 follows immediately after the king of the north goes out to destroy and annihilate many (Daniel 11:44-45).The chapter division at this point is unfortunate.

In **The Great Controversy**, p. 613, we find the beginning of the chapter titled, '*The Time of Trouble*'. Ellen White began this chapter by quoting Daniel 12:1. This is a critical reference point which will help us comprehend how Ellen White's understood the meaning of the king of the north. The next chapter is titled '*God's People Delivered*' (p. 635) and then on page 637, Ellen White explains the special resurrection and quotes Daniel 12:2. One cannot help but see that in these pages Ellen White is commenting on three events of Daniel 12:1-2 in their proper chronological order: 1) The standing up of Michael and the time of trouble, 2) the deliverance of God's people, 3) the special resurrection.

Now, if Daniel 12:1-2 is a continuation of the events described in Daniel 11:40-45 then we would expect Ellen White to comment on these verses immediately before she quotes Daniel 12:1. And what do we find in **The Great Controversy** just before the chapter on 'The Time of Trouble'? A careful examination of the chapters which immediately precede 'The Time of Trouble' leaves no doubt about Ellen White's understanding of the king of the north. In these chapters she writes about the healing of **the papacy's mortal wound** through the aid of the civil powers of the world and apostate Protestantism. Notably, she also writes about how the loud cry and the sealing message will fill the wicked with rage against the remnant and how the persecution which ensues will cause a great shaking among God's people. Later on in our study we will see in greater detail how Ellen White followed the precise chronological sequence of Daniel 11:40-12:3. But for now, suffice it to say that Ellen White was far from silent on the identity of the king of the north.

Uriah Smith's new view of the king of the north ruled for many decades in Seventh-day Adventist prophetic interpretation. Evangelists preached many a spectacular sermon on the fall of Turkey, the drying up of the river Euphrates and the mustering of the nations of the East for

one great final battle against the Western Nations in the Valley of Meggido. The Pioneer view seemed to be dead, buried and forgotten.

But then, in the 1930's, the Australian evangelist Louis F. Were began reexamining the prophecy of Daniel 11 and resurrected the pioneer view. Amidst much denominational opposition from the 'old guard' and at the cost of his ministerial credentials, Louis Were nudged the church back to the original view. The work of Louis Were was built upon by scholars such as Raymond F. Cottrell and Hans LaRondelle. Presently, the church has come full circle back to the original view of the pioneers and none too soon! What was not Present Truth in Uriah Smith's day is certainly Present Truth in a day when the Papacy, Protestantism and the civil powers seem to be courting each other on an unprecedented scale.

Structural Considerations

It is not our intention to study the whole of Daniel 11. This would take us far beyond the scope of this paper. What we wish to do is zero in on verses 30-45. However, before we can do this we must determine where these verses fit within the historical flow of events described in the chapter. The historical sequence in verses 2-39 seems to follow the same basic order as that of Daniel 8. But starting with verse 40 what was only hinted at in Daniel 8 (verses 17, 19, 25-26) is described in minute detail in 11:40-12:1.

Daniel 11:2-39

- 11:2 _____ Persia (**Daniel 8:3**), the fourth king being Artaxerxes
- 11:3 _____ Greece (Alexander the Great, **Daniel 8:4**)
- 11:4 _____ Division of Alexander's Greek empire (**Daniel 8:4**)
- 11:20-22 _____ Pagan Rome (**Daniel 8:9-10**)
- 11:30-39 _____ Papal Rome during the 1260 years (**Daniel 8:11-12**)

Daniel 11:40-12:1

- 11:40A _____ Papacy mortally wounded by France in 1798
- 11:40B _____ Papacy's deadly wound is healed as it moves south from the Euphrates
- 11:40C _____ Papacy conquers the countries north of spiritual Israel
- 11:41 _____ Papacy enters the Glorious Land of Israel and many people fall
- 11:41 _____ Edom, Moab and Ammon flee to Jerusalem to escape from the Papacy
- 11:42 _____ The Papacy moves south and overcomes Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya
- 11:43 _____ Great riches accumulated by the Papacy
- 11:44 _____ When in the south, tidings from the north and east trouble the Papacy
- 11:45 _____ The Papacy readies to attack God's people in Jerusalem
- 12:1 _____ Judgment Ends when Michael stands up (in **Daniel 8:13-14** the hour of God's judgment began)

Principles of Interpretation

Careful notice must be taken of the geographical progression of the king of the North's conquests as noted in the chart above. In Daniel 11:40-45, the invasions of the king of the north are compared with the Euphrates river at flood stage (see also **Isaiah 8:7-8; Revelation 16:12-16; 17:1-6, 15**). The overflowing river originates in Babylon and then moves west and overwhelms the countries north of Israel (verse 40). It then continues moving south, enters the glorious land of Palestine and overthrows many people (verse 41). As it overwhelms Edom, Moab and Ammon east of Israel, multitudes escape from these nations to Jerusalem (verse 41). The river then continues moving south overcoming Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya (verses 42-43).

However, when the king of the north is in Egypt, south and west of Israel, tidings from the north and the east (these tidings are coming from Jerusalem because Jerusalem is north and east of Egypt) shake him up (verse 44) so he moves to the north and east setting up the tents of his palace in the Valley of Meggido between the Mediterranean and Mount Zion intent on making a devastating strike against the Holy City where the tidings are coming from (verse 45). It is vital to realize that at this point, the king of the north has overcome the whole civilized world of the time. Only one victory remains to be gained, against Jerusalem. If the king of the north could conquer Jerusalem, his victory would be complete. But when he is about to strike the final blow, he comes to his end with none to help him.

A very important question at this juncture is this: In the end-time, are we to understand the king of the north, the king of the south, Edom, Ammon, Moab, Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia literally or are we to see in them symbols of worldwide religious and political systems? That is to say, are we to understand the king of the north as Russia invading the literal land of Israel, conquering literal Egypt and ending up at literal Jerusalem?

Obviously, we cannot take Edom, Ammon and Moab literally because they do not even exist as nations anymore. If we cannot take these nations literally, why should we take the others so? Is there a guiding principle to help us understand this prophecy and if so, what is it? Louis Were suggests the following succinct principle:

*"When passing over into the Christian era there is an automatic transition from literal to spiritual Babylon; from literal to spiritual Jerusalem; from the literal lands of Israel and Babylon to their spiritual antitypes." (Louis F. Were, **The King of the North at Jerusalem**, p. 75)*

As we saw in our study of the seventy weeks, when Stephen was stoned, the door of probation closed for the Jewish theocracy and the Gentiles became God's new spiritual and worldwide Israel (see, **Galatians 3:16, 26-29; Romans 2:28-29; 9:6-8**). No longer were there to be any holy mountains (see **John 4:20-24**). Today, where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there He is in the midst of them (**Matthew 18:20**). That is to say, the holy land today is worldwide and includes those who are spiritually linked to Jesus Christ. Those who are not gathered to Christ, scatter (**Luke 11:23**).

In Hebrews 8:8 we are told that the new covenant (see **Matthew 26:28**) is made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Are we to understand that the new covenant is only for **literal** Israel and **literal** Judah? If the language of Hebrews 8:8 were taken literally, we would have to reach this conclusion. But not even the staunchest dispensationalist would go so far as to say that the new covenant applies only to literal Israel. The new covenant is made with a spiritual and worldwide Israel. This must mean that the enemies of Israel are also to be interpreted as spiritual and worldwide. (For other examples, see how Ellen White uses Zechariah 12:8 in **5 Testimonies for the Church**, p. 81 and Isaiah 4:3-4 in **5 Testimonies for the Church**, p. 475, 476; Ellen G. White, **Prophets & Kings**, p. 92).

This principle has extremely important implications for the study of the prophecy of Daniel 11. It means that all the events in Daniel 11 before the year 34 are to be interpreted literally. Thus, the king of the north in verses 3-15 represents literal Syria, which was literally north of Israel, and the king of the south represents literal Egypt which was literally south of Israel. But in Daniel 11:40, Israel (the glorious land) is worldwide and spiritual and therefore the king of the north and the king of the south are to be understood as worldwide and spiritual. This principle also holds true with Edom, Moab, Ammon, Ethiopia and Libya. The same could be said about the **people** of Daniel. In Daniel 9:24 the prophet was informed by Gabriel those seventy weeks were determined for his people and city. The people and city in this case are to be understood as literal Israelites in the literal city of Jerusalem. But in Daniel 10:14; 12:1 the people of Daniel must be interpreted as spiritual and worldwide Israel. With this principle in mind, let us now do a verse by verse study of Daniel 11:31-12:3.

Comments on Daniel 11:31

Before we begin our comments on verse 31 it would be well to identify the king of the north.

The Bible clearly teaches that the **true** King of the north is God who dwells on Mount Zion in the heavenly Jerusalem (**Isaiah 14:12-14; Psalm 48:1-2; Matthew 5:35-36**). In ages past, Satan attempted to overthrow God and usurp His throne in heaven, but he failed. Consequently Satan set up a rival kingdom on earth. In this way, Satan became the **counterfeit** king of the north, wanting to usurp the legitimate position of God. As God sits in the heavenly Jerusalem temple in the sides of the north, Satan sits in the earthly temple in the sides of the symbolic north planting a counterfeit religion on the church. The north is not a denial of God and religion but rather the establishment of a false god and a false religion. (**II Thessalonians 2:3-4**). God's kingdom is called Israel and Satan's kingdom is called Babylon. But there is more.

God the Father has his vicar or vice-regent, Jesus. Satan also has his vicar or vice-regent, the pope. Thus the two invisible champions--God and Satan--have their respective earthly representatives. Territorially speaking, Jerusalem, in the sides of the north, was God's Holy See in the Old Testament. There, David and his successors sat as types of Jesus, the King of kings and Lord of lords (**Revelation 17:14**). On the other hand, Satan's See in the Old Testament was Babylon, the arch-enemy of Israel. There sat Nebuchadnezzar, the counterfeit king of kings (**Ezekiel 26:7; see also 38:6, 15; 39:2**).

Biblically, the kingdom of the north was Assyria/Babylon because it was geographically north of Israel. Jeremiah warned Judah that an evil would come upon them from the north, a clear reference to Babylon (**Jeremiah 1:13-15; 4:6-7; 6:1, 22-23; 10:22; 25:9, 26; 31:8; Ezekiel 26:7**). Significantly, the invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar is described as an all-encompassing flood (**Jeremiah 47:2**). The flood of Babylon is identified as the river Euphrates (**Jeremiah 46:2, 6, 10, 20, 24; Joshua 24:2, 3, 14**). When the Assyrian King Senaquerib invaded Judah in the year 701 B. C., his military campaign was also described as an overwhelming flood (**Isaiah 8:7-8**). In Daniel 3 we find a clear description of Babylon's counterfeit religion. It seeks to impose by force its religion upon God's faithful remnant.

Literally speaking, the king of the north in Daniel 11 is Babylon. His invasion of the glorious land is compared to an overwhelming flood (**Daniel 11:40**). Symbolically however, the king of the north represents the papacy, which will employ 'multitudes, nations, tongues and people' (**Revelation 17:1, 15**) to attempt to overwhelm the end-time remnant church. For several reasons, the king of the north represents the same power as the little horn of Daniel 8.

Besides the fact that both the little horn and the king of the north follow Media and Persia in the prophetic chain, there are four other close parallels between the king of the north in this verse and the little horn in Daniel 8. As we have previously noted, the little horn of Daniel 8 represents the Roman Catholic papacy. This being the case, the king of the north in Daniel 11 must represent the same power. Let's take a look at the four parallels:

1) 'Arms shall stand on *his* part [on his behalf] . . .' (11:31 KJV)

Regarding the word 'arms,' Walter C. Kaiser remarks: "In the plural 'arms' is equivalent to military or political forces or armies (**Daniel 11:15, 22, 31**)" (R. Laird Harris, editor. **Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), volume 1, pp. 253-254) This means that the king of the north would be helped by the military forces of a political power (see **Psalms 37:17; Isaiah 44:12; Ezekiel 30:22-25; II Chronicles. 32:8; Daniel. 11:5**). One is reminded of the union of iron and clay in the feet of the image of Daniel 2. One is also reminded that the little horn would arise '*but not by his own power*' Daniel 8:24. Revelation 13:10 presents the same scenario. The beast used the sword to slay the saints and the same sword would slay him. Significant is the fact that the king of the north existed before this point but without the aid of 'arms'. II Thessalonians 2 underlines that the man of sin existed before the restrainer was removed and the restrainer was the Roman Empire.

This is the same idea we find in Daniel 8:12 where the little horn was given a host to carry on his nefarious work against the sanctuary, the Prince and the daily. As we have previously noted, the word 'host' in this context means 'army'. What is pictured here is the union of the religious and political powers, the union of church and state, if you please.

2) ‘. . . and **they** shall pollute the sanctuary of strength. . .’ (Daniel 11:31 KJV)

Significant here is the change of pronoun from the singular to the plural. The pronoun ‘they’ can be a reference to the armies or to the armies in union with the king of the north. I believe the proper sense in the context is the latter. In other words, the political power stands on behalf of the king of the north and then **they, together**, pollute the sanctuary. In what sense does this union of church and state pollute the sanctuary?

The Hebrew word *chalal* means ‘to pollute, to defile, to profane.’

One cannot miss the fact that the little horn of Daniel 8 also tramples upon the sanctuary, the Prince and the host of the Prince for which reason the sanctuary must be cleansed.

3) ‘. . . and shall take away the daily **sacrifice**. . .’ (Daniel 11:31 KJV)

In Daniel 8 the little horn, with the help of a **host that was given to him** (not by his own strength), takes away the daily and in Daniel 11 the king of the north takes away the daily with the help of **arms**. It is clear that these two prophecies are parallel.

Let’s talk now about the ‘daily’ (*tahmid*). What does this strange word mean? The problem with this word is that it is an adjective that stands alone unqualified by a noun. The question which begs to be answered is the following: The little horn takes away the daily what? The meaning of the word is simply ‘something which goes on continuously without interruption.’ But what is it that ‘goes on continuously without interruption’?

It bears noting that this word is accompanied by the definite article. It is **THE** daily (*hatamid*) which the little horn takes away (see also **Daniel 11:31; 12:11**). The **King James Version** adds the word ‘sacrifice,’ assuming that *tahmid* refers to the morning and evening sacrifice. But this is erroneous assumption. There is a Hebrew expression for this sacrifice which is *holat tamid*.

What, then, does this word mean? Let’s take a closer look (see Pastor Stephen P. Bohr’s, ‘What is the Daily that the Little Horn Took away?’) The Old Testament makes it abundantly clear that this word refers to the **daily ministration of the priest in the court and in the holy place of the sanctuary**. In other words, the little horn with the aid of the

armies was going to attempt to take away from the Prince of the host His ministrations in the court and in the holy place of the sanctuary.

In order to comprehend how the little horn along with the secular power did this, we need to answer two fundamental questions: **1)** In which sanctuary does the Prince carry on His ministry at this point in the vision? **2)** What does each of the pieces of furniture in the court and in the holy place represent? In other words, what is the symbolic significance of the altar of sacrifice, the seven branched candlestick, the table of showbread and the altar of incense? If we know the answer to these questions then we will be able to know also what the little horn attempted to take away from the Prince and when.

Let's answer the first question. There can be no doubt that the Prince of the host is Jesus. But where does Jesus minister today?

Let's go to the gospels to find the answer. We are told in Matthew 21:12-13 that at the end of the Triumphal Entry Jesus entered the '**temple of God**' and called it '**My Father's house**.' However, just a few days later Jesus announced to the Jewish leaders: '**Your house is left unto you desolate**' as he abandoned the temple for the last time (**Matthew 23:38**). Obviously a change had taken place. The Jerusalem Temple was no longer the Father's house or the temple of God because it had been forsaken by the presence of Jesus. In A. D. 70 the Jerusalem Temple was destroyed (**Luke 19:41-44; Matthew 24:1-3**) and has never been rebuilt. The conclusion is inevitable. It is impossible to conclude that the sanctuary the little horn and the armies trampled upon was the Jerusalem Temple. During the Christian dispensation when the little horn and the armies did their work, there was no earthly Jerusalem Temple in existence!!

But if it wasn't the literal Jerusalem temple that was trampled upon by the little horn and the armies (see also **Luke 21:24** and **Revelation 11:2**), then, which one was? The answer is two-fold.

Upon His ascension, Jesus physically began His ministry as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary (**Hebrews 8:1-2**). He is the real High Priest who ministers in the literal heavenly temple on the literal heavenly Mt. Zion in the literal heavenly Jerusalem. He is the minister of a better covenant because He presents before His Father His own better blood. He is the living *Shekinah* who dwells in the heavenly temple.

But there is more. Jesus is also the minister of the spiritual temple on earth which is the Church. This spiritual temple has spiritual foundation stones, spiritual building stones, a spiritual Cornerstone, and a spiritual *Shekinah* (the Holy Spirit) which entered it on the Day of Pentecost (see, **Ephesians 2:20-22**; **I Peter 2:1-10**; **I Corinthians 3:16-17**; **II Corinthians 6:14-18**; **II Thessalonians 2:3-4**).

In other words, Jesus ministers in **two places** at the same time: Physically in heaven and spiritually on earth through His representative, the Holy Spirit. His heavenly hosts are the angels and His earthly hosts are His saints.

So then, what is meant by the little horn and the armies taking away the 'daily' from the Prince and killing His hosts? It goes without saying that it cannot mean that the little horn and the armies literally and personally travelled to heaven and deposed the Prince and destroyed His angels. This idea would be preposterous. What, then, does it mean? The answer is found in Daniel 8:11 where we are told that the little horn cast down the **place** of the Prince's sanctuary. We have already shown that the place of the Prince's sanctuary is in the literal Temple in heaven and in His church on earth.

The word for 'place' (*makon*) here is unusual. There are some very common Hebrew words for 'place' in the Old Testament but this is not one of them. The word *makon* is used only 17 times in the Hebrew Bible and in 16 of these references the word denotes the **heavenly sanctuary** as God's dwelling place (**Exodus 15:17**). Perhaps it would be a good idea to look at a few of these references. In I Kings 8:39, 41, 43, 49 (and parallel passages in **II Chronicles 6:30, 33, 39**; study also **Psalms 89:14; 97:2** (KJV) where *makon* is translated, 'habitation') we are informed that God hears our prayers, forgives our sins, saves us and metes out His justice from His heavenly **place** (*makon*).

While the prayers of God's people are uttered on earth they are heard by God in heaven: *'Hear the plea of your servant and of your people Israel when they pray toward this place: O hear in heaven your dwelling place, heed and forgive.'* (**I Kings 8:30**; [What version?] see also **Daniel 6:10**). Thus there is an intimate connection between the earthly and heavenly temples. In a sense, God dwells in both!!

For our purposes here, it is important to remember that when Nebuchadnezzar came and destroyed the Jerusalem Temple, he was not able to touch the heavenly temple!! In the same way, the little horn was able to take over the functions of the Prince and kill His hosts on earth but he was not able to destroy the angels or take away the functions of the Prince in heaven.

The act of casting down the place of the Prince's sanctuary and the taking away of the daily does not mean that the little horn is demolishing the mortar and stones of the heavenly sanctuary. What it does mean is that the little horn usurps on earth the **daily ministration** of the heavenly Prince. What belongs to the Prince in heaven, the little horn usurps and sets up on earth. The place of the sanctuary is removed from heaven and set up on earth. The central issue is: Who will control the sanctuary service in the court and in the holy place? Significantly, at this point in the flow of church history, the little horn tries to interfere with the ministry of the Prince in the court and in the holy place. This is perfectly understandable because during the Middle Ages Jesus had not yet entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary.

And why is the control of the sanctuary such a vital issue? To answer this question we must return to our second question above: What was the meaning of the ministration of the priest at the altar of sacrifice, the candlestick, the table of showbread and the altar of incense? Let us examine each of these separately.

THE ALTAR OF SACRIFICE

In the earthly sanctuary service every morning and evening a lamb was offered and consumed upon the altar of sacrifice. As long as the Hebrew sanctuary and temple stood, there was never a time when the fire on this altar was extinguished. This was the **daily** burnt offering (**Exodus 29:39**). This sacrifice of the lamb, of course, represented the death of Jesus Christ on the cross (**John 1:29; I Peter 1:19; Revelation 13:8**). The fact that the sacrifice was offered **daily**, morning and evening, indicates that the efficacy of His sacrifice is perpetual. He died **once and for all and never needs to die again!** The benefits of His one and only sacrifice is brought out clearly in Hebrews 7:27 where the old Hebrew system is contrasted with the ministry of Christ: *'Who needeth not **daily**, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did **once** when he offered up himself.'*

And again in Hebrews 9:25-26: *'Not yet that he should offer himself **often**, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he **often** have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now **once** in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men **once** to die, but after this the judgment: So Christ was **once** offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.'*

The teaching of the once-for-all death of Jesus is counterfeited in the Roman Catholic sacrifice of the mass. In the mass the once-for-all sacrifice of Jesus is repeated over and over again. Instead of looking to the Lamb of God in heaven, Roman Catholic believers are taught to look at the wafer host where the ubiquitous body of Jesus is supposedly found. Instead of coming boldly to Jesus at the throne of grace **in heaven** to claim His once for all sacrifice, believers are taught that they are being nourished by feeding on the literal body of Jesus **on earth repeatedly**. In fact, the host is stored in a flower-like artifact called the Tabernacle. At the center of the artifact is the round wafer-like host and coming forth from the host are the rays of the sun. When the tabernacle is brought forth before the congregation, the faithful are taught to bow and worship the host. This is simply a refined and sophisticated system of sun-worship. Furthermore, in Roman Catholic theology, the priest on earth takes over the power and prerogatives of Jesus when he pronounces the words of consecration *hoc est corpus meum* ('this is my body'). Roman Catholic theology teaches that when these words are pronounced, the earthly priest has the power to transubstantiate or transform the wafer into the real body of Jesus. In other words, the earthly priest has the power to **create the Creator!!** This is blasphemy to the fullest degree.

THE TABLE OF SHOWBREAD

The table of the showbread contained two stacks of unleavened bread each with six loaves. By these twelve loaves, God wanted to teach Israel that there was sufficient bread to feed each and every one of the twelve tribes of Israel. This bread was called **(Numbers 4:7)** the '**continual**' (*tahmid*) bread because it was available continually to satisfy the spiritual needs of Israel. What did this bread represent?

In the Bible, bread is consistently used as a symbol of the Word of God. In Isaiah 55:10-11 we are told: *'For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither; but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and **bread** to the eater: **So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.'***

When Jesus was tempted by the devil to change stones into bread, He replied: *'Man shall not live by **bread** alone, but by every **word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'* **(Matthew 4:4;** see also **Deuteronomy 8:3-4)**. After Jesus fed 5000 men with only five loaves of bread and two fishes He made a very controversial remark: *'Except ye eat*

the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you' (**John 6:53**). Was Jesus teaching that we are to eat his literal flesh and drink His literal blood like Roman Catholic theology teaches? Absolutely not! Notice how Jesus explained His own striking remark: *'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the **words** that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life'* (**John 6:63**). That is to say, the words of Jesus have power to nourish the spiritual life. As literal bread sustains physical life, the Word of God sustains spiritual life. Spiritually speaking, when we study the Word we spiritually assimilate Jesus and he becomes flesh of our flesh and bone of our bones.

It is the ingrafted Word of God which cleanses our life and gives us the victory over sin. David understood this when he exclaimed: *'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy **word** . . . Thy **word** have I hid in mine heart that I might not sin against thee'* (**Psalms 119:9, 11**).

Jesus agreed with David when He said to His disciples: *'Now ye are clean through the **word** which I have spoken unto you'* (**John 15:3**). And the apostle Paul adds his testimony when he states that the church is sanctified and cleansed *'with the washing of the water by the **word**'* (**Ephesians 5:26**).

What have we discovered so far about the showbread? First of all, it represents Jesus as He is contained in the written Word of God. Secondly, it is continually available to all of God's people. And thirdly, if assimilated, it will nourish the life spiritually and provide victory over sin.

In What sense, then, did the little horn cast down the meaning of the table of the showbread? The answer is not hard to find. Roman Catholicism substituted the traditions of men in place of the Word of God. The word of a supposedly infallible Magisterium was placed above a 'thus saith the Lord'. The number of unbiblical (or shall we say, anti-biblical?) traditions is legion: Purgatory, limbo, celibacy, auricular confession, an eternally burning hell, lent, processions, the mass, relics, canonization of saints, the rosary, bowing before images, the immaculate conception, the assumption of Mary, baptism of infants by aspersion, novenas, the observance of Sunday, etc, etc, etc.

And what was the end result of these traditions replacing the Word of God? Spiritual malnutrition and a moral laxity which made the pagan Romans look like saints!. It is no coincidence that the third and fourth seals of Revelation describe this period as one of famine for the Word of God (see, **Revelation 6:5-8**). In effect, the third horse (the period of Constantine) brings in the unbiblical teachings and practices of the pagans and the

result under the fourth horse (the 1260 years of papal dominion) is a life threatening scarcity of bread—famine!! This is also the period of the fourth church of Revelation. Under this church, Jezebel the harlot was in control. During this period of 1260 years there was no dew or rain and as a result there was famine for the Word of God. (**Revelation 2:20; 11:3, 6; 12:6, 14; cf. Amos 8:11-12**).

THE CANDLESTICK

According to Leviticus 24:1-4, one of the functions of the High Priest was to trim the wicks and replenish the oil in the seven-branched candlestick which was located in the holy place in the morning and in the evening. In this way he would make sure that the light of the candlestick burned continually (*tahmid*). What was represented by the candlestick? Let's interpret the symbols: The number seven represents totality and oil represents the Holy Spirit. But, what does the candlestick itself represent? Revelation 1 gives us the clear answer. The seven-branched candlestick represents seven stages in the history of the Christian church from the days of the apostles till the end of time. The symbol is clear. By receiving a fresh supply of the Holy Spirit morning and evening, the church was to enlighten the world with the gospel continually. At times, it appeared like the light of the church was about to be extinguished. Particularly during the period of Thyatira the light burned dim. This is why the period of papal oppression is known as the 'dark ages.'

THE GOLDEN ALTAR OF INCENSE

The incense which was offered upon this altar was called the 'perpetual (*tamid*) incense' because it was to be burned on the altar morning and evening continually. What did the incense represent? The incense upon the altar is connected with the **prayers** of the congregation. For example, in Luke 1:9-11 we are told that when Zacharias went into the temple to offer incense, the people were praying to God outside the holy place. In Psalm 141:2 David exclaims: '*Let my **prayer** be set forth before thee as incense. . . .*' Even more explicitly, Revelation 8:3-4 explains the meaning of this altar: '*And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it **with the prayers** of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, **ascended up before God** out of the angel's hand.*'

It appears from this passage that the incense represents the merits of Jesus which is mixed with the prayers of God's people. In other words, the incense which was placed

upon the golden altar represents the prayers of God's people which are mingled with the precious merits of Christ's blood and therefore are acceptable before the Father.

It is no coincidence that directly beyond this altar was the veil which divided the holy from the most holy and behind the veil stood the ark of covenant, a symbol of God's throne. When incense was offered on the golden altar, the smoke ascended up the curtain and entered the presence of God beyond the veil. This is why there were angels embroidered upon the curtain. The angels take our prayers to Jesus and by the merits of Jesus those prayers enter the very presence of God. This is the meaning of the ladder which Jacob saw in his dream (see, **Genesis 28:11-12** and **John 1:51**).

In what sense did the little horn take away this function from the Prince? Roman Catholicism has established a counterfeit priesthood to whom the faithful confess their sins. That is to say, instead of people directing their prayers to Jesus in heaven for forgiveness, they utter them to human priests on earth who cannot forgive. In this way, the intercessory ministry of Jesus is cast down from heaven and placed on earth!! Furthermore, the faithful in Roman Catholicism offer their petitions to Mary and the saints instead of to Jesus. In consequence, the eyes of people are taken off of Jesus who can truly hear their petitions and forgive their sins.

The Bible is crystal clear that there is but '**one mediator** between God and men, the man Christ Jesus' (**I Timothy 2:5**). Jesus tells us: '*I am the way, the truth and the life, no man cometh unto the father but **by me***' (**John 14:6**). In Romans 8:34 the apostle Paul explains that it is Jesus who '*makes intercession for us.*' And in words which are impossible to misunderstand, the book of Hebrews explicitly tells that Jesus '*is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them*' (**Hebrews 7:25**). Why do we need mere human intermediaries when we can come boldly to the throne of grace through Jesus, the God-Man? The confessional in Roman Catholicism focuses the attention of people upon a man on earth instead of directing them to Christ in heaven.

Summarizing, then, there are two princes that are struggling for the souls of human beings. One of them performs a continual ministry of salvation in the heavenly sanctuary by pleading the blood of His one and only sacrifice before the Father (the altar of sacrifice). He feeds His people with the Word of God (the table of showbread), keeps the light of the church burning by the power of the Holy Spirit (the candlestick) and forgives those who come to Him in penitence and prayer (the golden altar of incense).

The other prince, unable to usurp the heavenly ministry of the Prince, establishes a counterfeit continual ministry (the mass, tradition, the confessional, the pope) in the earthly temple—the church (see **II Thessalonians 2:3-4**). By getting people on earth to focus on his counterfeit ministry, the little horn/king of the north helped by the armies, casts down the place of the sanctuary and deprives human beings from discerning the saving work of Christ! Without being able to discern the saving work of Christ, souls perish in sin!

- 4) ‘. . . **they** [the king of the north and the armies that aid him] shall place the abomination of desolation. . .’ (**Daniel 11:31 NKJV**)

This phrase is parallel to Daniel 8 where we are told that the little horn, with the aid of his host, set up the ‘transgression of desolation.’ The Hebrew word ‘desolation’ is common in the Old Testament (**Jeremiah. 12:11; 33:10; Leviticus 26:31-32; Daniel 9:17, 18, 26, 27; 12:11**) and frequently refers to the trampling of Jerusalem by the pagan idolatrous nations because of Israel’s unfaithfulness.

The equivalent Greek word is used in Matthew 23:38 where Jesus told the Jewish leaders: ‘*your house is left unto you **desolate**,*’ and also in Matthew 24:15 where Jesus spoke about the ‘*abomination of desolation*’ spoken of by Daniel the prophet. It is well known that Matthew 24 requires a **two-fold fulfillment**, the first of which was the destruction of the literal city of Jerusalem because of its rejection of the Messiah (**Matthew 24:1-3; Daniel 9:26-27**). The second fulfillment, which carries us well into the Christian dispensation, is referred to in Luke 21:24 and Revelation 11:2. There we are told, ‘*the holy city [the true church] shall they [the papacy] tread under foot forty and two months.*’ This trampling was done by the beast from the sea (**Revelation 13:5**), the Roman Catholic papacy when it allied itself with the political states of Europe from 538-1798. This is the period which is being described in Daniel 11:31.

The word ‘abomination’ is consistently used in the Old Testament in conjunction with idolatry. A notable example is found in Ezekiel 8:16-18 links the word ‘abomination’ with idolatry in general and with sun worship in particular. In the succeeding context God predicted that these abominations would bring desolation as a result. Thus the abomination of desolation already existed in the days of Israel immediately before the Babylonian captivity and foreshadows the abomination of desolation in the days of Christ.

Moving to New Testament times, Ellen White affirms that the abomination of desolation has a three-fold application:

First Fulfillment: The Roman Standards

*“When the idolatrous **standards of the Romans** [which contained an eagle and a sun in honor of the sun god Mithra] should be **set up** in the holy ground, which extended some furlongs outside the city walls, then the followers of Christ were to find safety in flight. When the warning sign should be seen, those who would escape must make no delay. Throughout the **land of Judea**, as well as in **Jerusalem** itself, the signal for flight must be immediately obeyed. He who chanced to be upon the **housetop** must not go down into his house, even to save his most valued treasures. Those who were working in the fields or vineyards must not take time to return for the **outer garment** laid aside while they should be toiling in the heat of the day. They must not hesitate a moment, lest they be involved in the general destruction.” Ellen G White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 25.*

Second Fulfillment: The Papacy during the 1260 Years

Significantly, the papacy had the audacity to tamper with God’s Law by deleting the second commandment and by changing the day of worship from Sabbath to the day of the sun. Thus the abomination of desolation was set up during the 1260 years by idolatry in general and by Sunday keeping more specifically. Regarding this period of church history, Ellen White affirms:

*“To afford converts from heathenism a substitute for the **worship of idols**, and thus to promote their nominal acceptance of Christianity, the **adoration of images and relics** was gradually introduced into Christian worship. The decree of a general council [Second Council of Nice, A. D. 787] finally established this **system of idolatry**. To complete the sacrilegious work, Rome presumed to expunge from the law of God the second commandment, forbidding image worship and to divide the tenth commandment, in order to preserve the number.”Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, 1888 edition, p. 51*

Ellen White also calls Sunday observance an abomination:

*“But the question of Sabbath and **Sunday observance** is to be agitated everywhere and the deceptions of Satan will flood the world. The man of sin has instituted a **spurious sabbath** and the Protestant world has taken this child of the papacy and cradled and*

nurtured it. Satan means to make all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of the fornication of Babylon. Men are binding themselves together in bonds of union to show their disloyalty to the God of heaven. The first day of the week is to be exalted and presented to all for observance. Shall we be partakers of this **cup of abomination**? Shall we bow to the authorities of earth and despise God?" **Review and Herald**, April 15, 1890

The End Time Abomination of Desolation

When the papacy attempted to change the day of worship at the beginning of the 1260 year prophecy, it set up the abomination of desolation in history. Notably, Ellen White repeatedly calls Sunday the idol Sabbath. The change in the law with the aid of the political power would thus be linked with the abomination of desolation. This abomination of desolation that was set up during the 1260 years also has a future dimension. Ellen White tells us that the national Sunday law at the end will be the abomination of desolation. So the abomination of desolation has a past dimension and a future one as well.

*"The **Sunday idol** is set up as was this image [in Daniel 3]. Human laws demand that it be worshiped as sacred and holy, thus putting it where God's holy Sabbath should be. The Protestant world has **set up** an **idol sabbath** in the place where God's Sabbath should be [reminds us of the abomination of desolations that is set up where it ought not be], and they are treading in the footsteps of the Papacy."* **Manuscript Releases**, volume 12, pp. 219, 220

*"The Sabbath question is one that will demand great care and wisdom in its presentation. Much of the grace and power of God will be needed to **cast down the idol** that has been erected in the **shape of a false sabbath**"* **9 Testimonies for the Church**, p. 211

*"Among professed Christians there are **idolaters**, men and women who are not sealed by God. Many have subverted the Christian faith into **idolatry**, giving to a man-made institution the glory and honor that God requires for His Sabbath day, and compelling others to **worship this idol**. Such ones will surely be visited with God's retributive judgments, which are to be poured out without mixture of mercy upon the unrepentant despisers of God's law."* **Manuscript Releases**, volume 19, p. 244

*"Sunday keeping is not yet the mark of the beast, and will not be until the decree goes forth causing men to **worship** this **idol sabbath**."* **The Faith I Live By**, p. 286

Ellen White counsels how we need to be careful about how we attack the idol Sunday:

*“If we counsel them not to respect the **idol sabbath** exalted to take the place of the Sabbath of the Lord our God, then instruct them in this matter in a **quiet way** and encourage **no defying** of the law powers in words or actions unless called to do this for the honor of God to vindicate His downtrodden law. Let there be no **unnecessary act of arousing the combative spirit or passions of opponents.**” 3 Selected Messages, p. 395*

*“The Sabbath question is one that will demand **great care and wisdom** in its presentation. Much of the **grace and power of God** will be needed to **cast down the idol that has been erected in the shape of a false sabbath**. Lift up the standard, lift it up, higher and still higher. Point the people to the twentieth chapter of Exodus, in which the law of God is recorded.” Testimonies for the Church, volume 9, pp. 211, 212*

The abomination of desolation comes when Sunday is officially set up as the day of worship as the Roman Standards were set up when Jerusalem was about to fall. Thus the abomination that began when the papacy changed the law will be consummated when on pain of death Sunday will be imposed by law.

*“No law has ever been made to exalt the **idol sabbath** but that Satan has taken a leading part in its enactment and its enforcement. Every law for the elevation of Sunday has a direct reference to the fourth commandment. Every move that has been made to enforce its observance is for the purpose of exalting the man of sin above God and above all that is worshiped. Satan would have us exalt the **idol sabbath**, but we cannot do it, for it would be disloyalty to God.” Review and Herald, April 29, 1890*

*“Satan has taken the world captive. He has introduced an **idol sabbath**, apparently giving to it great importance. He has stolen the homage of the Christian world away from the Sabbath of the Lord for this **idol sabbath**. The world bows to a tradition, a man-made commandment. As Nebuchadnezzar set up his golden image on the plain of Dura, and so exalted himself, so Satan exalts himself in this **false sabbath**, for which he has stolen the livery of heaven.” Review and Herald, March 8, 1898*

*“Those who respect this human law will be favored, but those who will not **bow** to the **idol sabbath** will have no favors shown them.” Maranatha, p. 195*

*“There is to be no compromise with those who are **worshiping an idol sabbath**. We are not to spend our time in controversy with those who know the truth, and upon whom the light of truth has been shining, when they turn away their ear from the truth to turn to fables. I was told that men will employ every policy to make less prominent the difference between the faith of Seventh-day Adventists and those who observe the first day of the week. In this controversy the whole world will be engaged, and the time is short. This is no time to haul down our colors.” 2 Selected Message, p. 385*

*“Under his (Satan) guidance the Christian world has made void the law of God by tearing down the seventh-day Sabbath, and exalting in its stead a common working day. As men depart further and further from God, Satan is permitted to have power over the children of disobedience. He hurls destruction among men. There is calamity by land and sea. Property and life are destroyed by fire and flood. Satan resolves to charge this upon those who refuse to **bow to the idol which he has set up**. His agents point to Seventh-day Adventists as the cause of the trouble. “These people stand out in defiance of law,” they say. “They desecrate Sunday. Were they compelled to obey the law for Sunday observance, there would be a cessation of these terrible judgments.” Review and Herald, July 16, 1901*

*History [the history of Esther] will repeat itself. In this age the test will be on the point of Sabbath observance. The same masterful mind that plotted against the faithful in ages past, is now at work to gain control of the falling churches, that through them he may condemn and put to death all who will not worship the **idol sabbath**.” Signs of the Times, February 22, 1910*

*“An **idol sabbath** has been set up, as the golden image was set up in the plains of Dura. And as Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, issued a decree that all who would not bow down and worship this image should be killed, so a proclamation will be made that all who will not reverence the **Sunday institution** will be punished with imprisonment and death. Thus the Sabbath of the Lord is trampled underfoot. But the Lord has declared, “Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and write grievousness which they have prescribed” [**Isaiah. 10:1**]. [Zephaniah 1:14-18; 2:1-3, quoted.] Manuscript Releases, volume 14, p. 91*

Notice Ellen White’s comments on the abomination of desolation at the end and how she links it with the Roman standards that surrounded the literal city of Jerusalem:

*“As the approach of the **Roman armies** was a sign to the disciples of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, so may **this apostasy** be a sign to us that the limit of God's forbearance is reached, that the measure of our nation's iniquity is full, and that the angel of mercy is about to take her flight, never to return. The people of God will then be plunged into those scenes of affliction and distress which prophets have described as the time of Jacob's trouble. The cries of the faithful, persecuted ones ascend to heaven. And as the blood of Abel cried from the ground, there are voices also crying to God from martyrs' graves, from the sepulchers of the sea, from mountain caverns, from convent vaults: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 5, p. 451*

*“It is no time now for God's people to be fixing their affections or laying up their treasure in the world. The time is not far distant, when, like the early disciples, we shall be forced to seek a refuge in desolate and solitary places. As the **siege of Jerusalem by the Roman armies** was the signal for flight to the Judean Christians, so the **assumption of power on the part of our nation in the decree enforcing the papal sabbath** will be a warning to us. It will then be time to **leave the large cities**, preparatory to leaving the smaller ones for retired homes in secluded places among the mountains. And now, instead of seeking expensive dwellings here, we should be preparing to move to a better country, even a heavenly. Instead of spending our means in self-gratification, we should be studying to economize. Every talent lent of God should be used to His glory in giving the warning to the world.” **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 5, pp. 464, 465*

COMMENTS ON DANIEL 11:32

‘ . . . and such as do wickedly against the covenant. . . ’ (Daniel 11:32 KJV)

Those who do wickedly against the covenant are the ones who lend arms to the king of the north. Thus the first part of verse 32 adds to the idea of verse 31. The thought is that the king of the north would get ‘arms’ to **do** wickedly against the covenant. But what is meant by the expression ‘*shall do wickedly against the covenant*’? As we have already seen the king of the north represents the same power as the little horn. This being the case, it will help us to go back to Daniel 7 and 8 to see how the little horn acted wickedly against the covenant.

A close examination of Israel's Covenant reveals that it consisted of two interrelated parts: **Covenant Law (Deuteronomy 4:12-13)** and **Covenant Sacrifice and ministrations (Deuteronomy 31:14-16; Matthew 26:26-28)**. It was the transgression of covenant law which made covenant sacrifice necessary. In this context one cannot help but notice that while the little horn of Daniel 7 attempted to change God's law (**Daniel 7:25**) while the little horn of Daniel 8, with the aid of the state, took away from Christ His exclusive role as sacrifice and High Priest and

trampled upon the covenant sanctuary and the covenant people (see what was included under the two covenants in **Hebrews 8-9**). In other words, the king of the north (or the little horn) and his cohorts acted wickedly against the covenant prince, the covenant people, the covenant sacrifice, the covenant priesthood and the covenant law!!

‘ . . . shall he corrupt by flatteries. . . ’ (Daniel 11:32 KJV)

Here we are told that the king of the north would actually corrupt the political power. Strange twist, the religious power corrupting the political power! And how did this happen?

Before we answer this question it is important to remember that the political power has its legitimate realm of authority, that is, to govern in civil matters. The church also has its legitimate realm of authority, that is, to govern in spiritual matters. But the moment the state blends with the church the result is the corruption of both!

The root of the Hebrew word *chalaq* (‘flatteries’) denotes something slippery and smooth. In its extended meaning it refers to the use of deceit and treachery to gain an objective. The meaning of the word involves using camouflage to hide the real intentions of the heart. In other words the king of the north is depicted as devious and deceptive in his intentions. A few texts will help us better grasp the meaning of the word *chalaq*.

Daniel 11:21 describes a vile person who obtains the kingdom by flatteries and verse 34 refers to those who join God’s people with flatteries, that is, without showing their true colors. Psalm 33:1-3 describes a person who flatters himself, that is to say, who deceives or fools himself. Proverbs 7:5 speaks of a strange woman who flatters with her words (see also, **Proverbs 6:24; 26:28; Psalm 5:9**). Psalm 12:1-3 describes a person who flatters with the lips and speaks with a *‘double heart’*. This means that while such a person says one thing with his lips, he feels just the opposite in his heart. Ezekiel 12:24 speaks of flattering divinations from the false prophets. Obviously this involves telling the people what they want to hear rather than the truth. There is a lot of truth in the expression: ‘Flattery will get you everywhere’.

Immediately the image of a sly politician comes to mind. Frequently politicians will promise the world in order to be elected but in their hearts they know they will not be able to deliver half of what they promised. Another image that comes to mind is the chameleon which changes colors to blend in with its environment.

This picture of the king of the north closely parallels that of the little horn in Daniel 8:25: *‘And through his **policy** also he shall cause **craft** to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by **peace** shall destroy many . . .’* The deceptive character of the king of the north is also brought out in II Thessalonians 2:9-10 where he works with deceptive miracles and signs and wonders. Thus the king of the north is spoken of as a crafty and sly operator—a cunning diplomat! Even a hasty glimpse at medieval history reveals that the Roman Catholic papacy indeed offered the political powers of Europe stability in exchange for the throne (**Revelation 13:2**) and yet delivered poverty, ignorance, disease and suffering.

Ellen White well described the deceptive nature of the papacy when she stated:

“It is a part of her policy to assume the character which will best accomplish her purpose; but beneath the variable appearance of the chameleon she conceals the invariable venom of the serpent.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 571

‘... but the people who do know their God’ (Daniel 11:32 NKJV)

The word ‘but’ here indicates a contrast between those who do wickedly against the **covenant** and those who know their God. Now, if the king of the north and his cohorts do wickedly against the covenant, then we would expect God’s people in contrast to do righteously in favor of the **covenant**. In other words, both groups are characterized by their attitude toward the **covenant**.

The meaning of the word ‘know’ (*yada*) is rich in the Old Testament and here denotes much more than knowing **of** God or **about** God. It involves knowing God with the heart rather than a mere intellectual assent. *Yada* is a relationship word which carries the connotation of personal intimacy. The word is used quite frequently to describe the **covenant relationship** which God desires to sustain with His people (see for example, **Deuteronomy 7:9**). Let’s examine a few Biblical examples.

Genesis 4:1 uses the word to describe sexual intimacy between Adam and Eve. In Deuteronomy 34:10 we are told that no prophet arose after Moses whom God knew face to face. Obviously this denotes much more than just seeing Moses’ physical face. In Jeremiah 4:22 God complained that Israel did not know Him. Obviously Israel knew much **about** God at this point but they did not know or experience God as a person. In contrast, Jeremiah 31:34 vividly describe the time when God would write His law in the minds and hearts of His people and as a result they would all know Him. In Hosea 13:4 God challenges Israel to not know any God other than Himself. Frequently in the Old Testament, not knowing God leads to wrong ethical behavior such as in Jeremiah 9:3. On the other hand, we are told that to know God means to act ethically like God (**I John 2:3-4; 4:8**). John 17:3 underlines that we must know God in order to receive eternal life.

‘... shall be strong’ (Daniel 11:32 NKJV)

Here we find that in order to be strong one must know God. The word ‘strong’ is used not infrequently in the Old Testament to describe steadfastness in the face of stiff opposition and apparently insurmountable obstacles. The word is used twice in Daniel 11:5 to describe strength in military conquest. Let’s notice a few other examples.

The word is repeatedly used by God to encourage Joshua to be strong in the conquest of the land of Canaan (**Joshua 1:6, 7, 9, 18; 10:25; 14:11; 17:13; Deut. 31:6**). As noted before, the word is also used to describe strength and courage in the midst of trying circumstances. For

example, when Sennacherib came against Jerusalem, Hezekiah encouraged the people to be strong and of good courage because the Lord was with them (**II Chronicles 32:7**; see also, **II Chronicles 15:7**). The word is used when there is potential for discouragement (**Isaiah 35:4**). After the captivity, when the rebuilding of the temple seemed to be an insurmountable task, God told the people through Zechariah that they should be strong (**Zechariah 8:9, 13**; see also, **Haggai 2:4**). The succeeding context of Daniel 11:32 clearly indicate that those who knew their God would face fiery trials for which they would need supernatural strength.

But the expression 'be strong' is also used in the context of the **covenant relationship** between Israel and the Lord. We are told in Deuteronomy 11:8: (KJV)

*'Therefore shall ye **keep all the commandments** which I command you this day, that ye may be strong, and go in and possess the land, whither ye go to possess it.'*

And the chronicler tells us about God's charge to David:

*'Only the Lord give thee wisdom and understanding, and give thee charge concerning Israel, that thou mayest **keep the law of the LORD thy God**. Then shalt thou prosper, if thou takest heed to fulfill the statutes and judgments which the LORD charged Moses with concerning Israel: be **strong**, and of good courage; dread not, nor be dismayed.'* (**I Chronicles 22:12-13, KJV**).

In both these verses, being strong is directly related with keeping the commandments of God, which are at the very foundation of the covenant!

*'and do **exploits**' (Daniel 11:32 KJV)*

The italics in the KJV indicate that the word 'exploits' is not found in the original text. As we shall see, the addition of this word in the **King James Version** is unfortunate. The phrase simply says: 'the people that do know their God shall be strong and **do**.' The question is: What will those who know their God do? The word 'do' appears to stand unqualified and seems to be left hanging in the air (we shall see in verse 33 that the word 'understanding' also stands unqualified). But is it really?

We have already seen that 'know' and 'be strong' are closely linked with the **covenant**. Likewise, the word 'do' (*asah*) is used to describe the fulfillment of the ethical obligations required by the **covenant**. That is to say, *asah* is an action word that describes obedience to the stipulations of the **covenant**. Regarding this, Thomas E. McComiskey states:

*"Aside from the numerous occurrences of the meaning 'do' or 'make' in a general sense, 'asah is often used with the sense of **ethical obligation**. The covenant people were frequently commanded to 'do' all that God had commanded (Ex. 23:22; Lev. 19:37; Dt. 6:18, etc.) The numerous contexts in which this concept occurs attest to the importance of an ethical response to God which goes beyond mere mental abstraction and which is translatable into obedience*

which is evidenced in demonstrable act.” (R. Laird Harris, editor. Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), volume 2, p. 701)

Deuteronomy 4:5-6 (KJV) underlines the importance of ‘doing’ the stipulations of God’s covenant.

*“Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and **do** them; for this is your wisdom and **understanding** in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say: ‘Surely this great nation is a **wise** and **understanding** people.’”*

Of particular importance is God’s declaration that ‘doing’ these statutes and commandments will be Israel’s wisdom and **understanding**. As we shall see in verse 33, God’s faithful people are characterized by their understanding.

The sense of verses 32-33 then is this: The wicked king of the north and his political allies will do wickedly against the **covenant**. In contrast, God’s people will **know** the God of the covenant, will have covenant **strength** in the face of incredible persecution, will **obey** the covenant stipulations and will therefore have covenant **understanding**. To put it a different way: The people, who **know** their God will remain **strong** in God, will **obey** God and will **understand** God. Clearly then, the word ‘do’ is qualified by the word ‘covenant’. In verses 32-33 the wicked stand in rebellion against the covenant while God’s faithful people keep the covenant even in the face of persecution and death!

COMMENTS ON VERSE 33

‘. . . and they that understand among the people’ (Daniel 11:33 KJV)

The ‘people’ here are those who are faithful to the covenant and those who understand are their teachers. But what does the word ‘understand’ mean? Louis Goldberg states:

*“In many instances sakal [the word which is used here] is synonymous with bin [the word used, for example, in **Daniel 9:23**]. . . but there is a fine distinction. While bin indicates ‘distinguishing between,’ sakal relates to an intelligent knowledge of **the reason**. There is the process of thinking through a complex arrangement of thoughts resulting in a wise dealing and use of good practical common sense.” (R. Laird Harris, Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981), volume 2, p. 877)*

The word *sakal* is used in the Old Testament to describe an understanding of God and of divine things and it is occasionally connected with the covenant. Several examples follow.

In I Chronicles 28:19 we are told that David understood the temple pattern which God showed him. Nehemiah 8:13 explains that the people understood the law when it was read after the captivity. Psalm 14:2 tells us that those who understand seek God. In Isaiah 41:20 God invites

Israel to understand that He is the Creator. In Psalm 119:99 David exclaims that he understands more than all his teachers because he meditates on God's testimonies. In Psalm 111:10 we are told that those who keep God's commandments have good understanding.

Turning to other uses in the book of Daniel we find in chapter 9:13 that the prophet was lamenting because Israel has gone into captivity. The reason was that they did not understand God's truth. In Daniel 9:25 the prophet was told to understand the prophecy of the seventy weeks. In Daniel 5:11, 12, 14 Belshazzar was informed that Daniel had understanding to interpret divine dreams and visions. The same word is used in Daniel 11:35, a text we will study shortly (notice also, **Daniel 12:10; Revelation 13:18; 17:9**).

In Jeremiah 3:15 God promised to give Israel shepherds who would feed them with wisdom and understanding. God, speaking through the same prophet, exhorts His people to not glory in their riches, or power or wisdom but rather in **knowing** and **understanding** Him. Psalm 47:7 encourages God's people to sing with understanding. Proverbs 21:16 warns that those who go astray from the path of understanding will end up in company with the dead. In Isaiah 44:18 we are told that the wicked do not understand God.

'shall instruct many' (**Daniel 11:33 NKJV**)

Once again we are bewildered by the fact that the word *'instruct'* appears to have no qualifier. The question immediately suggests itself: Instruct in what? Clearly the context must dictate the answer. In the context we have already seen that the covenant involves knowing God, being strong in the face of opposition, doing what the covenant requires, and understanding divine things. All these elements must be included in the instruction provided by those who have understanding. The word *'instruct'* (*bin*) appears quite frequently in the book of Daniel and is used there in the sense of understanding (see **Daniel 1:4, 17, 20; 2:21; 9:22, 23; 10:1, 11, 12, 14; 12:10**). In this particular verse we are studying the sense seems to be: *'and they that understand among the people shall help many others understand.'* The word *bin* is also used in Deuteronomy 32:10 where God instructed Israel in the howling wilderness. In Isaiah 40:13-14 the question is asked: 'Who instructed him [the LORD]?' And the book of Proverbs 1:2, 5; 4:1, 5, 7 uses the words *'instruction'* and *'understanding'* interchangeably. The words *'instruct'* and *'understand'* are closely related because the purpose of instruction is to impart understanding.

'yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days' (**Daniel 11:33, KJV**)

The word *'they'* here can refer to the people who were instructed by those who understand or to those who understand and instructed the people. At any rate, the last part of this verse brings to view a devastating persecution. Several parallels come to mind from other passages in Daniel and Revelation:

- 1) One is reminded of the **onslaught** of the little horn in both Daniel 7:21, 25 and Daniel 8:24 where we are told that the little horn would destroy both the strong [those who

understand and instruct] and the people of the saints [those who are instructed]. One is also reminded of the work of the beast in Revelation 13:7.

- 2) The **sword** and the **captivity** remind us of Revelation 13:10 where we are told that the beast led God's people into captivity and killed them with the sword precisely during the 42 months.
- 3) The success of the little horn and the beast is underlined in these prophecies. In Daniel 11 we are told that the king of the north is **successful** in leading God's people into captivity, killing them with the sword, burning them with fire and confiscating their goods. Daniel 7:21, 25 and 8:24 likewise speaks of the success of the little horn as does Revelation 13:7.
- 4) Especially intriguing is the reference to the persecution lasting for '**days**' (**Daniel 11:33**). As can be seen from the italics in the KJV the word '**days**' is supplied by the translators. Daniel 7:25 and Revelation 12:14 refer to this period as '*time, times and the dividing of time*' and Revelation 13: 5 calls it '*forty two months*'. But significantly, Revelation 12:6 refers to this period as 1260 **days**. Perhaps the King James Version translators were not far from the truth when they interpreted the days of Daniel 11:33 as **many** days. These time periods are linked by the fact that each time they are mentioned, it is in the context of oppression and persecution.
- 5) Also of great interest is the reference to the persecuted ones being '**aided with a little help.**' This is precisely what the earth is said to have done in Revelation 12:16. We will come back to this idea when we study verse 34.

In verse 33 we have a strikingly precise description of the methods used by the Roman Catholic Inquisition. Notice the following inspired words from the pen of Ellen G. White in **The Great Controversy**, p. 196:

*"As the Romish clergy saw their congregations diminishing, they invoked the **aid of the magistrates**, and by every means in their power endeavored to bring back their hearers. . . . In vain both **ecclesiastical** and **civil** authorities [remember the 'arms' which were put at the service of the king of the north?] were invoked to crush the heresy. In vain they resorted to **imprisonment, torture, fire, and sword**. Thousands of believers sealed their faith with their blood, and yet the work went on. Persecution served only to extend the truth, and the fanaticism which Satan endeavored to unite with it resulted in making more clear the contrast between the work of Satan and the work of God."*

Just a few remarks about the word 'spoil.' This word means 'plunder' or 'booty' acquired in a war (see, **Numbers 31:11, 53; II Chronicles 25:13; 14:14; Ezra 9:7; Esther 9:10; Nahum 2:9**). One can't help but think of the Waldenses whose homes and goods were plundered and confiscated at the behest of a papal decree. The Inquisition regularly deprived 'heretics' of their property and gave it to those who ratted on them.

*“I was shown the Waldenses, and what they suffered for their religion. They conscientiously studied the word of God, and lived up to the light which shone upon them. They were persecuted, and driven from their homes; **their possessions, gained by hard labor, were taken from them**, and their houses burned. They fled to the mountains and there suffered incredible hardships.” **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 1, p. 371*

COMMENTS ON VERSE 34

‘Now when they shall fall they shall be aided with a little help’ (Daniel 11:34, NKJV)

Not much needs to be said about the phrase *‘and when they shall fall’* other than that it is linked with the last part of verse 33. God’s people fell by sword, and by flame, by captivity and by spoil for many days. But they would be helped with a little help.

The question at this point is this: What is meant by the phrase ‘a little help’? Were God’s people helped by being given a **place** of refuge or were they helped because persecution was suspended for a period of **time**? In other words, is the help time related or place related? Or is it possible that both are true? In order to answer these questions it would be well to compare some elements of Revelation 12 and 13 with Daniel 11:32-34:

Daniel 11:32-34	Revelation 12:6, 13-16; 13:5-7,11
The people who know their God are persecuted (11:33)	The woman/saints are persecuted (12:6, 13-16, 13:7)
King of the north prevails (11:34)	The serpent/beast prevail (12:13-16; 13:7)
The people who know their God fall for <i>many days</i> (11:33)	The woman/saints fall for 1260 days /42 months (12:6, 14; 13:5)
Those who understand are helped with a little help (11:35)	The woman/saints are helped by the earth/beast from the earth (12:16; 13:11)

Now back to our original questions. An examination of the word *‘little’* indicates that in the Old Testament it is time related. In Ezra 9:7 we find that Israel was *‘delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to spoil, and to confusion of face, as it is this day.’* As can be seen, this verse uses very similar terminology to Daniel 11:33. In verse 8 Ezra is

more optimistic about the plight of Israel when he says: *'And now for a **little space** grace hath been shewed from the LORD our God to leave us a remnant to escape. . . .'* Here the word *'little'* is clearly time related, it means a *'short period of time.'*

There are other verses in the Old Testament which use the word *'little'* with a temporal connotation. Job speaks of the wicked as being exalted for a **little while** (**Job 24:24**). The psalmist tells us that *'for yet a **little while**, and the wicked shall not be. . . .'* (**Psalm 37:10**). Solomon, speaking of the sluggard says, *'yet a **little sleep**, a **little slumber**, a **little folding of the hands to sleep. . . .'*** (**Proverbs 6:10**). Referring to the pouring out of His wrath in Isaiah 10:25 the Lord says: *'For yet a **little while**, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction'* (see also, **Isaiah 26:20; 29:17**). In Hosea 1:4 God promises: *'for yet a **little while**, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu. . . .'* And in Haggai 2:6 God promises *to shake the heavens and the earth in a **little while***. In all the above references the word *'little'* stands unqualified, that is to say, the word *'while'* is added but the context clearly reveals that it should be included in the text.

In the light of the previous discussion, the word *'little'* in Daniel 11 most likely refers to a period of time during which persecution will cease. But is this all there is to say? We know that it was the angel Gabriel who gave the explanation in Daniel 11 (**Daniel 10:21; 11:2**). We also know that Gabriel was the angel who revealed the book of Revelation to John (**Revelation 1:1; 19:10; 22:8-9**). This being the case, we would expect Gabriel to amplify the meaning of Daniel 11 (after all, Daniel is a prophecy and the book Revelation is a revelation!!) and we would also expect his explanation in Revelation to harmonize perfectly with what he had previously given in Daniel.

Both Daniel and Revelation clearly indicate that the king of the north/little horn/beast would have two periods of dominion with a period of peace and liberty in between. This can be clearly seen in Revelation 13 where the sea beast is wounded (**Revelation 13:10**) and then after a certain period its deadly wound is healed (**Revelation 13:3, 12, 14**). Ironically, it is the beast (the United States as a nation) from the earth (the United States as a territory) that will change, so to speak, from Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde and will help the sea beast regain its lost power.

This same two-stage pattern can be discerned in Daniel 11:40 where the king of the north is attacked by the king of the south at the time of the end after the *'many days'* of persecution (**Daniel 11:40**). But the prophecy goes on to explain that the king of the north will rise to power once more and defeat the king of the south as it regains its world dominion (**Daniel 11:40-45**). Revelation 6:9-11 presents the same scenario. There, two groups of martyrs are spoken of with an interval of time in between. Revelation 12:13-15 brings out the same idea: After the 1260 years of persecution, the earth helps the woman (**Revelation 12:16**) only to have persecution raise its ugly head some time later (**Revelation 12:17**).

Also of interest is Matthew 24:21-22 where we are told that the great persecution of the true church during the middle Ages was cut short or else no flesh would have survived.

On the basis of our study we must conclude that the *'little help'* given to those of understanding consists of the period of time during which the United States provided refuge for those who had been persecuted during the 1260 years. The **territory** of the United States has actually given the true church a respite in **time** during which persecution has ceased.

Lest anyone wonder whether 390 years of respite from persecution (from Colonial times in the early 1600's until today) constitute a little time, I would remind you that from God's perspective 400 years is as nothing and even from our perspective of 6000 years of human history, 400 years is short.

Something we must keep in mind is that the territory of the United States provided refuge for the pilgrims (1620 A. D.) long before the republican style of government was established. Thus Revelation 12:16 refers to the territory of the United States and Revelation 13:11 describes the moment at which the government of the United States arose from that territory to establish its two foundational principles of civil and religious liberty.

'but many shall cleave to them with flatteries' (**Daniel 11:34 KJV**)

We will not say much about this phrase other than that the word *'flatteries'* is the same as in verse 32. It is a matter of fact that many who joined the Christian cause were not sincere but rather joined out of convenience.

COMMENTS ON VERSE 35

'and some of them of understanding shall fall' (**Daniel 11:35, KJV**)

Verse 35 expands upon the meaning of verse 33. While in verse 33 we found that those of understanding fell by sword, by flame, by captivity and by spoil, in verse 35 we are told what was accomplished by their fall. That is to say, verse 35 explains that their suffering was not without purpose.

'to try them' (**Daniel 11:35, KJV**)

The word *'try'* (*tsaraph*) has the basic meaning of refining or testing precious metals by fire. It is used in an extended meaning to describe the testing or refining of God's people in the furnace of affliction. For example, in the days of Gideon, God tried the men of Israel in order to determine who was fit to go to war against the Midianites (**Judges 7:4**). In Psalm 26:2 David plead with the Lord to try or test his reins and his heart. In Isaiah 48:10 God says to Israel: *'Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction.'* In a similar vein, God says about the remnant of His people in Zechariah 13:9: *'I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try (tsaraph) them as gold is tried. . .'* Malachi 3:2 describes the coming of the Messiah as a *'refiner's (tsaraph) fire'* who shall *'sit as a refiner (tsaraph) and purifier of silver. . .'* In Daniel 7 and 8 we are told that the little horn persecuted the saints of the Most High (**Daniel 7:21, 25; 8:24**) but in Daniel 11:35

we are told what the end result of their suffering was: They were purified and made white by their trials (see also, **Revelation 3:10**).

‘and to purge, and to make them white ’ (Daniel 11:35, KJV)

The word *‘purge’* means ‘to make clean, to purify, to cleanse.’ This meaning can be discerned in several texts such as Ezekiel 20:38; II Samuel 22:27; Psalm 12:6; Zephaniah 3:9; Daniel 12:10. The key question at this point is: How were those of understanding cleansed during the 1260 years? Were they cleansed merely by the trials and suffering they experienced or was there some other cleansing agent? The book of Revelation ought to help us answer these questions.

In Revelation 6:9-11 we catch a glimpse of a group of martyrs who are crying out to God for justice (see **Genesis 4**). Though their plea is not answered immediately, they are given **white robes** and told to wait until a future group of martyrs is killed like as they were. It is important to realize that this scene is taking place during the fifth seal. Under the fourth seal (the yellow horse of death) these martyrs were unjustly mowed down by the beast from the sea/little horn (**Daniel 7:21, 25; Revelation 13:7**) and now, under the fifth seal, they are crying out for justice. But justice is delayed until the end-time martyrs die as they did (**Revelation 19:2**). Remarkably, the fifth seal fits within the identical historical time frame as the period described in Daniel 11:32-35—the *‘many days’*

The question still remains: How were these martyrs cleansed? The answer is not hard to find. The idea of being cleansed in the context of tribulation is an important theme in the book of Revelation. For example, in Revelation 7:14 we are told regarding those who will go through the end-time tribulation that they *‘have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the lamb [see also, Revelation 1:5; I John 1:9].’* Four important ideas are brought to view here: tribulation, blood, robes and cleansing. These ideas are at the very center of Daniel 11:35.

Revelation 12:11 must also be brought into the picture. Here we are told that the persecuted saints have overcome the slanderous accusations of Satan by the **blood** of the lamb and by the word of their testimony and they did not love their lives even unto death. Further, Revelation 19:7-8 presents a picture of the end-time bride of the lamb. At first sight it would appear that the bride has made her garments white by her righteous deeds but a closer look reveals that her righteous deeds were the result of trust in the lamb.

On the basis of the previous discussion we must conclude that those of understanding who went through the medieval tribulation (as well as those who will go through the end-time tribulation) were purged and made white by the blood of the lamb. To put it another way, in the midst of persecution their characters were refined by their trust in the blood of Jesus.

‘even to the time of the end’ (Daniel 11:35, KJV)

As we shall see in greater detail later (see our discussion of verse 40 below), the time of the end began when the 1260 years ended. That is to say, the time of the end began when the *‘many*

days' of persecution came to an end (see **Daniel 7:25**). Daniel 12:4 is crystal clear when it describes the time of the end as a period of time during which the knowledge of Daniel 8-12 would be increased.

'because it is yet for a time appointed' (Daniel 11:35, KJV)

The time appointed here are the 1260 days/42months/three and a half times. This was the period during which God gave the saints into the hand of the little horn/beast/king of the north (see **Daniel 7:25; Revelation 13:5, 7; Daniel 11:33**). This is the same time period God gave Jezebel to repent (**Revelation 2:23**).

The word *mowad* ('appointed') is used in the Old Testament to denote a point or a period of time during which a pre-established or predetermined event will occur. The word is used in Isaiah 1:14 and Numbers 9:2-3 to denote the specific time God appointed for the celebration of the yearly feasts. In Jeremiah 8:7 God laments that the stork knows her appointed times but His people do not know their judgment. In Genesis 18:14 God promised that Sarah would have Isaac at the time appointed. According to I Samuel 13:11 Saul offered the sacrifice at Gilgal because Samuel did not come within the time period that Samuel had appointed. And the prophet Habakkuk was informed that *'the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it because it will surely come, it will not tarry.'* (**Habakkuk 2:3**).

Besides the three uses of the word in chapter 11 (verses 27, 29, 35), Daniel 8:19 is of particular importance. When Gabriel came to explain the vision of chapter 8 to Daniel he said: *'Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the **last end** [this is no longer during the 1260 years] of the indignation [on the meaning of this word see comments on verse 36 below]: for at the time appointed the end shall be.'* Even a cursory comparison of Daniel 8:23-25 with Daniel 11:32-39 reveals some striking parallels. These parallels leave no room for doubt that the little horn represents the same power as the king of the north. But whereas Daniel 11:31-39 describes the time appointed by God for the king of the north to rule over the saints during the 1260 years, Daniel 8:19 takes us forward in time to the moment which God has appointed for the same power to come to his end with none to help him. This thought will be amplified in verse 36.

COMMENTS ON VERSE 36

'And the king shall do according to his will', (Daniel 11:36, KJV)

During this period of 1260 years the king of the north would basically be allowed to do as he pleased. The saints, the law, and the sanctuary cultus would all be under his control. One is reminded of the arrogance of the little horn in chapters seven and eight. Significantly, the **little horn** of Daniel 8:9 is identified later in the chapter as a **king** of fierce countenance (**Daniel 8:23**). Obviously the little horn is the king of the north!!

'And he shall exalt himself' (Daniel 11:36, KJV)

The Hebrew word *rum* (exalt) is frequently used in the Psalms to describe the joyous exaltation of God by His people. The word is frequently linked with the idea of praise and worship due God because of His infinite greatness and worthiness. Thus the psalmist exclaimed: *'Exalt ye the LORD our God, and worship at His footstool; for He is holy.'* (Psalm 99:5; see also, verse 9). Notice a few other texts: *'Thou art my God, I will exalt thee'* (Psalm 118:28). *'O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together.'* (Psalm 34:3). *'Be thou exalted, O God above the heavens: and thy glory above all the earth.'* (Psalm 108:5; see also Psalm 57:5, 11). No creature can claim the right to be exalted by other creatures. Only God can exalt His creatures if he wishes to do so. *'He who exalts himself will be humbled and he who humbles himself will be exalted.'* The role of the creature is to humble himself that God may exalt him (see **Matthew 23:12; Philippians 2:5-11**).

Yet at the very beginning, even before creation, there was a creature who claimed the right to be exalted. Isaiah 14:12-14 describes the rebellion of Lucifer. In verse 13 we are told that the first creature of God boastfully declared: *'I will exalt (rum) my throne above the stars of God.'* Unable to exalt his throne above the angels in heaven, Lucifer set up a rival throne on earth and placed his vice-regent upon it, the king of the north. Just as the Father in heaven placed his Son upon the throne as His vice-regent, so did Satan place his son of perdition upon the throne as his vice-regent. To this the apostle Paul referred when he spoke about the man of sin sitting in the temple of God demanding to be worshiped. (**II Thessalonians 2:3-4**).

'and magnify himself above every god' (**Daniel 11:36, KJV**)

Only God deserves to be magnified because He is the Creator: *'Let the LORD be magnified,'* exclaimed the psalmist (**Psalm 35:27**; see also **Psalm 40:16**). When God intervenes to deliver Israel from the invasion of Gog, we are told that He will magnify Himself and sanctify Himself. But no human being or nation has a right to magnify itself. Self-magnification by mere creatures is looked upon as the earmark of apostasy. Thus we are told that Moab will be cut off because it magnified itself against the Lord (**Jeremiah 48:26**; see also verse 42). And when Babylon destroyed Jerusalem, Jeremiah prayed, *'Oh Lord, behold my affliction: for the enemy hath magnified himself'* (**Lamentations 1:9**).

The very word *'magnify'* which is used twice in Daniel 11:36, 37 with reference to the king of the north, is used also in Daniel 8:11, 25 where we are told that the little horn or *'king of fierce countenance'* magnified himself against the Prince of the host. It is obvious that this power sought to steal the power and prerogatives of God. One is reminded of Paul's words about the man of sin *'who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.'* (**II Thessalonians 2:4**)

'And shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods' (**Daniel 11:36, KJV**)

The expression 'marvelous things' is actually the translation of a single Hebrew word. With the exception of this verse, the word is used exclusively to describe the marvelous creative and redemptive works of God (see **Psalm 17:7; 78:12ff; 98:1-3; 139:14; Zechariah 8:6-7**). This means that the king of the north is a usurper of the power and prerogatives which belong only to God. In Psalm 105:2 God's people are invited to sing psalms unto the Lord and to talk of His wondrous works. Then in verse 5 we are told to '*remember his **marvelous** works that he hath done; his wonders and the judgments of his mouth.*'

One is reminded of the boastful claims of the little horn of Daniel, chapters seven and eight. In Daniel 7 we are told that the little horn would speak '*great words against the Most High.*' This belligerent attitude is reflected in his attempt to change God's times and law. And in Daniel 8 we are told that the little horn would attempt to usurp Christ's high priestly work of salvation in the heavenly sanctuary. The beast of Revelation 13 also comes to mind. In verse 5 we are told that this beast would speak '*great words and blasphemies.*' As we saw in our detailed analysis of Daniel 7 (see, 'Stephen P. Bohr's Notes on Daniel 7') the Roman Catholic papacy fulfills this specification with undeniable precision.

'and shall prosper' (Daniel 11:36, KJV)

The word '*prosper*' is used of Joseph in Genesis 39:23. There we are told that everything that Joseph did prospered. In the Bible we find that the wicked oftentimes prosper for a season (see, **Jeremiah 12:1; Psalm 73:12**) but in the end they receive their just reward. Thus, things went well for the king of the north, at least during the period of its dominion.

Again we can't fail to see the connection between the king of the north and the little horn of Daniel chapters seven and eight. In Daniel 7:21 we are told that the little horn **prevailed** against the saints of the Most High and in verse 25 we are informed that the saints and the times and law would be **given into his hand** for a time, times and the dividing of time. In Daniel 8:12, 24 we are told that the little horn '*practiced and prospered*' and in Revelation 13:7 we find God gave the beast power '*to make war with the saints, and to **overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.***' We do know that things went well for the Roman Catholic papacy until it was mortally wounded in 1798.

The links between the little horn (**Daniel 7 and 8**), the king of the north (**Daniel 11**), the man of sin (**II Thessalonians 2**) and the beast (**Revelation 13:1-10**) reveal that they denote the same historical power:

1. Each one of these powers is the **last one** before Jesus establishes His eternal kingdom.
2. In each case these powers **exalt themselves** above God.
3. In each case they speak **great words** and blasphemies against the Most High.
4. In each case the powers **prosper** for a period of time.
5. In every case, the powers come to an **ignominious end** with none to help.

till the indignation be accomplished' (Daniel 11:36, KJV)

Does the word *'indignation'* refer to the indignation of the king of the north or to the indignation of God? And when will this indignation be accomplished? Before we can answer these questions we must study the meaning of the words *'indignation'* and *'accomplished.'*

The word *'indignation'* here refers to the outpouring of God's wrath. Speaking about God's judgment upon apostate Jerusalem, the psalmist wrote: *'He cast upon them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, and indignation (zaam), and trouble. . . (Psalms 78:49).'* Referring to the destruction of the Assyrian oppressors of Israel, God promised: *'For yet a little while, and the indignation (zaam) shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction.'* (Isaiah 10:25). With reference to God's judgment upon historical Babylon we are told: *'The LORD hath opened his armory, and hath brought forth the weapons of His indignation (zaam): for this is the work of the Lord God of hosts in the land of the Chaldeans'* (Jeremiah 50:25).

But the word is not only used to describe historical manifestations of God's wrath. The word is also used in many significant eschatological passages. In Psalm 69:24 God is invited to settle accounts with the wicked: *'Pour out [don't miss the importance of this expression] thine indignation (zaam) upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them'*. In Isaiah 13:5 God and His armies are described as coming from *'a far country, from the end of heaven, even the LORD, and the weapons of His indignation (zaam), to destroy the whole land.'* In the 'Little Apocalypse' of Isaiah (Isaiah 24-27) God's people are encouraged to seek refuge in the time of trouble: *'Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for little moment, until the indignation (zaam) be overpast. For behold, the LORD cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain.'* (Isaiah 26:20-21). Notice how Ellen White employs this passage:

"The Lord is a refuge for all who put their trust in Him. He bids them hide in Him for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. He is soon to come out of His place to punish the world for its iniquity. Then the earth shall disclose her blood and shall no more cover her slain." Ellen G. White, The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, volume 7, p. 967.

Let's take a look at three other verses from the minor prophets. In Nahum 1:6 the question is asked: 'Who can stand before his **indignation** (zaam)? And who can abide in the fierceness of his **anger**? His **fury** is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him. [see **Revelation 6:14-17**]' In Habakkuk 3 we find a clear description of the second coming of Jesus. After speaking of the sun and moon standing still in their habitation, the destruction of the wicked is described: *'Thou didst march through the land in indignation (zaam), thou didst thresh the heathen in anger.'* (Verses 11-12) In Zephaniah 3:8 we find the following words: *'Therefore wait upon me, saith the LORD, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to **pour** upon them my indignation (zaam), even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy.'*

In Daniel 8:19 we find a very important use of the word *zaam*. There God informs Daniel: *'Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation (zaam); for at the time appointed the end shall be.'* It is clear that this verse is parallel to the last half of Daniel 11:36. But we must now take a look at the word *'accomplished.'*

The Hebrew word *'accomplished'* (*kalah*) means 'to finish' 'accomplish' 'end' (see, for example, **Genesis 2:1; Exodus 40:33; I Kings 6:22; II Chronicles 36:22; Jeremiah 4:27; Jeremiah 8:20**, etc.) In several passages of the Old Testament the word is used in conjunction with the idea of God's wrath or indignation coming to an end. For example, when God promised to scatter Israel for her apostasy, He stated *'thus shall mine anger be accomplished'* (*kalah*) (see also, **Ezekiel 6:12; 7:8; 13:15; 20:8, 21; Lamentations 4:11**).

In order to understand **when** the eschatological wrath of God will come to an end we must turn to the New Testament, particularly the book of Revelation. The equivalent Greek word for the Hebrew *kalah* is *telos*. This word is translated 'end' (**Revelation 2:26**) 'filled up' (**Revelation 15:1**), 'finished' (**John 19:30; Revelation 10:7; 11:7; 20:5**), 'fulfilled' (**Revelation 15:8; 17:17; 20:3**). See also Revelation 16:17 where at the conclusion of the seventh plague, God says, 'It is done'.

A careful study of Revelation 15:1, 8; 17:17 reveals that the wrath of God is finished, ended, accomplished or filled up at the conclusion of the seven last plagues (when we use the expression 'mission accomplished' we mean the mission was finished, fulfilled or came to an end). It is to the conclusion of the seven last plagues that Daniel 11:36 points. Though the primary theme of Daniel 11:31-39 is the 1260 years of papal persecution, the last part of verse 36 momentarily carries us forward to the time when the king of the north will come to his end with none to help him. That is to say, the last half of Daniel 11:36 points forward to the time when the king of the north will *'come to his end with none to help him'* as described in Daniel 11:45.

According to verses 31-39 the king of the north would persecute God's people and prosper for [1260] 'days' only to be wounded by the king of the south at the time of the end (verse 40). After a temporary suspension of its power, the king of the north would have a second stage of power and prosperity after which it would come to its end once and for all at the conclusion of the seven last plagues.

It is in this context that we must understand Ellen White's comment that much of the history of Daniel 11:31-36 will be repeated (see page 3 above). As noted before, Ellen White is not saying that Daniel 11:31-36 will have a dual fulfillment. What she is saying is that 'scenes **similar** to those described' will occur. And why will they be similar? Simply because when the king of the north (the papacy) resurrects after its deadly wound it will be the same power with the same evil character. It will not have changed one iota during its period of convalescence. It will have essentially the same character and carry out the same actions as it did during the previous stage of its existence only on a much larger scale. This is why I believe that Daniel 11:40-45

contains the eschatological repetition of the historical scenes described in Daniel 11:31-39. Ellen White, ever in harmony with Scripture, concurs with this view:

*'And let it be remembered, it is the boast of Rome that she **never changes**. The principles of Gregory VII and Innocent III are **still** the principles of the Roman Catholic Church. And had she but the power [which was removed in 1798], she would put them in practice with as much vigor now as in **past centuries**. . . . Rome is aiming to **re-establish** her power, to **recover** her lost supremacy. . . . She is silently growing into power. Her doctrines are exerting their influence in legislative halls, in the churches, and in the hearts of men. She is piling up her lofty and massive structures in the secret recesses of which her former persecutions **will be repeated**. Stealthily and unsuspectedly she is strengthening her **forces** to further her own ends when the time shall come for her to strike.'* Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 581

*"Let the restraints now imposed by secular governments be removed [these restraints were put in place in 1798] and Rome be **reinstated** in her former power, and there would speedily be a **revival** of her tyranny and persecution."* Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 564

*"The Roman Church now presents a fair front to the world, covering with apologies her record of horrible cruelties. She has clothed herself in Christlike garments; but she is **unchanged**. Every principle of the papacy that existed in **past ages** exists today. The doctrines devised in the darkest ages are **still held**. Let none deceive themselves. The papacy that Protestants are now so ready to honor is **the same** that ruled the world in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up at the peril of their lives, to expose her iniquity. She possesses the same pride and arrogant assumption that lorded it over kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when she crushed out human liberty and slew the saints of the Most High.'* Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 571

'for that that is determined shall be done' (Daniel 11:36, KJV)

As we have seen in our study of Daniel 9:24, 26, and 27 the Hebrew word *charats* means 'determined, decreed, decided.' It is used to denote an event which will occur on a time schedule which has previously been determined by God (see, **Job 14:5; Isaiah 10:23; 28:22**). The Jerusalem translation catches the nuance of word: *'for what has been **decreed** will certainly be fulfilled.'* It is clear that the power of the king of the north is not absolute and endless, it is limited by the decree of God. It was God who allowed the king of the north to exercise his dominion for 1260 years in the past and it will be God who will cut short its career at the end (**Daniel 11:45**). According to Revelation 17:17, the beast, the harlot and the kings will agree for a short period of time at the end, but only *'until the words of God shall be fulfilled.'* And God's words are fulfilled or ended when he says, at the conclusion of the seventh plague: *'It is done.'* (**Revelation 16:17**)

COMMENTS ON VERSE 37 & 38

In the last half of verse 36 Gabriel has momentarily taken us to the very end of the seven last plagues when the king of the north will come to his end with none to help. But now Gabriel goes back in time to continue his discussion of the 1260 year career of the papacy. It is obvious that verse 37 cannot be in chronological continuity with the last part of verse 36!

‘neither shall he regard the God of his fathers’ (Daniel 11:37, KJV)

The word *‘regard’* here means *‘to pay attention to’* (see **Psalm 28:5; 94:7; Job 30:20**) In other words, the king of the north would not pay attention to the God of his fathers, or to the love of women or to any god whatsoever.

The King James translators correctly understood the *‘God of his fathers’* as a reference to the true God and for this reason they capitalized the word *‘God’*. This clearly indicates that the fathers or ancestors of the king of the north originally worshiped the true God. In short, this means that the king of the north fell away or apostatized from the God of his fathers. This would seem to indicate that the king of the north represents an **apostate** Christian system. One is reminded of the warning of the apostle Paul in II Thessalonians 2 that after his death there would be a *‘falling away’* (the Greek word is *apostasia*).

But who are the *‘fathers’* whom the king of the north disregards? In the Old Testament, the fathers of Israel are the nation’s founders--Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the twelve sons of Jacob to whom God made the promises (**Exodus 3:13,15,16; I Chronicles 29:18; John 8:39 Acts 3:13**). But, as we have seen, in Daniel 11:37 we are well into the Christian dispensation. The question is: Who were the founding fathers of the Christian church? The answer is clear: The twelve apostles. Paul stated that the church was built upon the *‘foundations’* of the apostles and the prophets (**Ephesians 2:20**) and John saw that the **foundations** of the New Jerusalem contained the names of the twelve apostles (**Revelation 21:14**).

The picture is clear: The king of the north would go astray from the teachings and practices of the apostles. Ellen White makes the following impressive comparison between the apostasy of the Jewish church and the falling away of the Papal church:

“The Pharisees had declared themselves the children of Abraham. Jesus told them that this claim could be established only by doing the works of Abraham. The true children of Abraham would live as he did, a life of obedience to God. They would not try to kill One who was speaking the truth that was given Him from God. In plotting against Christ, the rabbis were not doing the works of Abraham. A mere lineal descent from Abraham was of no value. Without a spiritual connection with him, which would be manifested in possessing the same spirit, and doing the same works, they were not his children.

This principle bears with equal weight upon a question that has long agitated the Christian world—the question of apostolic succession. Descent from Abraham was proved, not by name

and lineage, but by likeness of character. So the apostolic succession rests not upon the transmission of ecclesiastical authority, but upon spiritual relationship. A life actuated by the apostles' spirit, the belief and teaching of the truth they taught, this is the true evidence of apostolic succession. This is what constitutes men the successors of the first teachers of the gospel." Ellen G. White, **The Desire of Ages**, pp. 466-467

If the apostles resurrected today, they would die again on the spot, of a heart attack! They would be unable to recognize the church they founded. The Roman Catholic Church claims to have the successors of the apostles and yet they killed the saints of the Most High during the dark ages as the Jewish establishment killed Jesus (as we shall see in verse 38, Roman Catholicism allied itself with the state—the god of forces—a god which the apostles never knew!). And the teachings of Roman Catholicism are diametrically opposed to the teachings of the apostles!

'nor the desire of women' (Daniel 11:37, KJV)

Notice that this whole system would disregard the desire (cf. **Isaiah 53:2; Haggai 2:7**) of women. What is meant by this enigmatic expression? How did the king of the north refuse to pay attention to the desire of women? There are strong reasons to see in this a reference to the practice of celibacy in Roman Catholicism. Even though Peter (**Matthew 8:14-15**), Paul (probably), the deacons (**I Timothy 3:12**), the elders (**Titus 1:5-6**), and the bishops (**I Timothy 3:2, 4**) of the early church were all married, Roman Catholicism since the time of Gregory VII has forbidden marriage to the clergy. One is reminded of the warning of the apostle Paul: 'Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall **depart from the faith**, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. . . . **Forbidding to marry**. . . ' (**I Timothy 4:1**).

In unequivocal words, Canon 10 of the Council of Trent states:

'Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness to remain in virginity or celibacy, than to be married, let him be accursed.'

'nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all' (Daniel 11:37, KJV)

Once again one is reminded of the blasphemous boasts of the little horns of Daniel 7 and 8, of the beast of Revelation 13:1-10 and of the man of sin of II Thessalonians 2. In a previous study, we have provided irrefutable historical evidence (see, 'Stephen P. Bohr's Notes on Daniel 7') to substantiate the fact that the Roman Catholic system fits this description like a glove fits the hand!

'but in his estate shall he honor the God of forces' (Daniel 11:38, KJV)

Though the King James translators capitalized the word God, the context makes it obvious that the king of the north is not really honoring the true God! The expression 'in his estate' can also

be translated 'instead of' or 'in place of'. That is to say, instead of honoring the God of his fathers, the king of the north would honor the god of forces. But who is this god of forces?

The word 'forces' is the translation of the Hebrew *mauzzim*. It is used to describe the LORD as the fortress, shelter or refuge of his people (see, **Psalm 27:1; 31:2, 4; 43:2; 37:39; 89:13** [and its context of verses 9-12]; **Jeremiah 16:19; Nahum 1:7**). The word is also used elsewhere in Daniel 11 to denote a military fortress or stronghold (verses 7, 10, 19, 31) In still other passages of the Old Testament it denotes a fortified city (**Isaiah 17:9; 23:11**) The word can also be used to describe human protection, such as in Isaiah 30:2, 3 where the word is translated 'strengthen.' The picture is that the king of the north would be helped by political and military power.

'and a god whom his fathers knew not' (Daniel 11:38, KJV)

In the light of the previous discussion, it seems like the **King James Version** translation, '*god of forces*' is a good one. What is being described here is the union of the king of the north with military forces—a union of church and state, if you please! How different from the attitude of the apostles! It is well known that the apostolic fathers did not use the military strength of the state to accomplish their mission. They employed the sword of the Spirit. They used persuasion, not coercion. In this, they got their marching orders from Jesus Himself (**Acts 1:6-8**). In John 18:36-37 Jesus explained to Pilate that if His kingdom were of this world, the disciples would fight to free Him. And when Peter drew the sword to defend Jesus, he was told to put it away (**Matthew 26:51-52**). It was the apostate church which appealed to the arm of the state to punish dissenters and to compel unbelievers to become Christians. This 'god' was unknown to the fathers!

'shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things' (Daniel 11:38, KJV)

The gold, silver, precious stones and pleasant things are described in connection with Babylon in Revelation 17:4. Here both church and state (the harlot and the kings: **Revelation 17:2**) enjoy a mutually enriching relationship until the kings hate the harlot and make her desolate and naked (**Revelation 17:15-17**). Revelation 18:12-13 even gives an expanded list of pleasant things with which the harlot and the merchants of the earth do business. Noteworthy is the fact that in Daniel 11 the conquests of the king of the north are described symbolically as the flooding river of Babylon (**Daniel 11:40-41**) and in Revelation 17 the harlot, who is identified as Babylon (**Revelation 17:5**), is described as sitting upon the many waters of the river Euphrates (**Revelation 17:1, 15; 16:12**). As we shall see, the drying up of the Euphrates (**Revelation 16:12**) is parallel to the king of the north coming to his end with none to help him (**Daniel 11:45**). There can be no doubt that Daniel 11:40-45 and Revelation 17 are describing the same end-time power!

COMMENTS ON VERSE 40

In verses 31-39 there is not the slightest hint of any opposition to the king of the north. For [1260] 'days' he did his own will and prospered (verse 33). But at the time of the end, the king of the south pushed at him. When did the time of the end begin? I will first provide a quotation from the pen of Ellen G. White and then we will see if what she says is in harmony with Scripture and history.

"The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message [the first angel's message] is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment had come. The prophecies present a succession of events leading down to the opening of the judgment. This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But that part of his prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal "to the time of the end." Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on the fulfillment of these prophecies. But at the time of the end, says the prophet, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." (Daniel 12:4).

*'The apostle Paul warned the church not to look for the coming of Christ in his day. "That day shall not come," he says, "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed." 2 Thessalonians 2:3. Not till after the great apostasy, and the long period of the reign of the "man of sin," can we look for the advent of our Lord. The "man of sin," which is also styled "the mystery of iniquity," "the son of perdition," and "that wicked," represents the papacy, which, as foretold in prophecy, was to maintain its supremacy for 1260 years. **This period ended in 1798.** The coming of Christ could not take place before that time. Paul covers with his caution the whole of the Christian dispensation down to the year 1798. It is this side of that time that the message of Christ's second coming is to be proclaimed.*

*'No such message has ever been given in past ages. Paul, as we have seen, did not preach it; he pointed his brethren into the then far-distant future for the coming of the Lord. The Reformers did not proclaim it. Martin Luther placed the judgment about three hundred years in the future from his day. **But since 1798** the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the judgment near." Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 355, 356*

'And at the time of the end' (Daniel 11:40, KJV)

The first biblical clue comes from Daniel 11:40 where we find a very important chronological detail. There we are told that the king of the south would push at the king of the north **at** [not during] the time of the end. Clearly the time of the end began when the king of the south pushed at the king of the north. Therefore, if we can discover who the king of the south is and when he pushed at the king of the north then we will also be able to determine when the time of the end began.

A second clue is found in Daniel 11:33 where we are told that the king of the north exercised dominion over God's people for '*many days*' (see also **Daniel 11:35**). As we have previously shown (see pages 14-16), these '*days*' are equivalent to '*time, times and half a time*' in Daniel 7:25 and '*forty two months*' in Revelation 13:5-7. Now if the dominion of the little horn/beast/king of the north was limited to 1260 years, then its dominion must have been removed at the end of those years. That is to say, the dominion of the king of the north was removed when he was attacked by the king of the south and given the deadly wound in 1798. This would also prove that the time of the end begins with the deadly wound when the first stage of dominion of the little horn and the beast came to an end.

Daniel 12:4 provides another clue which helps us determine when the time of the end began (see also Daniel 8:17 and carefully study **Stephen P. Bohr's Notes on Daniel 10**). There, Daniel was told to '*shut up the words and seal the book until the time of the end.*' He was also told that at the time of the end knowledge of the little book would be increased, that is to say, the sealed book would be opened. Therefore, if we can discover the moment when Daniel 8-12 was unsealed, we can also know when the time of the end began.

Revelation 10 describes the specific moment when this book was opened. In verse 2 we first see an angel with an open book in his hand. A more literal translation of the verb would be: '*the book **having been opened.***' Next the angel proclaimed a powerful message from the book to earth and sea. Finally John was told to eat the book and it was sweet in his mouth but bitter in his stomach. The time of the end, therefore, must have begun when the knowledge of the '*little book*' (**Daniel 8-12**) was greatly increased, an increase which led to a bittersweet experience.

The strongest clue for the beginning point of the time of the end is found in Revelation 11. This last clue will become clear as we continue our study.

'the king of the south' (**Daniel 11:40, KJV**)

Historically and geographically the king of the south is Egypt because Egypt was geographically south of Israel. Daniel 11:5, 8 makes this identification clear when it tells us that the king of the south took captives into Egypt. Interestingly, Daniel 11:40 in the LXX states that at the time of the end the **king of Egypt** would attack the king of the north.

Whereas the north is the realm of counterfeit religion, the south is the opposite it is the denial of religion and of God. It is a human government without God. In this sense it represents secular humanism.

But who is this king of the south who attacked the king of the north at the time of the end? It certainly could not be literal geographic Egypt because God's true Israel at that time was no longer literal geographic Israel. If Israel is spiritual and worldwide at the time of the end, then Egypt must also represent a spiritual and worldwide system. But, which system is represented here by the word 'Egypt'? Revelation 11 will help us answer this question, but before we go there it would be well to determine two things:

- The salient characteristic of ancient Egypt
- The meaning of the expression ‘shall **push** at him’

There is one characteristic of ancient Egypt which ‘jumps out’ of the pages in Exodus: Its arrogant refusal to recognize the existence of the true God. When Moses and Aaron demanded the release of Israel, Pharaoh defiantly thundered: ‘*Who is the LORD that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the LORD neither will I let Israel go.*’ (**Exodus 5:2**) Pharaoh’s reaction to each of the ten plagues of Egypt reveals his persistent refusal to recognize the existence of Israel’s God! Ezekiel 29:3 further portrays this atheistic arrogance when Pharaoh is quoted as saying: ‘*My river [the Nile] is mine own, and I have made it for myself.*’ Pharaoh claimed to have creative power!!

Concerning the atheistic spirit of ancient Egypt, Ellen White remarks:

“Of all nations presented in Bible history, Egypt most boldly denied the existence of the living God and resisted His commands. No monarch ever ventured upon more open and highhanded rebellion against the authority of Heaven than did the king of Egypt. When the message was brought him by Moses, in the name of the Lord, Pharaoh proudly answered: “Who is Jehovah that I should hearken unto His voice to let Israel go? I know not Jehovah, and moreover I will not let Israel go.” Exodus 5:2, A.R.V. This is atheism, and the nation represented by Egypt would give voice to a similar denial of the claims of the living God and would manifest a like spirit of unbelief and defiance.” (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 269)

Some have questioned whether ancient Egypt could really be portrayed as an atheistic power; after all, Egypt had many gods. It is true that Egypt had many gods but biblically speaking, atheism does not mean that you deny the existence of **any** god or gods but rather that you deny the existence of the **true** God. Accordingly, Hezekiah stated that Sennacherib cast the gods of the nations into the fire because ‘**they were no gods**’ (**Ezekiel 37:19**). When the apostle Paul taught against idolatry he was accused of saying that these idols were no gods at all (**Acts 17:26**; see also **II Corinthians 8:4-6**; **Galatians 4:8**). It is well known that when Christians refused to offer incense on Caesar’s altar, the crowd cried out: ‘kill the atheists.’ In other words, a person who denied the gods of Rome was, in the eyes of the pagan Romans, an atheist. Thus, the salient characteristic of ancient Egypt was its open defiance of the true God.

In short, whereas the north represents the realm of counterfeit religion, the south represents the secular governments of the world which can trace their origin to the French Revolution. Notably, though in Daniel 11:40 the king of the north and the king of the south are at odds, later on they join forces to persecute God’s remnant people who have found refuge in spiritual Jerusalem. Daniel 11 describes the gathering of all nations—north and south—against God’s holy Jerusalem as does Revelation 16:14.

Now to the meaning of the expression ‘*shall push at him.*’ The Hebrew word *nagach* is used in the Old Testament to describe the act of thrusting with horns in order to gore a person or

kingdom to death (**Ezekiel 34:21; I Kings 22:11; II Chronicles 18:10; Psalm 44:5**). In the context of the book of Daniel, the word is used (**Daniel 8:4**) to describe the ram goring the kingdom of Babylon. Obviously, the king of the south's 'pushing' in Daniel 11 is far more than a friendly shove—it had the intention of goring the king of the north to death!! The question is: which nation in history arrogantly and defiantly denied the existence of the true God and arose with the specific intent of goring to death the power which had ruled for 1260 years? The answer is found in Revelation 11.

Revelation 11:3 brings to view **two witnesses** (also referred to as two olive trees or candlesticks) who gave their testimony clothed in **sackcloth** for **1260 days**. These two witnesses represent the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament gives witness to Jesus (**John 5:39**) as does the New (**John 21:24**). The oil from the olive trees represents the Holy Spirit who inspired both Testaments (**II Peter 1:21; II Timothy 3:16**). The candlesticks symbolize the fact that the two Testaments give spiritual light through the preaching of the church (**Psalm 119:105; Matthew 25:1-12**). Sackcloth in the Bible represents suffering and mourning (**Psalm 30:11**).

A careful study of the contents and literary structure of Revelation 12-13 reveals that the 1260 days represent the same time period as the '*time, times and half a time*' of Daniel 7 and Revelation 12:6, the '*42 months*' of Revelation 13:5, and the 1260 days of Revelation 12:14. The picture here is that the Bible during this period of 1260 years was giving testimony to Jesus but in suffering and mourning and obscurity.

But things were about to get a lot worse for these witnesses. Revelation 11:7 indicates that at the end of their testimony (at the conclusion of the 1260 years) '*the beast that ascends out of the bottomless pit*' would make war against them and '*overcome them and kill them.*' Their bodies would remain in the street of the great city whose name '*spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified*' (**Revelation 11:8**). The death of the two witnesses would lead to great mirth and celebration on the part of those who killed them (**Revelation 11:9-10**). Neither Sodom nor Egypt in this text is literal. Sodom didn't even exist at this time. Besides, Jesus wasn't literally crucified in Egypt or Sodom. The text clearly states that Sodom and Egypt are to be understood **spiritually or symbolically**.

The question is this: What power in history made open war against the Bible at the end of the 1260 years? Which power arose with the express intent of annihilating the papacy (**Revelation 13:9-10**)? There is one nation only which fits the specifications of the prophecy: France. Concerning this, Ellen White remarks:

'This prophecy has received a most exact and striking fulfillment in the history of France.' (Ellen White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 269)

The French Revolution began in 1789. From 1793-1797 France, in its national assembly, adopted a resolution which officially denied the existence of God. Copies of the Bible were confiscated and burned. Churches were closed. The Goddess of Reason was enthroned amidst

great lasciviousness in the Cathedral of Notre Dame. The citizenry was ebullient with joy that they were finally free from the restraints of the Church and the Bible. Members of both the nobility and the clergy were rounded up and decapitated with the guillotine. Says Ellen White:

"France is the only nation in the world concerning which the authentic record survives, that as a nation she lifted her hand in open rebellion against the Author of the universe [keep in mind that the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution had not yet taken place when Ellen White died in 1915]. Plenty of blasphemers, plenty of infidels, there have been, and still continue to be, in England, Germany, Spain, and elsewhere; but France stands apart in the world's history as the single state which, by the decree of her Legislative Assembly, pronounced that there was no God, and of which the entire population of the capital, and a vast majority elsewhere, women as well as men, danced and sang with joy in accepting the announcement." **Blackwood's Magazine**, November, 1870. Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 269

Revelation 11 and Revelation 13:10 must be studied together. Both refer to the same prophetic time period (42 months and 1260 days) and both reach their climax in events which transpired between 1793 and 1798. In Revelation 11:3 we have a description of the papacy's war on the Bible for 1260 years. This warfare climaxed in the attack of France against God and the Bible from 1793-1797. In Revelation 13:5, 10 we find a description of the papacy's dominion over the saints for 42 months culminating with the war of France against the Roman Catholic system from 1793-1798. During the reign of terror in France, scores of priests were slain 'with the sword' and in 1798; the pope was taken into captivity. Regarding the slaughter of the religious leaders, Ellen White remarks:

"The scaffolds ran red with the blood of the priests. The galleys and the prisons, once crowded with Huguenots, were now filled with their persecutors. Chained to the bench and toiling at the oar, the Roman Catholic clergy experienced all those woes which their church had so freely inflicted on the gentle heretics." Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 283

Regarding the meaning of 'Sodom' in Revelation 11, Ellen White has this to say:

"France presented also the characteristics which especially distinguished Sodom. During the Revolution there was manifest a state of moral debasement and corruption similar to that which brought destruction upon the cities of the plain." Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 269

At the conclusion of the Revolution in 1798 Pope Pius VI was taken prisoner and died in exile. It was the intent of Napoleon to destroy the papacy whose principles stood in direct opposition to the principles of the Revolution. According to Daniel 11:40 the time of the end begins when the king of the south **pushed** at the king of the north. This being the case, the time of the end must have begun in 1798 when the papacy was wounded by the French Revolution!

The picture in Daniel 11:33 is parallel: For '[1260] days' (verse 33) the king of the north led God's people into **captivity** and killed them with the **sword** but in 1798 the king of the south led

the king of the north into **captivity** and wounded him with the **sword**. In my [Notes on Daniel 7](#) I have provided ample evidence that the papacy sustained a deadly wound in 1798, a wound which has not yet fully healed in the twenty first century. Says the late Jesuit, Malachi Martin:

*"[For] **fifteen hundred years** and more, Rome had kept as strong a hand as possible in each local community around the wide world. . . . By and large, and admitting some exceptions, that had been the Roman view until **two hundred years of inactivity** had been **imposed** upon the papacy by the **major secular powers of the world**."* Quoted in [Christianity Today](#) (November 21, 1986), p. 26.

All atheistic Marxist movements of the 20th century have derived their inspiration from the French Revolution. The reason is understandable: The Revolution was an uprising of the proletariat against the nobility and the clergy. Religion has been called the opium of the people because the Roman Catholic system used it to control the masses during the 1260 years.

For centuries church and state had joined hands to impose upon European society an oppressive system which they claimed to derive from the Bible but which was really the product of human tradition. The rulers and priests who lived in opulence controlled the people by warning them of the fearfulness of hell or by offering them the hope of a future reward in heaven. As a result, Europe languished in ignorance and poverty. When the revolutionaries overthrew the church-state alliance they also threw out the Bible, that is, they threw out the proverbial baby with the bath water.

It is remarkable to see how the first part of Daniel 11:40 has been fulfilled since 1798. First, democracies were established in the United States and Europe. Then in 1917 a 'French Revolution' took place in Russia (once again it was a war against the ruling class and the clergy). Soon, to the consternation of the papacy and the western world, country after country became communist: China, the Soviet Union, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and North Korea. Nicaragua followed suit and El Salvador hung in the balance. Especially disturbing to the Roman Catholic Church was the fact that communism was overtaking countries which had traditionally been Roman Catholic strongholds. It appeared like in the aftermath of the French Revolution the whole world would become communist. The king of the south was **pushing** at the king of the north.

In a very interesting article in [Life magazine](#) we are told about an event in the life of Joseph Stalin:

*'In 1935 Josef Stalin, absolute ruler of the Soviet Union, was given some unsolicited advice. Make a propitiatory gesture to the Vatican, he was told. **Pushed** too far, his country's Catholics might become counterrevolutionary. Stalin's great mustache amplified his sneer. 'The Pope. And how many divisions has he?' The answer then was that he has none. The answer now is that he needs none. The structures of Communism are crumbling to the touch.'* ([Life](#), December, 1989, bold is mine)

Time Magazine for December 4, 1989 describes the Marxist onslaught against the Roman Catholic clergy after the Bolshevik Revolution:

“Until recently, the battalions of Marxism seemed to have the upper hand over the soldiers of the Cross. In the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, Lenin had pledged toleration but delivered terror. ‘Russia turned crimson with the blood of martyrs,’ says Father Gleb Yakunin, Russian orthodoxy’s bravest agitator for religious freedom. In the Bolsheviks’ first five years in power, 28 bishops and 1,200 priests were cut down by the red sickle. Stalin greatly accelerated the terror, and by the end of Khrushchev’s rule, liquidation of the clergy reached an estimated 50,000. After World War II, fierce but generally less bloody persecution spread into the Ukraine and the new Soviet bloc, affecting millions of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well as Orthodox.”

But the prophecy of Daniel 11:40 clearly indicated that the Soviet Sickle would be trounced by the Roman Catholic Cross. True, Daniel 11:40 affirmed that the king of the south would attack the king of the north in 1798. But the same verse then goes on to explain that the king of the north would rise against the king of the south and finally overwhelm him. This same perspective is presented in Revelation 13:3, 12, and 14 where we are informed that after receiving a deadly wound, the beast would have a miraculous recovery and the whole world would eventually wonder after the beast and worship it.

In the early 1980's this all appeared impossible. Well do I remember how my students in our Seventh-day Adventist University in Medellin, Colombia snickered when I told them that the days of communism were numbered! Many said: ‘Can’t you see how country after country is going communist?’ Yes, I answered, but the prophecy of Daniel 11 tells us that communism will be overcome by the papacy. Few were persuaded!

In the late 1940's, decades before the Berlin Wall came down, Louis F. Were, like a lonely voice crying out in the wilderness, boldly stated:

“Communism is the one great barrier between her [the papacy] and her goal. This barrier she regards as a serious hindrance to the acquisition of world control. This barrier she seeks to remove. The Scriptures declare that she will overcome this tremendous barrier—‘the land of Egypt shall not escape’. The countries that have adopted ‘godless Communism’ will not escape her [the papacy’s] control.” (Louis F. Were, **Before Probation Closes**, p. 60)

How could Louis F. Were make such a bold statement when every news source around him said just the opposite? The answer is quite simple. Were allowed the Bible to explain current events rather than having current events explain the Bible! Certainly Louis Were’s view has been remarkably vindicated *post-mortem*.

‘And the king of the north shall come against him [the king of the south] like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships’ (Daniel 11:40, KJV)

These words in Daniel 11:40 describe the healing of the papacy's deadly wound. Then the following verses describe an onslaught by the king of the north which not only fells the king of the south but overruns the entire world as well.

The word 'whirlwind' is frequently translated 'storm' or 'tempest' (**Isaiah 28:2; Psalm 58:9; Nahum 1:3; Psalm 50:3**). It is used as a metaphor of conquering armies. Speaking about the period which follows the healing of the deadly wound, Ellen White perceptively states:

*"God has revealed what is to take place in the last days that His people may be prepared to stand against the **tempest** of opposition and wrath. Those who have been warned of the events before them are not to sit in calm expectation of the coming **storm**, comforting themselves that the Lord will shelter His faithful ones in the day of trouble. . . ." Ellen G. White, **The Faith I Live By**, p. 325, (bold is mine)*

*"Angels are now restraining the **winds** of strife, that they may not blow until the world shall be warned of its coming doom; but a **storm** is gathering, ready to burst upon the earth; and when God shall bid His angels loose the **winds**, there will be such a scene of strife as no pen can picture." Ellen G. White, **Education**, pp. 179-180*

*"As the **storm** approaches a large class who have professed faith in the third angel's message, but have not been sanctified through obedience to the truth, abandon their position and join the ranks of the opposition. By uniting with the world and partaking of its spirit, they have come to view matters in nearly the same light; and when the test is brought, they are prepared to choose the easy, popular side. Men of talent and pleasing address, who once rejoiced in the truth, employ their powers to deceive and mislead souls. They become the most bitter enemies of their former brethren." Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p.608, (bold is mine).*

*"Prophecies are being fulfilled, and **stormy times** are before us. Old controversies which have apparently been hushed for a long time will be revived, and new controversies will spring up; new and old will commingle, and this will take place right early. The angels are holding the four **winds**, that they shall not blow, until the specified work of warning is given to the world; but the **storm** is gathering, the clouds are loading, ready to burst upon the world, and to many it will be as a thief in the night." Ellen G. White, **An Appeal to our Ministers and Conference Committees**, 1892, p. 38, (bold is mine).*

Chariots and horses are used to portray **military** power (**I Kings 1:5; 20:1; I Samuel 13:5; Exodus 14:9; Joshua 24:6; Isaiah 43:17; Ezekiel 26:7; Revelation 9:9**) and ships are symbolic of **economic** power (**I Kings 10:22; Psalm 107:23; Proverbs 31:14; Ezekiel 27:25, 29; Revelation 18:17-19**). The picture is clear: The king of the south would be overcome by great **military** and **economic** might of the king of the north!!

'and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over' (Daniel 11:40, KJV)

There is a geographical progression in the movements of the king of the north. His conquests are compared to an **inundating river**. He begins his campaign in Babylon in the North Country. He then moves west through Syria and Lebanon (the countries) and takes a southward turn into Israel (the glorious land). Next he attacks Ammon, Edom and Moab east and south of Israel, and then continues his southward movement into Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya. The picture is one of absolute and devastating conquest of the known world at that time from the River Euphrates to the Nile Delta!

The word 'overflow' is used elsewhere to depict a flooding river. Let's examine a few examples. In Psalm 69:2, 15 David exclaims to God:

*"I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods **overflow** me... Let not the waterflood **overflow** me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me."*

King Sennacherib's invasion of the glorious land in the year 722 B. C. is compared to an all-encompassing flood:

*"Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks: And he shall pass through Judah; he shall **overflow** and go over, he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel." (Isaiah 8:7-8. For further examples, notice **Daniel 11:10, 22, 26; 9:26; Jeremiah 47:2; Nahum 1:8 and Isaiah 43:2**).*

Let's summarize and interpret verse 40 in the light of what we have studied so far:

*"At the time of the end (**1798**), the king of the south (**France; atheistic communism**) will push (**give a deadly wound**) at the king of the north (**the papacy**) but the king of the north (**the papacy**) will recover from the attack (**the deadly wound will be healed**). By means of horses, chariots and many ships (**great military and economic power**) the king of the north (**the papacy**) will defeat the king of the south (**atheistic communism**). The victory of the king of the north (**the papacy**) will be comparable to the devastation caused by the great river Euphrates at flood stage."*

Some critical questions arise at this point: Was Roman Catholicism attacked in 1798 by an avowed atheistic power? Did Roman Catholicism overcome atheistic communism through great **military** and **economic** power? Is the papacy in the process of recovering its awesome global power? The answer to all these questions is a resounding yes!!

'But', someone might object, 'the papacy has not fired a single missile at atheistic communism! How can you say that she overcame atheistic communism with her great military strength?' The answer is actually quite simple. The papacy does not need its own military or economic

strength. All it must do (as it has always done!) is ally itself with the secular nations who do have this capability and use **their** resources. Has the papacy done this in recent years?

Before the fall of the iron curtain in 1989, the late Malachi Martin boldly predicted in his book **The Keys of this Blood**, that the papacy would eventually overwhelm its two global competitors, Marxism and Western Capitalism. Shortly after Martin's book was published, the iron curtain came down. Though this was a remarkable event in itself, even more remarkable was the manner in which it came down.

The cover of **Time Magazine** for February 24, 1992 bears the title: 'Holy Alliance.' Portrayed on the cover are Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul II. The subtitle tells it all: **PLACE THE TITLE HERE**. In the fascinating cover article written by **PUT THE NAME** we are told how the Vatican and the United States—two philosophical enemies to be sure—joined forces to precipitate the fall of the iron curtain. The United States took advantage of the vast intelligence network provided by the Vatican while the United States in turn contributed its vast technological, **economic** and **military** might. According to the article in **Time Magazine** it worked something like this.

The details of this 'Holy Alliance' are painstakingly documented and amplified in the book, **His Holiness** by **PUT IN THE NAME HERE**. This book is required reading for anyone who wishes to truly understand the deep entanglement of the United States with the Vatican in the overthrow of Soviet Communism.

The non-religious media has recognized that the United States, particularly during the presidency of Ronald Reagan, used its enormous **economic** resources to build up and modernize its **military**. Huge deficits were incurred in the process but the end result was that the Soviet Union could no longer compete. It could no longer expend huge chunks of its national budget on defense and still feed its citizens! In actual fact, the Soviet Union went bankrupt. It was economic necessity, not a philosophical change from Marxism to Capitalism, which prompted Gorbachev to cry out *perestroika!! glasnost!!*

Regarding the economic and military role of Ronald Reagan's presidency we are told:

*"In 1981, the Communist bloc got another shock. A new American President, Ronald Reagan, began fulfilling his promise to challenge the Soviets, not placate them. Over the next few years, he accelerated the **military buildup** and announced the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), a space-based system for protecting against a missile attack. He backed anti-Communist rebels in Nicaragua, Angola, Cambodia, and Afghanistan. And with **American troops**, he liberated the island of Grenada from Communist thugs.*

*"The Soviets' confidence was shaken. . . . The Western Europeans also pressured the Soviets. NATO forged ahead with **military modernization**. German voters spurned Soviet 'peace overtures' and elected a government that voted to deploy new intermediate-range missiles. .*

.Military pressure from America and its Western allies had caused the Soviets to flinch” (The Reader’s Digest, March, 1990, emphasis mine).

“In the 1980s, communist **economies**, always inefficient, went belly up. Before, they had lacked consumer and luxury goods. Now perennial shortages of staples worsened as well. When Soviet miners went on strike in 1989, their demands included soap, toilet paper, and sugar” (Reader’s Digest, March, 1990, emphasis mine).

“As the **economy** [of the Soviet Union] **deteriorates** and shortages grow, public disillusionment with Communism and with Gorbachev himself is rising, and hostile republics, nationalities and interests groups are competing more fiercely for political power and for shares in the **shrinking economy**. Corruption and crime are rampant; miners and railway workers threaten to cut off fuel supplies during the bitter winter; Azerbaijanis cut the rail line to an Armenian enclave in their midst; farmers hoard food, leaving city shelves bare” (U.S. News and World Report, January 15, 1990)

It was this turmoil in Eastern Europe which finally led Gorbachev to seek an audience with the Pope himself. Significantly, it was not Pope John Paul II who was visiting Gorbachev but rather the leader of the Soviet bloc who was traveling to visit the Pope. The expectancy of this event is described in an article which appeared in Time Magazine for December 4, 1989:

“Of all the events that have shaken the Soviet bloc in 1989, none is more fraught with history—or more implausible—than the polite encounter to take place this week in Vatican City. There, in the spacious ceremonial library of the 16th century Apostolic Palace, the czar of world atheism, Mikhail Gorbachev, will visit the Vicar of Christ, Pope John Paul II.

“The moment will be electric, not only because John Paul **helped inflame** the fervor for freedom in his Polish homeland that **swept** like brush fire across Eastern Europe. Beyond that, the meeting of the two men symbolizes the end of the 20th century=s most dramatic spiritual war, a conflict in which the seemingly irresistible force of Communism battered against the immovable object of Christianity.”

Time Magazine for December 11, 1989 used a significant historical analogy to describe this historic encounter between Gorbachev and John Paul II:

“When the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV decided to seek pardon of Pope Gregory VII in 1077, he stood barefoot for three days in the snow outside the papal quarters in Canossa, Italy. Gorbachev=s concordat with the church was no less significant in its way.”

That this secular magazine should compare John Paul II with Gregory VII and Mikhail Gorbachev with Henry IV is amazing. What the author is saying is that John Paul II humbled Gorbachev in 1989 much as his predecessor had done with Henry IV in 1077!

Significantly, the chronological sequence of the events which led to the fall of Communism is described in a Newsweek article (December 25, 1989) under the title 'Days of the **Whirlwind**.' One can't fail to notice that the word 'whirlwind' is the very one which is used in the King James translation of Daniel 11:41 to describe the king of the north's counterattack on the king of the south.

'He shall enter also into the glorious land' (Daniel 11:41, KJV)

Literally speaking there can be no doubt that the '*glorious land*' (same expression as in verse 16) represents the geographical territory of Israel. The same word is translated '*pleasant land*' in Daniel 8:9 and Jeremiah 3:19 and the '*glory of all lands*' in Ezekiel 20:6, 15.

In John 4:20-24 Jesus made it clear that after Pentecost there would be no more literal and local holy lands or holy mountains so the question we must ask is: What does the '*glorious land*' represent? Before we are able to answer this question we must first determine why God chose literal Israel and why He planted them in the literal '*glorious land*.' Here are the reasons:

1. Israel spent an extended period of **captivity** in Egypt.
2. At the end of that period God **delivered** them from bondage and took them to the land of Canaan. There they would have the **freedom** to preserve the worship of the true God and would be free to worship Him according to the dictates of their conscience.
3. The land of Canaan flowed with '*milk and honey which is the glory of all lands*' (**Ezekiel 20:6, 15**), a euphemism for unparalleled **abundance and prosperity**. God gave Israel every possible material advantage.
4. Israel was to guard the **law** and **preserve the worship** of the true God.
5. The land of Israel was at the **very hub** or epicenter of three continents. God had a providential purpose in placing Israel in this strategic location. As people from all three continents came through Israel, God's people would have the golden opportunity of giving witness to the true God. This purpose is clearly enunciated in Isaiah 49:6:

"And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."

6. God warned Israel that if they should prove unfaithful to Him, they would lose their prosperity and ultimately the land itself. So to speak, national apostasy would lead to national ruin. In effect, this is precisely what happened.

Notice the following quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy on God's providential plan for Israel:

*"God's law must be exalted, His authority maintained; and to the house of Israel was given this great and noble work. God separated them from the world, that He might commit to them a sacred trust. He made them the **depositories of His law**, and He purposed through them to preserve among men the knowledge of Himself. Thus the **light of heaven was to shine out** to a world enshrouded in darkness, and a voice was to be heard appealing to **all peoples to turn from idolatry to serve the living God**.*

*"With great power, and with a mighty hand," God brought His chosen people out of the land of Egypt. Exodus 32:11. "He sent Moses His servant; and Aaron whom He had chosen. They showed His signs among them, and wonders in the land of Ham." "He rebuked the Red Sea also, and it was dried up: so He led them through the depths." (Psalms 105:26, 27; 106:9). He rescued them from their servile state that He might **bring them to a good land**, a land which in His **providence He had prepared** for them **as a refuge** from their enemies. He would bring them to Himself and encircle them in His everlasting arms; and in return for His goodness and mercy they were to exalt His name and make it glorious in the earth.*

*"The Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the **waste howling wilderness**; He led him about, He instructed him, He kept him as the apple of His eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings: so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him." Deuteronomy 32:9-12. Thus He brought the Israelites unto Himself, that they might dwell as under the **shadow of the Most High**. Miraculously preserved from the perils of the wilderness wandering, they were finally established in the **Land of Promise** as a **favoured nation**." (Ellen G. White, Prophets and Kings, pp. 16-17)*

One can't help but notice the striking similarity between the providential establishment of ancient Israel and God's plan for Protestants who fled to the United States. Notice the similarities:

1. God's people were in **bondage** to the Roman Catholic system for 1260 years.
2. Toward the end of this period, God's people fled from Europe to the land which helped them (Revelation 12:16). In this new land (the United States of America) they would enjoy the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.
3. This land was truly a good land with almost unlimited material resources conducive to the proclamation of the gospel to the world.
4. It was God's purpose that in this land the law of God should be exalted and true worship preserved among its citizens. This task was particularly committed to Seventh-day Adventists.
5. The land was in a strategic location where missionaries could be sent out and inhabitants from every nation, kindred, tongue and people could come to learn about the true creator God and His worship.

6. But if this nation should prove unworthy of God's trust, national apostasy would lead to national ruin.

The Spirit of Prophecy confirms this scenario. In a remarkable article found in Signs of the Times ('Build the Old Waste Places') June 12, 1893, Ellen White quotes Jeremiah 3:18-19 which in its original context applies to the land which was originally given to literal Israel. Then, almost in the same breath, she goes on to speak of the prophetic destiny of the United States. These are her words:

*"When **the land** which the Lord provided as an **asylum** for his people, that they might **worship** him according to the dictates of their own consciences, **the land** over which for long years the **shield of Omnipotence** has been spread, **the land** which God has favored by making it the **depository of the pure religion of Christ**,--when **that land** shall, through its legislators, abjure the principles of Protestantism, and give countenance to Romish apostasy in tampering with God's **law**,--it is then that the final work of the man of sin will be revealed. Protestants will throw their whole influence and strength on the side of the Papacy; by a national act enforcing the false Sabbath, they will give life and vigor to the corrupt faith of Rome, reviving her tyranny and oppression of conscience. Then it will be time for God to work in mighty power for the vindication of his truth."*

In a similar vein, Ellen White says this about the role of the United States in prophecy:

*"The Lord has done more for the United States **than for any other country** upon which the sun shines. Here He provided an **asylum** for His people, where they could **worship** Him according to the dictates of conscience. Here Christianity has progressed in its purity. The life-giving doctrine of the one Mediator between God and man has been freely taught. **God designed** that this country should ever remain free for all people to worship Him in accordance with the dictates of conscience. **He designed** that its civil institutions, in their expansive productions, should represent the **freedom** of gospel privileges." (Ellen G. White, Maranatha, p. 193)*

*"The greatest and **most favored nation** upon the earth is the United States. A **gracious Providence** has shielded this country, and poured upon her the **choicest of Heaven's blessings**. Here the persecuted and oppressed have found **refuge**. Here the Christian faith in its purity has been taught. This people have been the recipients of **great light and unrivaled mercies**. But these gifts have been repaid by ingratitude and forgetfulness of God. The Infinite One keeps a reckoning with the nations, and their guilt is proportioned to the light rejected. A fearful record now stands in the register of heaven against **our land**; but the crime which shall fill up the measure of her iniquity is that of **making void the law of God**." Ellen G. White, Signs of the Times, July 4, 1899*

The book of Revelation (in full harmony with **Daniel 11:41**) portrays the time when the United States will fall into the hands of the Roman Catholic papacy and will do her bidding (**Revelation 13:11-18**). The beast which arose from the earth--the glorious land--(**Revelation 12:16**) and which had two horns like a lamb (civil and religious liberty) will speak as a dragon! This it will do

by making void the law of God and imposing the mark of the beast. Then, national apostasy will end only in national ruin.

It must be underlined that the 'glorious land' does not represent the United States as a mere civil society but rather as the stronghold of Protestant principles. These Protestant principles have been exported by mission activity to practically all nations of the earth.

'... and many countries shall be overthrown' (Daniel 11:41, KJV)

The word 'countries' is added by the King James Version translators but does not belong to the text. A better translation would be: 'many [who are in the glorious land] shall be overthrown [caused to fall].'

The word 'overthrown' (*kashal*) is significant. It means 'to waver, to totter, to falter, to stumble, to fall, through weakness of the legs or ankles.' In the King James Version it is most frequently translated 'fall' or 'stumble.' Though it can refer to physical stumbling and falling as in persecution or battle (**Daniel 11:14, 33, 34; Nahum 2:5; Isaiah 5:27; Jeremiah 46:6; Isaiah 40:30**) its more prevalent use seems to denote a moral stumbling and falling. Notice the following examples:

- **Isaiah 8:15:** *At the coming of the Messiah 'many among them [Israel] shall **stumble**, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.'*
- **Isaiah 28:7:** *'But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they **stumble** in judgment.'*
- **Jeremiah 50:32:** *'And the most proud shall **stumble** and fall and none shall raise him up: and I will kindle a fire in his cities, and it shall devour all round about him.'*
- **Jeremiah 18:15:** *'Because my people hath forgotten me, they have burned incense to vanity, and they have caused them to **stumble** in their ways from the ancient paths, to walk in paths, in a way not cast up.'*
- **Malachi 2:8:** *'But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to **stumble** at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts.'*
- **Proverbs 16:18:** *'Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall.'*
- **Isaiah 28:13:** *'But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little; that they might go, and **fall** backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken.'*
- **Hosea 5:5:** *'And the pride of Israel doth testify to his face: therefore shall Israel and Ephraim **fall** in their iniquity; Judah also shall **fall** with them.'*

- **Hosea 14:9:** *'Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? Prudent and he shall know them? For the ways of the LORD are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall **fall** therein.'*

Daniel 11:41 is saying that when the king of the north enters the glorious land [Protestantism as represented primarily in the United States], many will stumble and fall. This is what Seventh-day Adventists have called 'the shaking.' Notice the following corroborating statements from the Spirit of Prophecy:

*"The time is not far distant when the test will come to every soul. The mark of the beast will be urged upon us. Those who have step by step yielded to worldly demands and conformed to worldly customs will not find it a hard matter **to yield** to the powers that be, rather than subject themselves to derision, insult, threatened imprisonment, and death. The contest is between the commandments of God and the commandments of men. In this time the gold will be separated from the dross in the church. True godliness will be clearly distinguished from the appearance and tinsel of it. Many a star that we have admired for its brilliancy will then go out in darkness. **Chaff like a cloud will be borne away on the wind**, even from places where we see only floors of rich wheat. All who assume the ornaments of the sanctuary, but are not clothed with Christ's righteousness, will appear in the shame of their own nakedness."* Ellen G. White, **Testimonies for the Church**, volume 5, p. 81

*"The Word of God plainly declares that His law is to be scorned, trampled upon, by the world; there will be an extraordinary prevalence of iniquity. The professed **Protestant world** [the glorious land] will form a confederacy with the man of sin, and the church and the world will be in corrupt harmony.*

*"Here the great crisis is coming upon the world. The Scriptures teach that **popery** [the king of the north] is to regain its lost supremacy, and that the fires of persecution will be rekindled through the time-serving **concessions of the so-called Protestant world**. In this time of peril we can **stand** only as we have the truth and the power of God. Men can know the truth only by being themselves partakers of the divine nature. We have need now for more than human wisdom in reading and searching the Scriptures; and if we come to God's Word with humble hearts, He will raise up a standard for us against the lawless element.*

*"It is difficult to hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end; and the difficulty increases when there are hidden influences constantly at work to bring in another spirit, a counterworking element, on Satan's side of the question. In the absence of persecution, there have drifted into our ranks some who appear sound, and their Christianity unquestionable, but who, if persecution should arise, **would go out from us**. In the crisis, they would see force in specious reasoning that has had an influence on their minds. Satan has prepared various snares to meet varied minds. When the law of God is made void the church will be sifted by fiery trials, and a **larger proportion than we now anticipate**, will give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. Instead of being strengthened when brought into strait places, many prove that they*

are not living branches of the True Vine; they bore no fruit, and the husbandman taketh them away.

*“But when the world makes void the law of God, what will be the effect upon the truly obedient and righteous? **Will they be carried away by the strong current of evil?** Because so many rank themselves under the banner of the prince of darkness, will God's commandment-keeping people swerve from their allegiance? Never! Not one who is abiding in Christ will **fail or fall**. His followers will bow in obedience to a higher authority than that of any earthly potentate. While the contempt placed upon God's commandments leads many to suppress the truth and show less reverence for it, the faithful ones will with greater earnestness hold aloft its distinguishing truths. We are not left to our own direction. In all our ways we should acknowledge God, and He will direct our paths. We should consult His Word with humble hearts, ask His counsel, give up our will to His. We can do nothing without God.*

*“There is the highest reason for us to prize the true Sabbath and stand in its defense, for it is the sign which distinguishes the people of God from the world. The commandment that the world makes void is the one to which, for this very reason, God's people will give greater honor. It is when the unbelieving cast contempt upon the Word of God that the faithful Calebs are called for. It is then that they will stand firm at the post of duty, without parade, and **without swerving** because of reproach. The unbelieving spies stood ready to destroy Caleb. He saw the stones in the hands of those who had brought a false report, but this did not deter him; he had a message, and he would bear it. The same spirit will be manifested today by those who are true to God.” Selected Messages, volume 2, pp.367-369*

*“I was pointed to the providence of God among His people and was shown that every trial made by the refining, purifying process upon professed Christians proves some to be dross. The fine gold does not always appear. In every religious crisis some fall under temptation. The **shaking** of God blows away multitudes like dry leaves. Prosperity multiplies a mass of professors. Adversity purges them out of the church. As a class, their spirits are not steadfast with God. **They go out from us** because they are not of us; for when tribulation or persecution arises because of the word, many are offended.” Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, volume 4, p. 89*

*“As the **storm** approaches, a large class who have professed faith in the third angel's message but have not been sanctified through obedience to the truth, **abandon their position and join the ranks of the opposition**. By uniting with the world and partaking of its spirit, they have come to view matters in nearly the same light; and when the test is brought, they are prepared to choose the easy, popular side. Men of talent and pleasing address, who once rejoiced in the truth, employ their powers to deceive and mislead souls. They become the most bitter enemies of their former brethren. When Sabbath keepers are brought before the courts to answer for their faith, these **apostates** are the most efficient agents of Satan to misrepresent and accuse them, and by false reports and insinuations to stir up the rulers against them.” Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 608*

*“Soon God's people will be tested by fiery trials, and **the great proportion** of those who now appear to be genuine and true will prove to be base metal. Instead of being strengthened and confirmed by opposition, threats, and abuse, they will cowardly **take the side of the opposers**. . . Now is the time for God's people to show themselves true to principle. When the religion of Christ is most held in contempt, when His law is most despised, then should our zeal be the warmest and our courage and firmness the most unflinching. To stand in defense of truth and righteousness when **the majority forsake us**, to fight the battles of the Lord when champions are few--this will be our test. At this time we must gather warmth from the coldness of others, courage from their cowardice, and loyalty from their treason. **The nation** [the glorious land] will be on the side of the great rebel leader.”* Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, volume 5, pp. 135, 136

‘but these shall escape [malat] out of his hand’ (Daniel 11:41, KJV)

The word ‘escape’ is of particular importance here. The Hebrew word *malat* means ‘to be smooth, to escape as by slipperiness, to release, to rescue, to preserve.’ It is generally translated in the King James Version as ‘escape’ or ‘deliver.’ It is almost always used to express the idea of escaping from some imminent danger. Frequently it is used in the sense of physical flight in order to save one's life. Let's notice a few examples where the word is translated ‘escape’

When the angels took Lot out of Sodom, they told him: *‘Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; **escape** to the mountain, lest thou be consumed.’ (Genesis 19:17)*. Lot was not only told to flee but he was instructed to flee to a particular place, the mountain (verses 17, 19)

When David was fleeing from the wrath of king Saul, he said to himself: *‘I shall now perish one day by the hand of Saul: there is nothing better for me than that I should speedily **escape** into the land of the Philistines; and Saul shall despair of me, to seek me any more in any coast of Israel: so shall I **escape out of his hand**.’ (I Samuel 27:1)*.

Malat: Psalm 22:5; Psalm 41:1; Psalm 124; Isaiah 31:5; Jeremiah 51:6, 45

Palat: Isaiah 37:31, 32

For the New Testament perspective of the word ‘escape,’ study Luke 21:34-36 and I Thessalonians 5:3.

The word *malat* is also translated in the King James Version as ‘preserve’:

*‘As birds flying, so will the LORD of hosts defend Jerusalem; defending also he will deliver it; and passing over he will **preserve** it.’ (Isaiah 31:5)*. It is important to realize that the words ‘defend,’ ‘deliver,’ and ‘preserve’ are all used synonymously in this verse.

Obadiah makes an interesting use of the word *palat*. Verse 14 refers to Edom laying in wait to cut down the fugitives of Israel and deliver them into the hand of the enemy. In verse 17 we are explicitly told that deliverance is found on Mt. Zion.

The word *malat* is frequently translated 'deliver':

God promised Ebed-Melech the Ethiopian: *'But I will **deliver** thee in that day, saith the LORD: and thou shalt not be given into the hand of the men of whom thou art afraid. For I will surely **deliver** thee, and thou shalt not fall by the sword, but thy life shall be for a prey unto thee: because thou hast put thy trust in me, saith the LORD.'* (Jeremiah 39:18)

Before the fall of Babylon, God warned His people: *'Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and **deliver** every man his soul: be not cut off in her iniquity; for this is the time of the LORD's vengeance; he will render unto her a recompence . . . My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and **deliver** ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the LORD.'* (Jeremiah 51:6, 45)

We conclude our observations on the word *malat* by quoting two particularly important verses:

*'And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be **delivered** [malat]: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be **deliverance** [peletah], as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call.'* (Joel 2:32).

*'And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be **delivered**, every one that shall be found written in the book.'* (Daniel 12:1).

Though we shall have much more to say about these verses in our comments on verse 45, it would be well to underline several items at this juncture:

1. Though translated differently, the Hebrew words 'escape' in Daniel 11:41 and 'delivered' in Daniel 12:1 are identical. This would seem to indicate that the ones who escape from the hand of the king of the north in Daniel 11:41 are the very ones who are later delivered at the end of the time of trouble in Daniel 12:1.
2. The progression of Daniel 11:40-45 seems to indicate that the ones who 'escape' from the hand of the king of the north actually flee from Edom, Moab and Ammon to seek refuge in Jerusalem or Mount Zion. When the king of the north sets up the tents of his palace between the seas and the glorious holy mountain, God's remnant is inside Jerusalem. Joel 2:32 underscores this by stating that when the heathen come against Jerusalem (Joel 3) **deliverance** is found in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem. Furthermore, it is clear that the Hebrew words *malat* and *palat* are synonymous in Joel 2:32, a point which will become all the more important as we continue our study. Revelation 14:14-

20 makes it clear that the righteous are in Jerusalem while the wicked are outside the city to attempt to deliver the death blow.

3. The mention of deliverance of God's people in the Time of Jacob's Trouble brings to mind the experience of Jacob in Genesis 32. Upon hearing that his brother is coming against him with a band of armed men, Jacob divides his company into two groups so that at least one can **escape (Genesis 32:8)** from the wrath of his brother. In his prayer, Jacob pleads for God to **deliver (Genesis 32:11)** him from Esau. It is clear here that Esau foreshadows the king of the north while Jacob foreshadows God's remnant people. And the Angel with whom Jacob struggled was Michael!!

"... Edom, Moab and the prominent people of Ammon . (Daniel 11:41 NKJV)

Edom, Moab and Ammon had one thing in common and that is that they were all relatives of Israel. Edom was another name for Esau and Moab and Ammon were sons of Lot who was a nephew of Abraham.

Esau, the progenitor of Edom, was a profane fornicator who despised the birthright for a plate of lentils (**Hebrews 12:16, 17**) But many in the early church were of the same stripe and God was able to rescue them.

These three entities were revilers of God's people (**Zephaniah 2:8-10**) as many will be at the end of time.

Throughout the history of Edom, it was inimical to Israel (**Ezekiel 25:12**). When Israel asked for permission to go through their land at the Exodus, they refused. The Edomites were enemies of God's people. They cooperated in the conquest of Jerusalem by Babylon (**Psalms 137:8; Obadiah**).

Deuteronomy 2:8 the residents of Edom are referred to as brethren of Israel

Numbers 20:14 once again calls the Edomites brothers.

Isaiah 11:14 says that these nations would obey Israel after the return from captivity. After the Babylonian captivity of the church during the 1260 years God raised up a remnant to lead our brothers in other churches to join the remnant. An example of this was seen in 1844 when the Millerites preached the Midnight Cry. Many of God's faithful children of all denominations came out of their churches and joined those who were proclaiming the message. They were in these churches but they did not really belong to them. They were sincere and accepted the second angel's message to come out of Babylon. The Millerite experience foreshadows the experience at the end.

"At Oswego, New York, September 7, 1850, the Lord showed me that a great work must be done for His people before they could stand in the battle in the day of the Lord. I was pointed to those

who claim to be Adventists, but who **reject the present truth**, and saw that they were crumbling and that the hand of the Lord was in their midst to divide and scatter them now in the **gathering time**, so that the **precious jewels among them**, who have **formerly been deceived**, may have their eyes opened to see their true state. And now when the truth is presented to them by the Lord's messengers, they are **prepared to listen**, and see its beauty and harmony, and to **leave their former associates and errors**, **embrace the precious truth** and stand where they can define their position." Ellen G. White, Early Writings, p. 69.2

Amos 9:11, 12 is the key passage. This is picked up by James at the Jerusalem council and applied to winning the Gentiles through the preaching of the gospel by the power of the Holy Spirit after the Day of Pentecost (analyze **Acts 15:7, 12-17**). Many who undoubtedly had been enemies of the apostles came over to the side of the Lord.

*"In Christ's day many heard the gospel, but **their minds were darkened by false teaching**, and they did not recognize in the humble Teacher of Galilee the Sent of God. But after Christ's ascension His enthronement in His mediatorial kingdom was signalized by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit was given. Christ's witnesses proclaimed the power of the risen Saviour. The **light of heaven penetrated the darkened minds of those who had been deceived by the enemies of Christ**. They now saw Him exalted to be "a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts 5:31. They saw Him encircled with the glory of heaven, with infinite treasures in His hands to bestow upon all who would turn from their rebellion. As the apostles set forth the glory of the Only-Begotten of the Father, three thousand souls were convicted."* Ellen G. White, Christ's Object Lessons, p. 119 – 121.

Ellen White then explains how the message went to all the world under the power of the early rain and converts **flocked to the church** (as at the end the spiritual Edomites will flock to Mt. Zion or Jerusalem)

*"Then the glad tidings of a risen Saviour were carried to the uttermost bounds of the inhabited world. The **church beheld converts flocking to her** from all directions. Believers were reconverted. **Sinners united with Christians** in seeking the pearl of great price. The prophecy was fulfilled, The weak shall be "as David," and the house of David "as the angel of the Lord." Zechariah 12:8."* Ellen G. White, Christ's Object Lessons, p. 120

Then Ellen White states:

"These scenes are to be repeated, and with greater power. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the former rain, but the latter rain will be more abundant." Ellen G. White, Christ's Object Lessons, p. 121

In John 11:51, 52 we find a remarkable prophecy about the gathering of the Gentiles into one fold with the Jews. On the Day of Pentecost they were all gathered together and of one accord.

Then the Gentiles became fellow citizens. The key to gathering or scattering is your relationship to Jesus (**Luke 11:23**)

Jesus also talked about gathering sheep that were not part of the Israelite fold. He said that He must draw them so that there would be one flock and one shepherd (**John 10:16**)

The conquest of the remnant of Edom is interpreted by James as the residue of men who seek after the Lord. At the end of time there will be a new Pentecost only this time God's remnant church (whom the apostles foreshadow) will receive the latter rain and they will preach the gospel to every nation, kindred, tongue and people and these people will become part of the remnant people. Then the prophecy of Amos will be fulfilled once more by all those who come out of Babylon to join God's remnant people in Jerusalem.

*"The work will be **similar** to that of the Day of Pentecost. As the "former rain" was given, in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at the opening of the gospel, to cause the upspringing of the precious seed, so the "latter rain" will be given at its close for the ripening of the harvest. "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord: His going forth is prepared as the morning; and He shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth." Hosea 6:3. "Be glad then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God: for He hath given you the former rain moderately, and He will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain, and the latter rain." Joel 2:23. "In the last days, saith God, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh." "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." (**Acts 2:17, 21**). Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 611.2}*

The great work of the gospel is not to close with less manifestation of the power of God than marked its opening. **The prophecies which were fulfilled in the outpouring of the former rain at the opening of the gospel are again to be fulfilled in the latter rain at its close.** Here are "the times of refreshing" to which the apostle Peter looked forward when he said: *"Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and He shall send Jesus."* (**Acts 3:19, 20**). Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, pp. 611, 612

Notice that Jesus gives the great commission in Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15, 16 and Acts 1:7, 8 and the gospel goes to the entire world. There were many sincere brothers among the Gentiles who came out and joined God's people.

Jesus said to Paul: I have many people in this place and He was referring to the pagan people of Corinth. Not all in Corinth were God's people but he did have a remnant.

"Standard after standard was left to trail in the dust as company after company from the Lord's army joined the foe and tribe after tribe from the ranks of the enemy united with the commandment-keeping people of God." Ellen G. White, **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 8, p. 41.

“. . . when the storm of persecution really breaks upon us, the true sheep will hear the true Shepherd's voice. Self-denying efforts will be put forth to save the lost, and many who have strayed from the fold will come back to follow the great Shepherd.” Ellen G. White, **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 6, p. 401.

“There is a mighty work to be done in our world. The Lord has declared that the Gentiles shall be gathered in, and not the Gentiles only, but the Jews. There are among the Jews many who will be converted, and through whom we shall see the salvation of God go forth as a lamp that burneth. There are Jews everywhere, and to them the light of present truth is to be brought. There are among them many who will come to the light, and who will proclaim the immutability of the law of God with wonderful power. The Lord God will work. He will do wonderful things in righteousness.” Ellen G. White, **Manuscript 87, 1907**. {also **Evangelism**, p. 578.1}

“Notwithstanding the widespread declension of faith and piety, there are true followers of Christ in these churches. Before the final visitation of God's judgments upon the earth there will be among the people of the Lord such a revival of primitive godliness as has not been witnessed since apostolic times. The Spirit and power of God will be poured out upon His children. At that time many will separate themselves from those churches in which the love of this world has supplanted love for God and His word. Many, both of ministers and people, will gladly accept those great truths which God has caused to be proclaimed at this time to prepare a people for the Lord's second coming.” **The Great Controversy**, p. 464

“Thousands in the eleventh hour will see and acknowledge the truth. . . . These conversions to truth will be made with a rapidity that will surprise the church, and God's name alone will be glorified.” Ellen G. White, **2 Selected Messages**, p. 16 (1890) (also Last Day Events, p. 212)

“Souls that were scattered all through the religious bodies answered to the call, and the precious were hurried out of the doomed churches, as Lot was hurried out of Sodom before her destruction.” Ellen G. White, **Early Writings**, p. 279

“There are many souls to come out of the ranks of the world, out of the churches--even the Catholic Church--whose zeal will far exceed that of those who have stood in rank and file to proclaim the truth heretofore.” Ellen G. White, **3 Selected Messages**, pp. 386, 387 (1889)

“God has jewels in all the churches, and it is not for us to make sweeping denunciation of the professed religious world, but in humility and love, present to all the truth as it is in Jesus.” **Review and Herald**, January 17, 1893

“We should not go out of our way to make hard thrusts at the Catholics. Among the Catholics there are many who are most conscientious Christians and who walk in all the light that shines upon them, and God will work in their behalf.” Ellen G. White, **Testimonies for the Church**, Volume 9, p. 243.

“In the eighteenth chapter of the Revelation the people of God are called upon to come out of Babylon. According to this scripture, many of God's people must still be in Babylon. And in what religious bodies are the greater part of the followers of Christ now to be found? Without doubt, in the various churches professing the Protestant faith.” Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 383.

“Notwithstanding the spiritual darkness and alienation from God that exist in the churches which constitute Babylon, the great body of Christ's true followers are still to be found in their communion. There are many of these who have never seen the special truths for this time.” Ellen G White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 390.

It is vital to realize that Edom, Moab and Ammon are delivered from the power of the king of the north because they flee to Jerusalem for in Jerusalem and in Zion there is deliverance. These are they who have escaped and are written in the book (**Isaiah 4:1-3**)

Don't forget Zechariah 8:20-23

“He shall stretch out his hand against the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape.” (**Daniel 11:42, NKJV**)

The idiom ‘stretch out the hand’ is used in the Old Testament to describe an act of destruction (**Exodus 3:20; 9:15; I Samuel 24:6, 9, 11**).

The word ‘countries’ is ‘erets. It is used also in verse 40 but there it refers to countries or lands that are north of Israel. This is seen clearly by the geographical progression of the conquests of the king of the north. Notice the following examples about the meaning of the word ‘erets as it applies to the prophecy of Daniel 11:

Genesis 26:3, 4: God promised to give Abraham all the countries or lands of Palestine

Genesis 41:57: We are told that all the countries came to Egypt to buy grain from Joseph

Isaiah 8:9: Describes all the countries that were overcome by the king of Assyria

Jeremiah 23:3, 8: God promised to gather His people from all the countries or lands where He scattered them (see also **Ezekiel 11:16, 17; 20:34**)

Jeremiah 32:37: God promised to gather His people from all the countries where He had scattered them

Ezekiel 5:5, 6: God set Israel in the midst of the countries around her. Here nations and countries are synonymous

Ezekiel 34:13: Here countries are placed in contrast to the land of Israel. This shows that the countries of Daniel 11:42 are those beyond the borders of the glorious land (see also 36:24)

Daniel 9:7: Here the countries are described as being beyond the borders of Israel where Jerusalem is!

Zechariah 10:9, 10: The far countries here are Egypt and Assyria. Notice that God's people are beyond the borders of the glorious land. In verse 40 we are told that the king of the north went into the north countries (Lebanon, Syria, Tyre and Sidon). In verse 41 he enters the glorious land and the inhabitants of Edom, Moab and Ammon escape to Jerusalem and in verses 42 and 43 he overcomes the countries south of the glorious land—Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya. The picture is one of a devastating and universal conquest. The invasion begins in the north at the river Euphrates and ends in the south at Egypt.

The word 'escape' here is not the same word as that used in verse 41. The word in verse 41 was *malat* which is the very word that translated 'delivered' in Daniel 12:1. In the King James Version we would never guess that those who escape in Daniel 11:41 are those who are later delivered in Daniel 12:1 because in Daniel 11:41 the word *malat* is translated 'escape' whereas in Daniel 12:1 it is translated 'delivered'. We therefore know for sure that there will be Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites who will be in Jerusalem and will be delivered from the hand of the king of the north. Here the word 'escape' is *palat* which is used synonymously with *malat*.

For example, this is the very word that is used in Genesis 32:8 where Jacob divided his company into two so that one of them would be able to escape the wrath of Esau. Notably, in Genesis 32:11 Jacob used the word *malat* to ask the Lord to deliver him from the wrath of his brother. Thus in Genesis 32 *malat* and *palat* are used synonymously.

Other texts that use *palat* are:

Joshua 8:22: Ai would not be able to escape from Israel's sword

II Kings 19:31: In Sennacherib's invasion of Israel a remnant escapes out of Jerusalem (see also **Isaiah 37:35**)

Ezra 9:8: God left a remnant to escape from Israel after the captivity. Notice how in verse 7 we have the same idea as in Daniel 11:33.

Jeremiah 44:14, 28: A remnant escapes to Jerusalem

Jeremiah 50:28, 29: God's people escape but Babylon does not

In this context we must also link Joel 2:32 where both *malat* and *palat* are used interchangeably. Joel 2:30 must also be linked with Revelation 14:14-20 where all of God's

people have taken refuge in Jerusalem. Joel 2:32 reads: *‘And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered [malat], for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance [palat: the same word that is translated ‘escape’ in Daniel 11:42] as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call’* [the word ‘call’ is also used in Revelation 17:14 to refer to those who are with Jesus.

The testimony of the New Testament must also be taken into account. Both Luke 21:36 and I Thessalonians 5:3 describe those that shall not escape when probation closes.

Ellen White describes how country after country will fall into the hands of the papacy:

*“As America, the land of religious liberty, shall unite with the papacy in forcing the conscience and compelling men to honor the false sabbath, the people of **every country** on the globe will be led to follow her example.”* Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, Volume 6, p. 18

*“**Foreign nations** will follow the example of the United States. Though she leads out, yet the same crisis will come upon our people in **all parts of the world**.”* Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, Volume 6, p. 395.

*“But in this homage to the papacy the United States will not be alone. The influence of Rome in the **countries** that once acknowledged her dominion is still far from being destroyed. And prophecy foretells a restoration of her power.”* Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 579.

*“History will be repeated. False religion will be exalted. The first day of the week, a common working day, possessing no sanctity whatever, will be set up as was the image of Babylon. **All nations and tongues and peoples** will be commanded to worship this spurious sabbath. . . . The decree enforcing the worship of this day is to go forth to all the world.”* Ellen G. White, Last Day Events, p. 134.

“The whole world is to be stirred with enmity against Seventh-day Adventists, because they will not yield homage to the papacy, by honoring Sunday, the institution of this antichristian power. It is the purpose of Satan to cause them to be blotted from the earth, in order that his supremacy of the world may not be disputed.” Ellen G. White, Testimonies to Ministers, p. 37.

“Those who trample upon God's law make human laws which they will force the people to accept. Men will devise and counsel and plan what they will do. The whole world keeps Sunday, they say, and why should not this people, who are so few in number, do according to the laws of the land?” Ellen G. White, Manuscript 163, 1897. (also Last Day Events, p. 136.)

*“Every nation will be involved. Of this time John the Revelator declares: [**Revelation 18:3-7; 17:13, 14**, quoted]. “These have one mind.” There will be a universal bond of union, one great harmony, a confederacy of Satan's forces.”* Ellen G. White, Last Day Events, p. 137.

Outline of the meaning of the word 'escape':

The critical verses are Genesis 32, Daniel 12:1, Joel 2:32; Isaiah 37:32 and Revelation 14:14-20. In all of these verses there is war against God's faithful remnant in Jerusalem or Israel and God miraculously delivers them who escape from the power of the enemy. Not so with Egypt.

"He shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; also the Libyans and Ethiopians shall follow at his heels."(**Daniel 11:43 NKJV**)

This power will command great riches (**Revelation 17:4; 18:11-13, 16**). It will be so much in control of the world economy that it will be able to forbid buying and selling (**Revelation 13:15**).

In the Bible Ethiopia, Libya and Egypt are sometimes coupled together (**Ezekiel 30:1-6**). In this case Libya and Ethiopia are helpers of the king of the north. In Ezekiel 38:5 both of these countries are allies of Gog who comes from the land of Magog and Gog comes from the north. The expression 'shall walk at his steps' means 'shall fall in with him,' 'shall be his helpers' or 'shall follow in his train' (see **Romans 4:12; I John 2:6**)

"But news from the east and the north shall trouble him; therefore he shall go out with great fury to destroy and annihilate many." (**Daniel 11:44, NKJV**)

These tidings from the north and from the east trouble the king of the north when he is in Egypt, Ethiopia and Libya. The question is: What is north and east of Egypt? The answer is Israel and more specifically Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. These tidings are coming from Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. What are these tidings?

The word 'tidings' is variously translated in the Old Testament as 'tidings' (**I Samuel 4:19; II Samuel 13:30; Psalm 112:7; Jeremiah 49:23**), 'news' (**Proverbs 25:25**), 'doctrine' (**Isaiah 28:9**), 'report' (**Proverbs 15:30; Isaiah 53:1**) and 'rumor' (**Jeremiah 49:14; 51:46; Obadiah 1**). The reference in Obadiah 1 explains that a 'rumor from the LORD' is an 'ambassador sent among the heathen.' In other words, it is a message from the LORD through the instrumentality of an ambassador or representative.

In **Last Day Events**, p. 208 Ellen White explains this 'news' as the Loud Cry of Revelation 18:1-6. But why is this news described as coming from the north and from the east? In antiquity north was in heaven, that is, up. This is why in Isaiah 14:12-14 Lucifer wanted to ascend and occupy God's place in the sides of the north in heaven. Jerusalem and Zion are in the sides of the north (**Psalm 48:1, 2; Matthew 5:35, 36**). In Ezekiel 1:4ff God's cosmic chariot throne arrives from the north, that is, from heaven. In Isaiah 41:25, Cyrus the great deliverer of Israel from Babylonian captivity came from the north, dried up the River Euphrates and there was none to help Babylon.

The east is also God's point of the compass. In Luke 1:78 we are told that Jesus came into this world by way of the east because He came to enlighten the world. The star which announced

the birth of Jesus came from the east (**Matthew 2:2, 9**). At the second coming Jesus will come from the east (**Matthew 24:27; Revelation 16:12**). When God returned to the Jerusalem temple after the captivity he did so from the east (**Ezekiel 43:1, 2; 47:1-3**). After the millennium Christ will place His feet on the Mount of Olives which is east of Jerusalem. There can be no doubt that God's points of the compass are north and east because the sun rises in the east and reaches its greatest intensity in the north when it is directly overhead. The positive points of the quadrant in math are north and east while the negative points of the quadrant are west and south. West is where the darkness begins and south (directly underneath) is where the darkness of midnight reaches its deepest intensity. This is the reason why, after the close of probation, people will hunger and thirst for the Word of God and '*wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east*' seeking the Word of God but shall not be able to find it (**Amos 8:11, 12**). It is rather obvious that people would not seek for the Word of God which is light (**Psalms 119:105, 130**) in the west and in the south where darkness reigns!

The key questions at this point are: What are these tidings from the north and from the east? Is it the news about the second coming or even about the 'third' coming of Jesus after the millennium? The answer to these questions is no. The sequence of Daniel 11 shows that the tidings are given in the end time after 1798 (**Daniel 11:40**) but before the close of probation and the time of trouble (**Daniel 12:1**) when the king of the north will finally come to his end.

The book of Revelation helps us identify what these tidings are and when they will be given.

It is agreed that the beast of Revelation 13:1-10 represents the papacy. This power ruled for 42 months (till 1798) and then received a deadly wound but the wound will be healed (**Revelation 13:3**) and the whole world will wonder after the beast (same as the king of the north overwhelming the world in **Daniel 11:40-45**). It is clear that in the three angels' messages God gives tidings warning the world not to worship the beast (the king of the north). Later on in this prophecy those who gave the message are portrayed as being in Jerusalem and the wicked outside to destroy them (**Revelation 14:18-20**). It is obvious that this message enrages the king of the north/beast even to the point of giving a death decree (**Revelation 13:15**, cf. **Daniel 11:44; Revelation 14:18-20** in the light of **Joel 3**). When God's people are gathered in Zion and in Jerusalem (**Revelation 14:1-5, 20**) the wicked gather around the city in the entire world to destroy those who are inside (**Revelation 14:20; Daniel 11:45**).

When the final message has been given, and the whole world had decided to worship the Creator or the beast, then Michael will stand up and the door of probation will close (**Revelation 15:5-8; Daniel 12:1**). Then the time of trouble ensues during the period of the plagues (**Revelation 16:1-21**). At the moment of the sixth plague the whole world is gathered as a flood against God's remnant. The whole world has been flooded by Babylon's Euphrates river and only God's remnant remains with head above water (**Revelation 17:1-5; 16:12; Daniel 11:45**) But at this time God's people will be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book (**Daniel 12:1; Revelation 17:8**) and Babylon comes to its end with none to help her. The kings hate her, the merchants stand afar off, the waters withdraw their support and her daughters turn against her (**Revelation 17-18**).

Thus the three angels' message are God's final tidings which enrage the beast or king of the north. And where do these tidings come from? Revelation 18:1 describes a mighty angel who comes down from heaven (north) and causes the third angel's message to swell to loud cry status and the whole world is lightened by his glory. This is no local middle eastern fulfillment. The final call is given for God's people to escape from Babylon and come for refuge to Jerusalem. This is the same as we saw in Daniel 11:41. These are the Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites. Obviously there are two groups here—those who are in Jerusalem giving the message and those who are God's true people who are hearing the message. But notice that this message also comes from the east. The sealing message also comes from the east. Its purpose is to discourage people from receiving the mark of the beast in contrast to the seal of God. The sealing angel comes from the east (**Revelation 7:1, 2**). This sealing must come before the close of probation and the time of trouble because the purpose of the sealing is to protect God's people from the wrath that will be poured out during the time of trouble!! Thus Revelation 7:1, 2 is after 1798 and before the close of probation just like Daniel 11:44 (see also **Ezekiel 9:1-6**). In Scripture it is a revival of God's people that brings about the wrath of her enemies (**Ezekiel 36-38**); **Joel 2:28-32** and **Joel 3**; **Zechariah 13 and 14**; **Acts 2:4-5** and chapters **4-5**; **Revelation 14:6-12 and 14:18-20**).

What is meant by the word 'trouble'? The Hebrew word bahal means 'to shake intensely, to be alarmed, agitated, frightened, terrified, panicked, dismayed.' Notice the following texts where the word is used:

Daniel 4:5: Nebuchadnezzar was troubled by the dream that God gave him

Isaiah 13:8: Babylon will be alarmed when God comes against her

Daniel 4:19: Daniel was troubled when God revealed the meaning of Nebuchadnezzar's dream to him

Daniel 5:6, 9, 10: When the handwriting on the wall appeared, the king was greatly troubled

Daniel 7:15, 28: The vision of the beasts troubled Daniel

II Chronicles 32:18: Sennacherib attempted to trouble Israel by his threats

II Samuel 4:1: When the news of Abner's death reached Israel, they were troubled

Psalms 48:1-6: When the enemies of Israel saw Zion and Jerusalem they were troubled and afraid and filled with pain like a woman in travail

Psalms 83:17: When the wicked came against Jerusalem the psalmist says: 'Let them be confounded and troubled for ever: Yea, let them be put to shame and perish.'

In Job 21:6, Psalm 83:15; Isaiah 13:8 the word is translated 'afraid'.

Leviticus 26:16 translates the word 'terror' 'therefore': The word 'therefore' explains why the king of the north is troubled and filled with wrath at the same time. He goes out to kill and destroy because he hates the tidings that are coming from the north and the

east. This wrath will eventually lead to the death decree against God's people
(Revelation 13:15)

Daniel 11:44 makes it clear that the wrath of the king of the north is not ordinary. It is great fury which must be connected with Revelation 18:2, 3 where Babylon gives the kings and the nations the wine of the wrath of her fornication which leads her to attempt to kill God's saints **(Revelation 17:6; 18:24)**. In Revelation it is the 3 angels' message intensified by the fourth angel which angers Babylon. This anger is intensified by the expression 'to utterly make away many.' The best translation of this expression would be to annihilate or blot out (the very expression that Ellen White uses to describe Satan's designs for God's people. The Hebrew word shamad 'make away', is used in Deuteronomy 9:3; 31:3 to describe one who is anathematized. It is the very word that is used in the book of Esther (3:6, 13; 4:8; 8:11) to describe what Haman wanted to do to Israel. This is significant when we realize that the book of Esther is typological of the end time and that Haman wanted to obliterate, annihilate and blot out all the Jews!

Notice the following corroborating statements by Ellen White:

"I was pointed down to the time when the third angel's message was closing. The power of God had rested upon His people; they had accomplished their work and were prepared for the trying hour before them. They had received the latter rain, or refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and the living testimony had been revived. The last great warning had sounded everywhere, and it had stirred up and enraged the inhabitants of the earth who would not receive the message."
Early Writings, p. 279.1

"As the controversy extends into new fields and the minds of the people are called to God's downtrodden law, Satan is astir. The power attending the message will only madden those who oppose it. The clergy will put forth almost superhuman efforts to shut away the light lest it should shine upon their flocks. By every means at their command they will endeavor to suppress the discussion of these vital questions." **The Great Controversy**, p. 607.

"Those who honor the law of God have been accused of bringing judgments upon the world, and they will be regarded as the cause of the fearful convulsions of nature and the strife and bloodshed among men that are filling the earth with woe. The power attending the last warning has enraged the wicked; their anger is kindled against all who have received the message, and Satan will excite to still greater intensity the spirit of hatred and persecution." **The Great Controversy**, p. 614.3



*Secrets Unsealed is a 501(C)(3) non-profit ministry.
Your prayers and financial support are greatly appreciated.*

SECRETS UNSEALED
5949 E. Clinton Ave.
Fresno, CA 93727
559-264-2300 (USA & Int'l)
888-REV-1412 (USA Only)
888-738-1412 (USA Only)

Email: info@secretsunsealed.org
www.secretsunsealed.org

Additional Resources Available Online!