

By B.S. Thompson
for the Conference
65 Rome

STATEMENT OF DANIEL EILEVEN

I wish to state that I still adhere to the old view of Daniel 11 in its application as to the main features of the prophecy. I do not agree in all the details of the application that Elder Uriah Smith presents in his Book on Daniel and the Revelation. I believe that Elder Smith's positions on some points can be greatly strengthened with additional historical evidence. I shall endeavor to do this in the portion of the eleventh chapter which has been assigned to me, namely, the prophetic history of Rome. But before I take up the prophecy of the Roman empire in the eleventh chapter, I want to answer those points in the forty indictments of Brother M. C. Gilcox against the old view of Daniel 11th chapter, which relate particularly to the subject matter which I am to treat in this discussion.

In his introductory remarks he states that the old view of Daniel 11, was accepted by him because of his admiration of Elder Uriah Smith, and largely because it was held by accredited men among us, without a personal investigation of the facts. All I have to say to this indictment is that no one should accept either the old or the new position without investigating the facts for himself, so I do not see that it is any more a point in favor of the indictment of the old position than it is of the new.

The second point in the introduction states that he could not see why three of the four divisions of Greece should be recognized in the eighth chapter, and only two in the eleventh chapter, and the very one set aside in the eleventh chapter which is found necessary as a basis for Rome in the eighth chapter.

The eleventh chapter recognizes the four divisions of Alex-

ander's Empire, in verse 4, in almost the identical language as it is recorded in verse 8, Dan. 8th Chapter.

The eleventh chapter recognizes the four divisions of Alexander's Empire, in verse 4, in almost the identical language as it is recorded in verse 8, Dan. 8th Chapter.

The reason why the angel Gabriel singles out two divisions in Daniel 11th Chapter, namely the king of the north and the king of the south of Alexander's kingdom, is because these two kings were constantly overrunning Palestine and came into open conflict with God's people. God's people were being ground to pieces between the upper and nether mill-stones of these two reigning monarchies, and it was God's purpose to deal only with the nations which vitally affected the future welfare and destiny of his people and his cause. The fact that the Macedonian king through which Rome gained her ascendancy is not mentioned in this connection, does not imply that that kingdom was not in existence during this period. That power simply did not come in contact with God's people during this time, and consequently is not mentioned. Nevertheless, history testifies to the fact that Lysimachus conquered the territory of Cassander, and Seleucus conquered Lysimachus and for some time was absolute master of the three divisions of the Grecian Empire. He was the mighty king of the north. Afterwards the Macedonian horn revolted and gained its independence, but its rulers never came in contact with God's people, and for this reason this power is not referred to again until the Romans conquered Macedonia and "exalted themselves to establish the vision."

The third point in the introduction that Elder James White made the statement that the eleventh chapter of Daniel must parallel the four universal kingdoms of Dan. 2, 7 and 8th in the great political

outlines clear down to the second coming of Christ is not a logical conclusion. The same angel that revealed the political and ecclesiastical history of the world to Daniel also revealed the political and ecclesiastical history of the world during the Christian dispensation to John, the Revelator. The political history of the fourth kingdom was revealed to John, in the seven trumpets. The first four trumpets deal with the history of the Roman Empire, down to the time it was divided into ten divisions and the papacy was established. Then three war or judgment trumpets are presented which introduce the Mohammedan power in the 9th chapter and the French nation in the eleventh chapter of Revelation under the first and second woes. The Mohammedan and French nationalities are mentioned as the last actors upon the stage in the political history of the seven trumpets. The next scene is the third war—the awful time of trouble among the nations, and the second coming of Christ. It is an exact parallel of the latter part of the eleventh chapter and the first part of the 12th chapter of Daniel. Since the same angel in the Book of Revelation, closes the political history of the fourth universal empire with a description of the atheistical French nation which largely established the supremacy of the Papacy and finally disestablished it, by making war against God and all religious things, and since the same angel also mentions the Mohammedan power as waning and drying up just before Christ comes, that the nations of the whole world may be gathered together to the great battle of Armageddon within the domain of the Turk, and since all this is presented by the same angel that spoke to Daniel, as the great climax of the folly and destiny of the political history of nations in the Book of Revelation, why should it be considered as an incredible thing for the same angel to follow the

same outline of political history in the latter portion of the prophecy in the eleventh chapter of Daniel?

Moreover, we are plainly informed by the angel in the Book of Revelation that the first and second woes--namely the Mohammedan and French infidel nationalities were employed by the Lord as a scourge or judgment to punish the Papacy for their iniquities, their "worship of devils, and idols of gold, and silver and brass, and stone and of wood," and for "their murders," "their sorceries," "their fornication," and "their thefts."

But the Papacy did not repent of these things after the Lord afflicted them with the Turks, so the Lord accomplished his indignation upon the Papacy which He had before determined should be done by inflicting upon it a deadly wound, and He used infidel France to inflict the wound and accomplish his purpose. For the same reason France is introduced in Daniel eleven as in Revelation eleven to bring to view the atheistic king that was to prosper until God's indignation was accomplished against the papacy and the deadly wound inflicted, and also as the king of the bottomless pit that was to make war against God's two witnesses at the time the 1260 years expired and was to slay them in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where they also crucified our Lord.

The Book of Revelation in its political outlines of the Christian dispensation is a complement of the eleventh chapter of Daniel. It is the same angel that gives both outlines with additional light in the book of Revelation.

Another objection raised is that the old view of Daniel eleven is not the denominational view. This raises the question, who and what is the denomination? It is true to have no written creed outside of the Bible. But is it not equally true that all our denominational books and

periodicals are supposed to advocate our denominational views upon the doctrines and prophecies of the Bible? Have not all our periodicals and published books and pamphlets authorized by the denomination, set forth the old view of Dan. 11 until this day? If they do not represent the denominational view, then I fail to see why one or two articles written by one or two men in our periodicals or pamphlets unauthorized in the publication of the new view of Daniel 11 represents the denominational view.

Objection 1. in the real indictment states that the old view admits that Dan. 10-12 is a fuller explanation of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9, and then utterly departs from the idea, and drags in two powers, the principal one of which is a waning power.

I have already answered this indictment by showing that the old view winds up the political history of Rome in the eleventh chapter of Daniel exactly as John the Revelator winds up the history of Rome in the seven trumpets. The old view recognizes the political outlines of the 8th chapter in the eleventh, with the additional light that the book of Revelation throws upon the latter part of the prophecy, but the new view not only ignores the light that the Book of Revelation throws upon this prophecy by giving the history of the atheistical French and Mohammedan forces which God used to punish and disestablish the Papacy at the termination of the 1260 years of papal persecutions, but the new view also utterly ignores the establishment in the prophecy of the fourth universal empire, the whole history of imperial Rome, its destruction of the mighty and holy people, its standing up against the Prince of princes, and its consequent desolations of Jerusalem and Palestine. It makes one tremendous leap from Antiochus Epiphanes B.C. 164 to the establishment of the Papacy in the 6th century this side of

Christ—a period of over seven hundred years during which the most momentous events occurred in the history of the whole world relative to God's people and empire. If Antiochus Epiphanes should not be omitted in the eleventh chapter of Daniel because he slew 40,000 Jews on his return from Egypt, and changed the priest-hood and offered swine's blood in the temple, what shall we say of the new view which not only omits the founders of imperial Rome and the entire history of imperial Rome, but also all allusion to the power that put to death the Prince of the covenant, that in a single siege of Jerusalem slew not 40,000 thousand but ~~had~~ eleven hundred thousand, scattered the residue into all parts of the world, laid waste their city and temple, and forever abolished the high priest-hood among the Jews? Upon which profanation and persecution would the angel be likely to lay the greater emphasis, upon that carried on by Antiochus Epiphanes or by imperial Rome?

Point 2. of the indictment, states that the old view eliminated Rome as the climax of all antagonistic powers, and draws into the prophecy a power not growing vigorous and dominating, but long past its prime, a decrepit, waning, conquered power at best, and leaves Rome out of the prophecy with no further mention, a proceeding for which there is no justification.

My answer to this objection is that the political history of the seven trumpets in the Book of Revelation proceeds along the same line as the old view, and therefore this indictment is as much against John the Revelator as it is against those who hold the old view of Dan. 11. Only John leaves Rome out of the prophecy a great deal earlier in the Christian dispensation and introduces the Mohammedan and French Nationalities than the old view does on Dan. 11. The Book of Revelation is a justification of the old view and not of the new.

Objection 3. states that all the prophetic lines of Daniel deal

periodicals are supposed to advocate our denominational views upon the doctrines and prophecies of the Bible? Have not all our periodicals and published books and pamphlets authorized by the denomination, set forth the old view of Dan. 11 until this day? If they do not represent the denominational view, then I fail to see why one or two articles written by one or two men in our periodicals or pamphlets unauthorized in the publication of the new view of Daniel 11 represents the denominational view.

Objection 1. in the real indictment states that the old view admits that Dan. 10-12 is a fuller explanation of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9, and then utterly departs from the idea, and drags in two powers, the principal one of which is a waning power.

I have already answered this indictment by showing that the old view winds up the political history of Rome in the eleventh chapter of Daniel exactly as John the Revelator winds up the history of Rome in the seven trumpets. The old view recognizes the political outlines of the 8th chapter in the eleventh, with the additional light that the book of Revelation throws upon the latter part of the prophecy, but the new view not only ignores the light that the Book of Revelation throws upon this prophecy by giving the history of the atheistical French and Mohammedan forces which God used to punish and disestablish the Papacy at the termination of the 1260 years of papal persecutions, but the new view also utterly ignores the establishment in the prophecy of the fourth universal empire, the whole history of imperial Rome, its destruction of the mighty and holy people, its standing up against the Prince of princes, and its consequent desolations of Jerusalem and Palestine. It makes one tremendous leap from Antiochus Epiphanes B.C. 164 to the establishment of the Papacy in the 6th century this side of

with dominating world dynasties, even the eleventh admittedly to verses 35, inclusive, and then the old view sets them all aside, and introduces two new nations, neither of which are world powers. My answer to this objection is that not one of Daniel's prophecies deals with "dominating world dynasties" after Rome was divided into ten kingdoms. There were to be no more "world dynasties" after 476 A. D. until the everlasting kingdom of Christ is set up. After 476 A. D. the prophecies throughout the Books of Daniel and Revelation deal with the nations which divided the Roman Empire, and not with world dynasties. The prophecies indicate that some of these nations would be weak and rising powers.

Objection 4, states that the old view fails utterly to grasp the design of Chapter 11, the revelation of evil powers to stand up for world dominion against Him who only has the right to reign. My answer to this objection is that no such design of world dominance on the part of the king of the north is implied or mentioned in the latter part of the eleventh chapter of Daniel.

The prophecy clearly indicates that other nations have supported the king of the north but finally all help was refused and he as a consequence, came to his end, which precipitated the Battle of Armageddon, into which all nations were drawn. The king of the north comes to his end before this last great battle among the nations of the whole world is fought. This proves clearly that the king of the north is not the papacy, because the papacy in its spiritual dominance over the nations of the earth does not come to its end until it is consumed by the brightness of Christ's coming, after the Battle of Armageddon has been fought or while the conflict is still raging.

Objection 5, states that the old view telescopes a period of time unnatural to every line of prophecy, in order to accommodate

itself to a misunderstood phrase "a raiser of taxes."

My answer to this objection is that the recorded prophecy of Christ in Matthew 24, is written on the telescopic plan. From the verses 3 to 14 he carries us clear down to the end, and then backs up again and begins with the destruction of Jerusalem in verse 15. The same plan is followed in Revelation 20, 21 and 22. Revelation 20th chapter tells of the complete destruction of the wicked in the lake of fire. The first part of the 21st chapter tells of the passing away of the former earth and the restoration of the new earth, and then the eighth verse of the 21st and the 15th verse of the 22nd chapter backs up again and tell us of things that are to take place on the former earth. The telescoping, backing up, and jumping plan in outlining the prophetic periods is not unnatural in any line of prophecy. The new view leaps across a gap of 700 years and overlooks the most important events the Bible predicted would occur during that period of time.

Objection 6, states that the old view places the time of the end in 1798 contrary to the clear logic of Dan. 8:14-19, and 12:4,10,11; which places it at the end of the 2300 days, as does also the Spirit of Prophecy.

My answer to this objection is that the prophet Daniel and the Spirit of Prophecy both place the beginning of the time of the end at 1798 the termination of the 1260 days instead of the 2300 days. Dan. 8:17, and Dan. 12:4,10 tell us clearly that the vision shall be sealed and not understood till the time of the end, then it was to be unsealed and understood. But this did not mean that the vision of the 2300 days was not to be understood until the 2300 days expired in 1844, but that the vision was to be unsealed and understood at the time of the end before the time period of the 2300 days were ended. Unfortunately the indictment omitted Dan. 12:7,8 and a quotation from the Spirit of Prophecy on page

358 of the Great Controversy. In Dan. 12:8-9 we read that the angel asked the man clothed in linen: "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" and the man clothed in linen answered: "That it shall be for a time, times and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. Go thy way Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end."

Till the time of the end of what? One would most naturally conclude the time of the end of the 1260 days just alluded to. And to this agree the words of the Spirit of Prophecy on page 358 of the Great Controversy which read as follows: "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 a 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'..... 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." This makes it very clear that both the prophecy of Daniel and the Spirit of Prophecy place the commencement of the time of the end at the termination of the 1260 day prophecy, and not at the end of the 2300 days. The 2300 days end in the time of the end but not at the time beginning of time of the end.

Objection 7 states that the old view makes territory a means of identification in succession of empire, rather than world dominion and character, contrary to our interpretation uniformly followed in all other symbolic prophecy. My answer to this objection is that it is impossible to determine and locate the king of the north and the king of the south and the kings of the East and the kings of the West

on any other basis than a territorial basis. When there is only one world king that rules at a given time it is easy to locate him on the basis of world dominion and character, but when you have two or more kings reigning in the world contemporaneously it is impossible to identify them on a basis of world dominion and character. To which one shall we give the prerogative of world dominion and character when each has only a part of the world. The old view follows the same rule of interpretation concerning the king of the North and the king of the South throughout the entire chapter, whereas the new view follows two rules of interpretation concerning these two kings—one a literal territorial view at the beginning of the chapter and a second mystical philosophical interpretation at the end of the chapter.

Objection 8 states that the old view presents an interpretation with a constantly diminishing Biblical evidence instead of cumulative proof as do other prophecies. My answer to this objection is that the old view has all the Biblical evidence that the new view holds on the Papacy and in addition the old view has the cumulative Biblical evidence found in the 8th, 11th, and 18th chapters of the Book of Revelation on the French and Turks. The old view has more Bible evidence in the eleventh chapter than has the new view.

Objection 10, states that the old view makes the waning power of Turkey a striking sign of the last days, and that there is not the slightest evidence of its nearer fulfillment now than a half century ago.

My answer to this objection is that the history of the dismemberment of the Turkish empire during the past 80 years is a sufficient refutation of this indictment of the old view.

Objection 14 states that the old view makes Thrace or Turkey

in Europe a necessary part of the identification of the king of the North, and yet no Seleucid king held any part of Turkey in Europe, unless we may count the brief time after Seleucus Nicator conquered Lysimachus.

My answer to this objection is that Lysimachus the first and original king of the north mentioned in the eleventh chapter after Alexander's kingdom was divided, which held all of Thrace which included the countries on the Hellespont and the Bosphorus and Asia Minor, Armenia and Media, north of Syria. Later Lysimachus added to his northern territory all the dominion of Cassander's two sons--namely Macedonia and the adjacent countries. Then Seleucus after he had invaded India returned and added all of Asia Minor to his own vast dominion, and later at the battle of Cornepedion in B. C. 281 defeated and slew Lysimachus, and the historian says, "in consequence of which Seleucus made himself master of all his dominions" and also "became master of all the treasures of Lysimachus." Antiochus Soter, the son of Seleucus succeeded his father and reigned for nineteen years over all his father's dominions. Thus the dynasty of the Seleuciden was firmly established in the territory of the king of the North in Europe as well as in Asia.

Objection 15, states that the old view declares that Lysimachus conquered Cassander, when these two men never went to war against each other.

My answer to this objection is that this indictment rests on a point of mere technicality. Elder Smith used the figure of Personification instead of metonymy. What he really meant was not Cassander but Cassander's kingdom in the days of his two son--the lawful successors.

Objection 16, states that the old view declares that Seleucus conquered Lysimachus and thus became possessed of Macedonia and Thrace,

when nothing of the kind occurred.

I have already answered this indictment under objection 14, by giving historical proof that Seleucus became the sole master of all the dominions and all the treasures of Lysimachus, and Seleucus' son Antiochus Soter, succeeded to all his father's conquered possessions. A later disintegration of the western possessions in Europe does not militate against what constituted the original territory of the king of the North. When Rome conquered the territory of the original king of the North, it for a time being was the king of the North on the same basis as the Seleucidae of the East became the kings of the North. For the same reason, and on exactly the same basis, when the Ottoman rulers wrested this territory out of the hands of the Romans and drove them back into Western Europe, did the Turkish rulers become the kings of North. There is logic and consistency in this position of the old view.

Objection 17 states that the old view affirms that there were only two powers left of Alexander's empire when Seleucus won the victory in B. C. 331, whereas history shows there were three powers which persisted till Rome became dominant.

My answer to this indictment is that it does not correctly represent the old view. The old view insists that there were only two powers existent for a limited time, after which the Macedonian dynasty again gained its independence. But this fact does not change the territorial status of the original king of the North. The old view maintains the same division in B.C. 11 as it does in B.C. 8.

Objection 18, states that the old view in its shunting back

in the history of Rome to anchor to some expressions loses the prophecy of the greatest persecution the Jewish people ever suffered, under Antiochus IV.

My answer to this indictment is that it impeaches its own testimony. In order to bring in the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes which were but as a drop in the bucket in comparison to what imperial Rome did to the Jews, the new view devotes 16 verses of Daniel 11, to the short reign of eleven years of Antiochus Epiphanes and not a single verse to imperial Rome, and then without even mentioning that a fourth kingdom that was to rule all the world has been established on earth without mentioning the fact that imperial Rome destroyed millions upon millions of Jews in entirely subjugating their nation and many cities without mentioning the two worst sieges, famine and destruction that Jerusalem ever experienced at the hands of the Romans, without alluding to the power that was to crucify the Prince of the Covenant, and was to destroy the Sanctuary and the high-priest-hood, the new view leaps across a gap of 703 years from Antiochus Epiphanes to the establishment of the Papacy. The new view has set at naught its own arguments when it eliminates all the fearful and unparalleled devastations and persecutions of imperial Rome upon the Jews for a period of nearly 700 years and substitutes in its place the short period of a little more than three years during which Antiochus Epiphanes waged war upon the Jews, and employs sixteen verses of the prophecy to cover this short period.

It may be well to state right here why Antiochus Epiphanes is allowed to cover so many verses in the eleventh chapter of Daniel. The religious commentators of the Jewish Church were the first to give this much attention to Antiochus Epiphanes in order to avoid an allusion to the Messiah as the Prince of the Covenant being put to death

Later the commentators of the Catholic Church adopted the same view on this prophecy and had Antiochus Epiphanes cover nearly the whole of the prophecy from the fifteenth verse on down, so as to avoid the application of the prophecy to the Papacy from verses 31 to 35 inclusive. A number of modern Protestant writers have adopted the interpretation of the Catholic Church down to verse 31, then finding themselves in a dilemma to span a gap of 703 years they shut their eyes to the most momentous events in connection with the history of God's people and the unfolding of God's plan in the world, and blindly leap across a gap of seven centuries and land squarely upon the establishment of the supremacy of the Papacy.

Elder Uriah Smith was conversant with all these facts just stated and alludes to them in his treatise of the little horn that waxed exceeding great where these same Bible commentators and church historians endeavored to prove that the little horn represented Antiochus Epiphanes.

Elder Smith says: "The Romanists take that view to avoid the application of the prophecy to themselves; and many Protestants follow them, in order to oppose the doctrine that the second advent of Christ is now at hand." That Elder Smith was very familiar with the writers who held this new view on Daniel 11, is quite apparent. He quotes from the works that are brought forward to sustain the new view, namely, Macanbee; Josephus's Antiquities; Pridéaux; Bishop of Newton and others. He saw the error of their arguments and refused to follow them.

Objection 32, states again that the old view departs from the world-dominance principle, invariably used in other prophecies, and makes exact territory the chief factor of identification. I have already answered this objection, by showing that there are many nations and not one universal nation ruling the world in the latter portions of the great prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.

Objection 35 states that the old view presents the opinions of men, man, men, ranged around 1788, and the clause, "He shall come to his end and none shall help him." The old view presents a mighty mass of interesting history, artful diplomacy, and theories of men, but what do the wise men of the world know about the fulfillment of prophecy anyway. We believe these things because God says so.

My answer to this objection is that the author of this indictment, I find, by looking his treatise through, made some twenty-six appeals to the writings of men to support his views. The new view presents the explanation of twenty-six verses of Daniel eleventh chapter without a single reference to the Bible, and quotes copiously from Bishop Newton, Prideaux, and other human authorities, whereas the old view interprets the latter part of the eleventh chapter of Daniel in harmony with the inspired record of the political history of the Book of Revelation, as it is outlined in the eighth, ninth, eleventh and sixteenth chapters of Revelation. The old view presents both Bible and history -- the only logical way to proceed in giving an explanation of the prophecies.

Objection 36, is a repetition of indictment 35, which I have just answered.

Objections 38 and 39 find fault with the old view because it confines the territory of the king of the North to a little strip of territory north of Palestine, instead of giving the appellation - the King of the North - a world dominant character, that is to say a mystical, philosophical, Theosophical, Neo-Platonic interpretation. The great historian Heander says that this latter method of interpreting the Scriptures, doctrines and prophecies of the Bible

cludes all possibility of comprehension, changes the literal into a spiritual sense by arbitrary interpretations, and clothes all things in a hidden meaning so as to make things incomprehensible, ineffable, and the Absolute Being identical with nothing. The new view adheres to a literal interpretation of the king of the North and the king of the South, from the beginning of the division of Alexander's kingdom until we come to the 31st verse of Daniel 11, then when we read the 40th verse it suddenly changes its rule of interpretation and adopts the mystical, Theosophistic, Neo-Platonic system of interpretation. The old view is consistent and sticks to the literal text and literal interpretation throughout the entire chapter, and has literal kings that are reigning in literal territory.

ROMAN EMPIRE

I shall devote the rest of my time to the presentation of historical evidence that Rome is introduced into the prophecy in the 14th verse of the eleventh chapter, and fits the appellation, "the robbers of thy people" who were to "exalt themselves to establish the vision," a great deal better than a motley band of robbers and outlaws among the Jews in Palestine, as is held by the new view.

I accept the objective genitive instead of the subjective genitive as being the proper construction of the Hebrew text; There are many excellent authorities that sustain this construction of the text, and render it "the robbers of thy people," "the breakers of thy people," "the destroyers of thy people," etc.

How remarkably this designation fits the little horn that was to wax exceeding great in the vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel, "he shall destroy wonderfully and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people, and he shall also

stand up against the Prince of princes, but he (Rome) shall be broken without hands."

"The robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall," that is, "they shall be broken without hands" without human instrumentality. The original name of the Romans was robbers, Mommsen, Volume 1, Book 1, Chapter 4, Paragraph 1.

"This much is certain," says Mommsen, "that in the oldest form of it [the name of the Romans] known to us the inhabitants of the canton [on the hills of the Tiber] are called not *Romane*, but (by a shifting sound that frequently occurs in the earlier period of a language, but fell very early into abeyance in Latin) *Ramnians* (*Ramnēs*) a fact which constitutes an expressive testimony to the immortal antiquity of the name." "*Ramnēs*" means "foresters, or bushmen" and "bushmen" was the ancient term for "robbers." Hence *Ramnēs* or *Rarnian*, contracted later to *Romans*, means literally "robbers" or "violent men," "the children of the violent." Later they also called themselves "*Romani collini*" or "Romans of the Hill," others called them, "Hill-men" and "Mount Romans."

They were a lot of robbers and outlaws, and consequently their appellation - *Ramnians*, later contracted to *Romans*.

In Arnold's History of Rome, Chapter 1, paragraph 9, we read: "Romulus set apart a place of refuge to which any man might flee and be safe from his pursuers. So many fled thither from the country round about; those who had shed blood and fled from the avenger of blood. . . and even men of low degree who had run away from their lords." "So the city was filled with people (men) and they wanted wives, and the nations round about would not give them any wives."

"Thus they resorted to a curious expedient. A great festival in honor of Neptune was appointed, and the neighboring families were

invited to come with their families. In the midst of the games the young Romans rushed among the spectators, and each seizing a maiden, carried her off to be his wife." Thus they stole their wives, and the surrounding nations, the Greeks and the Sabines, from whom they stole their wives, called them robbers."

In Rollins' Ancient History, Books 22 and 23, Sec. 3, Paragraph 31, we find a letter written by Mithridates, king of Armenia to Arsaces, king of the Parthians as follows:

"Do you know that the Romans when they found themselves stopped by the ocean in the west turned their arms this way, that to look back to their foundation, and origin, whatever they had they had from violence; homes, wives, and dominion. A vile herd of every kind of vagabonds, without country, without forefathers, they established themselves for the misfortune of the human race. Neither divine or human laws restrained them from destroying remote neighbors, the weak or the powerful, their allies, or friends. They reckon as enemies all that are not their slaves and especially whatever bears the name of king. . . . It will be for your immortal glory to have supported two great kings and to have conquered and destroyed those robbers of the world."

The Hebrew word for "robbers" in Daniel 11:14, is a very significant word and is only used by the Lord himself, once in Daniel, once in Jeremiah, and again in Ezekiel, once in Isaiah and once in the Psalms. The Hebrew is "parits." Isaiah applies it to a "ravenous beast." Ezekiel in predicting the future destruction of Jerusalem after the fashion of Moses' prediction in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, concludes by saying: "I will give it (sanctuary) into the hands of the strangers for a prey, and to the wicked of the earth for a spoil; and they shall pollute it. My face will I also turn from them,

and they shall pollute my secret place; for the robbers (parits) shall enter into it and defile it." This cannot refer to Nebuchadnezzar, for he had already polluted the sanctuary and taken its vessels as a prey and spoil. It must refer to the future pollution of the sanctuary by the Romans in A.D. 70.

In Psalm 17:4 the Hebrew word "parits" is translated "the destroyer." Gesenius in his Hebrew lexicon defines the word "parits" - "one violent, rapacious, an oppressor, a tyrant." How fittingly the appellations: "the destroyer of thy people," "the oppressors of thy people," "the tyrants of thy people" who shall exalt themselves to establish the vision," "in these times" apply to the Romans. How aptly the expression: "The destroyers of thy people who shall exalt themselves to establish the vision" fits into the language of the vision of Daniel 8:24 and 25. Here imperial Rome is represented in the following descriptive language: "And he shall magnify (exalt) himself." "And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people," "he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." It was Imperial Rome that was to stand up against the Prince of princes. It was Imperial Rome that was to establish the vision of the seventy weeks in Daniel ninth chapter that was determined upon his people and his holy city. It was Imperial Rome that was to make possible the fulfillment of this vision, which was to seal up both the vision and the prophecy and make them sure, when they "cut off," (or literally "put to death as a malefactor") "the Messiah."

It is this same vision that the angel again refers to in Dan. 11:14. It is the same Prince of princes that the angel refers to in Dan. 11:23. "The Prince of the covenant," does not mean "a prince of a covenant." The angel is specific in his language, just as God is when He says "the seventh day is the Sabbath" not a seventh day or any seventh day. "The Prince of

of the Covenant." It is a specific Prince and a specific Covenant. Of what covenant is Christ the Prince? For what covenant was He broken? The word "broken" here is "shabar" and means "to meet a violent end or death" when applied to men." The prince of the covenant was to meet a violent death. Paul states that the old covenant was ratified with the blood of animals which met a violent death, therefore it was necessary that the new covenant be ratified by the death of the Prince of life in the same way.

It is the same mighty imperial Rome that caused "craft" (or deceit) "to prosper in his hand" in Daniel 8:25 that was to "work deceitfully" after the league was perfected between the Jews and Romans in 181 B.C. While the Romans promised to protect the Jews and preserve their land and nation inviolate from all their enemies, the Caesars who did according to their own will before whom none were able to stand, finally entered into the glorious land, and by their hands it was consumed. "wily"

After the great Caesar conquered the holy land in 65 B.C. he set his face to enter by force upon the possession of the whole kingdom. Egypt was the only division of "the whole kingdom" of Alexander that was not yet brought into subjection to the Roman power, and Caesar, the founder of imperial Rome, the one man that made the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2, 7, and 8, as world empire, now sets his face to enter by force into Egypt, where Cleopatra practiced her wily and corrupting machinations upon Caesar and his generals, and finally turned against him, but he finally subdued all his enemies and turned his face as a world monarch toward the stronghold of his own land -- the capital of the Roman Empire.

Froude in his wonderful book on "Caesar - A Sketch," using this significant language as to the divine purpose and mission

of Caesar in connection with God's plan and work in this earth, says:

"Caesar . . . came into the world at a special time and for a special object. The old religions were dead, from the pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates and the Nile, and the principles on which human society had been constructed were dead also. . . . A new life was about to dawn for mankind. Poetry, and faith, and devotion were to spring again out of the seeds which were sleeping in the heart of humanity. But this life which is to endure grows slowly; and as the soil must be prepared before the wheat can be sown, so before the Kingdom of Heaven could throw up its shoots there was needed a kingdom of this world where the nations were neither torn to pieces by violence nor were rushing after false ideals and spurious ambitions. Such a kingdom was the Empire of the Caesars -- a kingdom where peaceful men could work, think, and speak as they pleased, and travel freely among provinces ruled for the most part by Gallion, who protected life and property, and forbade fanatics to tear each other in pieces for their religious opinions. 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,' was the complaint of the Jewish priests to the Roman governor. Had Europe and Asia been covered with independent nations, each with a local religion represented in its ruling powers, Christianity must have been stifled in its cradle. If St. Paul had escaped the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, he would have been torn to pieces by the silver-smith at Ephesus. The appeal to Caesar's judgment-seat was the shield of his mission, and alone made possible his success.

"And this spirit, which confined government to its simplest duties, while it left opinion unfettered, was especially present in Julius Caesar himself. . . . He fought his battles to establish some tolerable degree of justice in the government of this world; and he succeeded, though he was murdered for doing it.

"Strange and startling resemblance between the fate of the founder of the kingdom of this world and of the founder of the kingdom not of this world, for which the first was the preparation." --

Froude - "Caesar - A Sketch," pages 434 - 436.

It seems strange that divine revelation in the Book of Daniel should deal with the founder of the Babylonian kingdom, the conqueror of the Babylonian Empire, the founder of the Grecian Empire and entirely omit any mention of the founder of the greatest world empire -- which was finally "to destroy the mighty and the holy people" and "also stand up against the Prince of princes, yea, the Prince of the covenant," and, "which mighty empire was to pollute the sanctuary of strength, and take away the daily sacrifice" and in its place establish the abomination that maketh desolate for a thousand two hundred and ninety years. The fact that the new view of Daniel 11 eliminates entirely all the dealings of imperial Rome with God's people and God's cause, and skips from Antiochus Epiphanes to the establishment of the Papacy, a period of over 700 years, is a sufficient defect in itself to destroy the force of the whole argument in support of Antiochus Epiphanes covering all the prophetic history from verses 15 to 31 of Daniel 11. Antiochus Epiphanes may have been important but can he eclipse the whole history of imperial Rome and what imperial Rome did to God's people? Was he greater than the founder of imperial Rome -- the conqueror of the world?

"But," says the angel to Daniel, "he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

Froude in commenting on Caesar's Death says: "As Caesar had lived to reconstruct the Roman world, so his death was necessary to finish the work. . . . Caesar entered and took his seat on Caesar's golden chair on the rostrum of the Roman Senate. A group of conspirators gathered around him, presenting a petition which he refused to grant. Caesar rose

from his seat. Cassius stabbed him in the throat. He looked round, and seeing not one friendly face, but only a ring of daggers pointing at him, he drew his gown over his head, gathered the folds about him that he might fall decently, and sank down without uttering another word." "He stumbled and fell," pierced with twenty-three daggers. "Thus the great Caesar died." The angel said; "He shall turn his face toward the stronghold of his own land, but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

Why was he not found after he stumbled and fell? Let Frodo give the answer. "They [the Roman senators] took on themselves the order of the funeral. They surrounded the body, which was reverently raised by the officers of the Forum. Part proposed to carry it to the Temple of Jupiter, in the Capitol, and burn it under the eyes of the assassins; part to take it into the Senate-house and use the meeting place of the Optimates a second time as a pyre of the people's friend. A few legionaries . . . advised that it should be consumed where it lay. The platform was torn up and the broken timbers piled into a heap. Chairs and benches were thrown on to it, the whole crowd rushing wildly to add a chip or splinter. Actors flung in their dresses, musicians their instruments, soldiers their swords. Women added their necklaces and scarfs. Mothers brought up their children to contribute toys and playthings. On the pile so composed the body of Caesar was reduced to ashes. . . . The demonstrations of sorrow were most remarkable among the Jews, crowds of whom continued for many nights to collect and wail in the Forum at the scene of the singular ceremony." Ibid -- pages 414, 415.

They sought for the great Caesar, their friend, but he was not to be found. He stumbled and fell, was reduced to ashes, they still sought after him, but he was not found. How remarkably he fulfilled this prophecy.

"Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom."

The great Augustus Caesar succeeded Julius Caesar. He is preeminently styled both in history and in sacred writ as the greatest tax raiser the world ever saw. Luke referring to the great Augustus, who reigned at the time of Christ's birth, in the time of "the glory of the kingdom," says: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." A ruler who taxed all the world is certainly a greater "raiser of taxes" than was Seleucus Philopater who only laid a small tax upon the Jews so he might be able to pay his annual tribute of 40,000 talents to the Romans, who had laid claim to his dominions.

"In the glory of the kingdom." What kingdom? If it is Israel's kingdom, all is well. For Christ is the glory of Israel's kingdom, and he appeared during the reign of the "raiser of taxes" Augustus Caesar. If it refers to the time of the glory of the kingdom of imperial Rome — all is well. Because the reign of Augustus Caesar is called, in history, "The Augustan Age," "the Golden Age," He truly appeared "in the glory of the kingdom" of imperial Rome.

And said the angel to Daniel: "And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom."

The new view holds that this verse refers to Antiochus Epiphanes — the Illustrious. No doubt, Antiochus Epiphanes was vile, but if we are to believe the records of Sutorius, a Roman Senator, who gives us a biography of the life of Tiberius Caesar, we must admit that Antiochus Epiphanes was indeed illustrious in virtue in comparison to the vile, voluptuous, profligate and drunken life which Tiberius Caesar lived. Seneca says, Tiberius was only drunk once in his life, and that was all the time.

Of all the Caesars that Suetonius describes Tiberius is

the vilest. Tiberius after he had fully established himself upon the throne of Rome through flatteries, so abundantly attested to by historians, erected a temporary residence in a villa on an island near the ancient city of Pompeii, and if I should read to you all the vile things that Suetonius says Tiberius indulged in, with the profligates of Pompeii, you can readily understand why the Lord rained brimstone and fiery lava out of the mouth of Mt. Vesuvius upon the inhabitants of this wicked city and destroyed them all in A.D. 79. I have never read anything so revolting, sickening, and disgusting of any ruler as the villainous character of Tiberius. No other ruler is more deserving of the title "a vile person" as the successor of Augustus Caesar, who came "in peaceably and obtained the kingdom by flatteries." It is no wonder when Livy, the wife of Augustus, by flatteries besought the great Emperor to nominate Tiberius as his successor that he said: "Your son is too vile to wear the purple of Rome."

It was during Tiberius' reign that "the Prince of the Covenant" met a violent death as is clearly set forth in the prophecy concerning this vile king. After mention is made of the violent death which the prince of the new covenant was to suffer, we are introduced to a league or alliance which was made with Rome after which Rome was to "work deceitfully" "against the holy covenant." Just as soon as the Prince of the new Covenant is introduced in the 22nd verse -- the new or holy covenant, the sanctuary of strength, and the daily ministry of the prince of the covenant become the bone of contention with Rome, until finally the abomination of desolation is set up in place of the continual ministry of the Prince of the covenant. Five times the holy covenant is mentioned after the Prince of the new covenant has ratified it by his death, until the Papacy obscures his daily ministry of the new covenant blessings by setting up its own abominable system. The warfare of Rome both pagan and papal is against the new covenant, the Prince of the new covenant, and his sanctuary. A lack of time prevents me from going into a detailed explanation of the history of imperial Rome from verses 23 to 31.