

Supplementary Material

A Literal King of the South:

Avoiding Phantomized Interpretations

Daniel 11:40 Prophecy Conference

Bering Springs, Michigan

October 19-21, 2018

John C. Witcombe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Jesus Said Watch.....	page 1
2. Spiritualizing Literal Jerusalem.....	page 7
3. The Papacy and the King of the North	page 8
4. Switching Rules Midstream.....	page 8
5. Atheistic France and the Year 1798	page 12
6. South and its Relation to Alexander’s Kingdom	page 17
7. Islam and the King of the South	page 20
8. The King of the South is	page 21
9. A Literal, Civil Interpretation of Daniel 11:30-39.....	page 26
10. Why the Change From Literal to Figurative?.....	page 27

This Supplementary Material document contains material that had to be removed from my paper in order to reduce its size to the 30-page maximum length requirement. If you found that my paper and Ken LeBrun’s paper made a compelling case for the position taught in Uriah Smith’s book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, then it will be worth your while to read this document. You will find additional compelling support for the Classical Adventist View of Daniel 11:40-45.

Jesus Said, Watch

If the author is correct in believing that the entire chapter of Daniel 11 is a delineation of literal, civil events that act as waymarks leading to the close of probation, then there would be an important, final, civil event prophesied in Daniel 11:45 for which we are to be watching.

In the gospel of Mark, Jesus says:

“Take ye heed, *watch* and pray: for ye know not when the time is. For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to *watch*. *Watch* ye therefore: for ye

know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, **Watch.**” {Mark 13:33-37, emphasis added}.

After quoting these verses, Ellen White pens these words:

“What time is here referred to? Not to the revelation of Christ in the clouds of heaven to find a people asleep. No; but to His return from His ministration in the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, when He lays off His priestly attire and clothes Himself with garments of vengeance, and when the mandate goes forth: ‘He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.’”¹

Four times Jesus repeats the word *watch*. There must be something tangible and physical here on earth upon which we are to focus our watchful attention, something that is intimately connected with the work Jesus is performing in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary and the close of human probation.

There are only two passages in the Bible that connect a prophesied event or activity here on earth with the close of probation. The first one is Daniel 12:1 “*And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people. . .*” emphasis added.

At what time? At the time of the event spoken of in the preceding verse—Daniel 11:45 “*And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.*” emphasis added.

And the only way to know what this is talking about so that we can watch for the arrival of the event mentioned in this verse is to go back to verse 40 in order to identify the pronouns found in verse 45.

The command of Jesus to watch for the event here on earth that signals the close of probation raises to the highest importance our need to understand the identity of the *kings of the north and south* in verse 40.

¹ EGW, *Testimonies*, vol. 2, 190.

If Daniel 11 is a delineation of literal, civil events taking place within a certain region of planet earth that provides waymarks pointing us to the close of human probation, then it would be of real concern if anyone was to remove a single waymark from this chapter.

Here is how a literal waymark could be removed. Daniel 11:3 says, “And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.” The literal meaning of the word *king* is “a male sovereign; ruler of a kingdom”. It is the literal reading of Daniel 11 verses 3 and 4 along with an assessment of the historical records that informs us that it was Alexander the Great to whom this *king* was referencing.

Now if we were to phantomize this text which means to make symbolic what can reasonably be understood in literal terms, we might say that the word *king* no longer means a male sovereign ruling over a kingdom. We might symbolize this word and make it refer to a religion, a philosophical ideology or any number of other things.

And by doing this to the text we have just removed the literal event of the rise and break up of Alexander’s empire—an important waymark on the path to the close of probation.

Why would anyone want to *phantomize* the word *king* in Daniel 11? There are several reasons why prophetic expositors have chosen to take a symbolic view of the word *king* in this chapter. Most have decided that the word *king* should have a literal meaning before the cross but after the cross, the word *king* must be understood symbolically.

And it is this very decision to *phantomize* the word *king* that has removed all the literal, civil waymarks in the most critical of times—the time of the end. The majority of our prophetic expositors have phantomized the last six verses of Daniel 11. A literal view of the word *king* in Daniel 11:40 provides for us in verse 45 a literal, civil event in a specific region of the world upon which we are to keep watch. As we see conditions in the world moving towards a literal, civil fulfillment of verse 45, we can know that our High Priest is also wrapping up His work in the Most

Holy Place. He will not allow verse 45 to be fulfilled until He is ready to stand up and close earth's probation. How important it is for us to be watching for the coming fulfillment of this event spoken of in verse 45!

This paper will present a literal interpretation of the last six verses of Daniel 11. It will set forth the event for which we are to be watching that is prophesied to take place just before Michael stands up.

The second passage that connects a literal event with the close of probation is found in Luke 21:

“And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judaea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and *Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*” {Luke 21:20-24, emphasis added}.

Jesus is asking His people to take note of literal Jerusalem. Non-ethnic Jews will continue to desecrate (trodden down) real estate that is considered sacred to Judaism. And this will continue “until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled” which refers to the close of probation. The time of the Jews was up to 34 AD and from that time until the close of probation is the time of the Gentiles. The fact that Gentile feet still desecrate the Temple Mount even after Israel captured this real estate from Jordan on June 7, 1967 provides spectacular evidence of a continuing prophetic fulfillment of a prophecy regarding literal Jerusalem:

“Even more astonishing was the Israeli decision, at the moment of victory, to concede sovereignty over the Temple Mount, Judaism's holiest site.”²

The prophecy of Luke 21:24 required this astonishing concession. Seeing that Jesus gave a prophecy involving literal Jerusalem in connection with the close of probation, it is not at all out of

² <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/06/israel-paratroopers-temple-mount-1967/529365>

place for Gabriel to give to Daniel a prophecy that also involves literal Jerusalem being connected with the close of probation as we find in a literal reading of Daniel 11:45, 12:1.

Many are guilty of phantomizing Daniel 11:40-45. And because this issue is so widespread today it bears repeating this significant statement from *The Great Controversy*:

“Concerning the popular system of interpreting, or *misinterpreting*, the Scriptures, Wolff wrote: ‘The greater part of the Christian church have swerved from the *plain sense of Scripture*, and have turned to the *phantomizing system of the Buddhists*, who believe that the future happiness of mankind will consist in moving about in the air, and suppose that when they are reading Jews they must understand Gentiles; *and when they read Jerusalem, they must understand the church; and if it is said earth, it means sky*; and for coming of the Lord they must understand the progress of the missionary societies; and going up to the mountain of the Lord’s house, signifies a grand class meeting of Methodists.’ --Journal of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, page 96”³

Let us postulate an updated paraphrase:

Concerning the popular system of interpreting or misinterpreting Daniel 11:40-45, Witcombe wrote: “The greater part of the Seventh-day Adventist prophetic expositors have swerved from the plain sense of Scripture and have turned to the phantomizing system of the Buddhists, who believe that when they are reading *king* they must understand anything but a literal sovereign civil ruler; and when they read *south*, they must understand atheism or Islam; and if it is said *north*, it means the papacy.”

There are 2,193 verses of the Bible where the word *king/kings/king’s* is used. In most of these verses the word *king* refers to a literal male sovereign ruler over a specified territory and a person’s name can be attached. The author is aware of only two instances where the word *king* has a figurative meaning where an individual’s name could not be attached:

“Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow: and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon.” {Judges 9:14, 15}.

“And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there (they) are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space.” {Revelation 17:9, 10}.

³ EGW, *The Great Controversy*, 360, emphasis added.

The context and language of these two exceptions demands that we treat the word *king* figuratively. The context and language surrounding the word *king* in Daniel 11:40 is no different from the context and language surrounding the word *king* in Daniel 11:5. So if we can apply a person's name to the *king* of verse 5 then we should be able to apply a person's name to the *king* of verse 40.

At this prophecy conference on Daniel 11 the question before us is this: Who is the *king of the south* in Daniel 11:40? If a writer of a submitted position paper is unable to place a person's name as the answer to this question, it is because they have chosen to treat the word *king* figuratively rather than literally. If, in this paper, we are able to demonstrate that the word *king* in verse 40 can be understood literally then, according to Miller's Rule #11, it must be viewed from the literal standpoint and anyone who would treat the word *king* figuratively would be guilty of phantomizing the text.

So in your quest for the truth on Daniel 11, first discover if it is possible to understand the word *king* in verse 40 in the same manner as it is understood in 2,190 other verses of the Bible—a literal male sovereign ruler over a specified territory. My paper along with Ken LeBrun's document will assist you in this endeavor. Once you have determined that a reasonable case can be made for a literal view of the word *king* in Daniel 11:40 then you can know that any expositor who is attempting to make a case for a figurative *king* is in violation of Miller's Rule #11. You need not spend your valuable time trying to make sense of the multiplied figurative presentations on the eleventh chapter of Daniel that are being published today. You can use Miller's Rule #11 as a template to quickly shift through the many books and papers that have been written on this chapter. If their interpretation does not allow a civil ruler's name to identify both the *king of the north* and the *king of the south* in Daniel 11:40 then move on to the next document.

Spiritualizing Literal Jerusalem

It is interesting that Wolff used spiritualizing Jerusalem to represent the church as an example of phantomizing the Bible. Notice what is taught by many in Daniel 11:45—glorious holy mountain = Jerusalem = Seventh-day Adventist Church. The problem with this equivalency is that Palestinian Jerusalem is never used as a symbol for the church. Here’s how the Apostle Paul viewed Jerusalem: “For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.” Galatians 4:25, 26.

“Jerusalem which now is” is not mentioned as a symbol, but as the literal application of a symbol. The symbol is Hagar/Ishmael, which Paul uses to illustrate the first covenant, which was made with “Jerusalem which now is,” the headquarters of the Jewish nation. The second covenant would then be symbolized by Sarah/Isaac, and is available to “us all”, all who accept Christ, i.e., the church, who are citizens of “Jerusalem which is above”.

In both cases, Jerusalem is an actual city. The first one is on earth in Palestine, and the second one is in heaven. Neither of them is symbolic, but rather literal cities with literal inhabitants. The first one was the habitation of the Jews. The second is the habitation “of us all”—the redeemed of God.

So Jerusalem which is above is actually identified in some way with the church as being the mother of us all. The problem, then, is not the identification of *Jerusalem which is above* with the church; the problem is turning the meaning of an expression (glorious holy mountain) into what that expression symbolizes (Jerusalem which now is) which must then be interpreted as something else (the church). If the Bible doesn’t explicitly teach that “Jerusalem which now is” represents the church then we should not make that application. Making an equivalency where none exists is to phantomize the text.

Once we start “phantomizing” the Bible, there is no end to the variety of interpretations we might find. Ellen White, with good reason, was inspired to place Joseph Wolff’s relevant statement in *The Great Controversy* where she prefaced it with these words: “Concerning the popular system of interpreting, or misinterpreting, the Scriptures...”

The Papacy and the King of the North

How is it that the *king of the north* becomes a symbol for the papacy? In the first half of Daniel 11, the *kings of the north* were identified as literal rulers from the northern division of Alexander’s original empire. Then, it is assumed, that after Rome conquered both *north* and *south* territories, Imperial Rome becomes the *king of the north*.

But, it is of interest to note that the rulers of Imperial Rome are never once explicitly described by the phrase, *king of the north* in Daniel 11. Instead, we find descriptions such as “raiser of taxes” and “vile person” being used to refer to Rome’s leaders. Why didn’t Gabriel ever call a Roman ruler the *king of the north* in Daniel 11? Could it be because Rome was ruling the world from the west?

So, once we have chosen to call Imperial Rome the *king of the north*, it would be natural to assume that when Imperial Rome gave its seat and authority to papal Rome, then papal Rome would also assume the title, *king of the north*. The problem with this scenario is that the angel Gabriel never gave Imperial Rome the title, *king of the north*.

Switching Rules Midstream

What do you think about switching our method of interpretation for the phrase *king of the south* in verse 40 just because we are post 1798? The idea is that before 1798 the *king of the south* was a literal person ruling from Egypt, but now that the 1260 year papal reign has come to an end,

we should view the phrase *king of the south* as representing something other than a civil ruler over Egypt.

Let's answer this question by looking at Daniel 2. In this chapter we have literal civil powers represented in the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image. These kings were established in their literal territories before 1798. Then in Daniel 2:44 these kings are again brought to view after 1798: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom...". Because this prophecy applies to the time of the end, do these kings no longer refer to civil rulers located in Europe? Ellen White indicates that these kings do, in fact, refer to civil rulers in Europe.⁴ We do not change geography or the meaning of the word *kings* just because the prophecy applies to a point in time after 1798. We do not make a universal or spiritual application of these *kings*. They are civil powers from start to finish in Daniel 2.

If there are no rules of prophetic interpretation that would allow us to change our interpretative method for the *kings* represented by the feet and toes in Daniel 2 after 1798, then there are no established rules that could be cited that would allow us to change our interpretive method for the phrase *king of the south* in verse 40.

There is nothing stated in the text of Daniel 11 that requires or instructs us to switch from a literal to a symbolic understanding of the phrase *king of the south*.

There are some prophetic expositors that have chosen to make symbolic, universal applications of the *kings of the north and south* after the cross instead of waiting until 1798. They have constructed a rule of prophetic interpretation that requires them to switch from a literal, localized application of these *kings of the north and south* before the cross to a symbolic, universal application after 31 AD. If this is truly a rule of prophetic interpretation rather than a rule of convenience designed to make the text say what they think it should say, then this rule must have universal application. If it cannot be applied to Daniel 2 with equal force as they apply it to Daniel

⁴ EGW, Manuscript 39, 1899.

11, then the contrived rule is shown to be just that—a rule designed to support a preconceived opinion.

To show that this “rule” cannot be applied to Daniel 2, thus demonstrating that it is not a valid rule of prophetic interpretation, the author will insert a segment of material from his booklet, *Unholy War*:⁵

In Daniel 2 we find a vision of a composite image made up of gold, silver, brass, iron and clay. The interpretation given in the text itself makes it clear that this image is foretelling coming civil kingdoms that would rise to power. Looking back through history, we can name those kingdoms:

- Head of Gold: Babylon
- Chest of Silver: Medo-Persia
- Belly and Thighs of Brass: Greece
- Legs of Iron: Rome
- *Feet and Toes of Iron and Clay: What do they represent?*

Some prophetic expositors interpret the feet of iron and clay as representing universal, apostate religion united with civil governments. Another interpretation taught by many is that the feet and toes represent the nations that arose from the fall of Rome.

How can we know which interpretation is the correct *biblical* interpretation? It all comes down to how the word *kingdom* should be interpreted in verses 41 and 42:

“And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the *kingdom* shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the *kingdom* shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.”—Daniel 2:41-43.

Is the term *kingdom* in these verses to be interpreted in the same literal manner as it is interpreted from the beginning of the prophecy—as indicating literal civil kingdoms? Or should we change its literal interpretation and give it a figurative interpretation since the time of the feet and toes is after the cross, at a time when the church is no longer the literal nation of Israel?

If the term *kingdom* in verses 41 and 42 of chapter 2 can be interpreted literally as a civil power, as we interpret the four preceding *kingdoms* in this chapter—and “if it makes good sense as it stands”—then it must be interpreted that way.

According to Miller's 11th Rule, we do not have the option of interpreting it figuratively if we are looking for the correct *biblical* interpretation.

Clearly, it is evident that the previous usage of the term *kingdom* requires a literal interpretation. In verse 41 and 42, there is nothing in the text itself to indicate that we should change from a literal interpretation of the term *kingdom* at this point in the prophecy. So we

⁵ John C. Witcombe, *Unholy War*, 4-8.

stay with a literal, civil interpretation, even though the literal Jewish nation had come to an end and the church, at the time of the feet and toes, is now worldwide.

Therefore, our historicist understanding of the feet and toes of iron and clay as having to do with the division of Rome into the modern nations of Europe is correct. Without this interpretation, the identification of the little horn of chapter 7 as being the papacy would not be evident.

Ellen White clearly supports the view that the various image parts, including the feet and toes of iron and clay, represent literal civil kingdoms of the world:

“The image shown to Nebuchadnezzar in the visions of the night represents the kingdoms of the world. The metals in the image, symbolizing the different kingdoms, became less and less pure and valuable, from the head down. The head of the image was of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the sides of brass, and the feet and toes iron mingled with clay. So the kingdoms represented by them deteriorated in value.”—*Review and Herald*, February 6, 1900.

This is the interpretation that is presented in every prophecy-based Adventist evangelistic series.

Metaphorical Applications

We should note that Ellen White also makes use of several *metaphorical* applications of the image that go beyond the *literal biblical* interpretation of the text. Here are three such *metaphorical* applications she draws from the image:

1. The image represents the “deterioration of religion”:

“*While representing the kingdoms of this earth*, the image that was revealed to Nebuchadnezzar also fitly represented deterioration of religion. We grow weak morally and spiritually, just in proportion as we forget God.”—*Review and Herald*, February 6, 1900, emphasis supplied.

Notice that the *metaphorical* application does not replace the *biblical* interpretation: “*While representing the kingdoms of this earth...*”

2. The feet of iron and clay represent “God’s sacred work”:

“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.”—*SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 4, p. 1168.

Perhaps the iron represents the foundational truths of our denomination, and the clay could be the spurious teachings indicated by the wood, hay, and stubble. This is not the *biblical* interpretation that we would teach in an evangelistic meeting—it is simply a *metaphorical* application of the text.

3. The feet of iron and clay represent “the mingling of churchcraft and statecraft”:

“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.”—*SDA Bible Commentary*, vol. 4, p. 1168.

Now Ellen White is saying that the feet of iron and clay represent, not God's sacred work, but the evil one's work in uniting the power of the state to the churches in Protestant America. Is this an interpretation or simply a *metaphorical* application? To be a legitimate interpretation, every specification of the prophecy must fit—which in this case, it doesn't. Notice that verse 43 says, "but they shall not cleave one to another," and we know that church and state will be cleaving together to enforce a national Sunday law. She wrote: "This *union* is weakening all the power of the churches." Union is the very opposite of what the text actually teaches. Therefore, her use of the text is clearly a *metaphorical* application rather than a *biblical* interpretation.

With the word "kingdom" in chapter 2, as it relates to the image itself, we stay with a literal, geographical, civil interpretation from start to finish. Even in the feet and toes, which come into play after the literal Jewish nation had come to an end and the church at this time is worldwide, the word *kingdom* is still interpreted as referring to literal, civil powers.

With this information in mind, let's look at Daniel 11. Can you think of any term in chapter 11 that, like the word *kingdom* in chapter 2, is found from start to finish throughout the prophecy?

North and South, Alexander's Empire, and Applying Rule #11

What about the terms *north* and *south*? The reference to these two compass directions begins in verse 5 and goes clear through to the very last verse. These terms—*north* and *south*—refer to two of the four geographical divisions of Alexander's Empire.

They are included in the *four heads* of the leopard in chapter 7, the *four horns* of the goat in chapter 8, and the *four winds* of heaven in verse 4 of chapter 11. These represent the four geographical regions into which Alexander's four generals divided his empire. In Daniel 11 these four geographical regions are reduced down to two—*north* and *south*.

If, in Daniel 11, we would maintain a literal interpretation of the terms *north* and *south* from beginning to end—just as we maintain a literal interpretation of the term *kingdom* in Daniel 2—we would discover the true interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45, where the time period corresponds with the same time period as the kingdom of the feet and toes of Daniel 2.

Atheistic France and the Year 1798

It is taught by many that it was atheistic France who gave the deadly wound to the papacy in 1798. From this they believe that the king of the south in Daniel 11:40 represents atheism. There are several problems with this view. One serious problem is that France was not atheistic in the year 1798.

Notice that at least two Millerites believed that France was an atheistic country in 1798:

"It has therefore been stated, that 'the time of the end' is from the fall of popery, 1798, to the end itself. The king of the South, we have also seen in the preceding remarks, is Egypt; and the king of the North, is Syria. 'Him,' in the 40th verse, is the **atheistical**

government of France . . . The French revolution, and the wars which followed it, and desolated Europe for so many years, were God's sore judgment of the Papal powers. Bonaparte was an instrument of vengeance in the hand of the Almighty."⁶

“But in the 11th Chapter of Dan., after predicting, verse 31, the taking away of the daily and placing the abomination that maketh desolate penal persecution, the reign of Atheism, he says, verse 40 ‘And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him; (the *Atheistical government*) and the king of the north come against him like a whirlwind,’ etc. . . . ‘The king of the south,’ is Egypt; ‘the king of the north,’ Syria. This we contend was fulfilled in the collision between *France, the Atheistical government*, and Egypt, the king of the south, in A. D. 1798, when Buonaparte invaded Egypt.”⁷

Today, a significant number of Seventh-day Adventists would agree with Litch and Himes.

But do the historical facts support this assumption? If they don't, what would that do to the teaching that atheistic France was the *king of the south* in Daniel 11:40?

It is clear from the historical records that official state atheism only occupied a short span of time within the 10-year period of time known as the French Revolution.

In *The Great Controversy* we find that official atheism in France began in 1793 and ended three and a half years later:

“According to the words of the prophet, then, *a little before the year 1798* some power of satanic origin and character would rise to make war upon the Bible. And in the land where the testimony of God's two witnesses should thus be silenced, there would be manifest the atheism of the Pharaoh and the licentiousness of Sodom. . . . This prophecy has received a most exact and striking fulfillment in the history of France. *During the Revolution, in 1793*, "the world for the first time heard an assembly of men, born and educated in civilization, and assuming the right to govern one of the finest of the European nations, uplift their united voice to deny the most solemn truth which man's soul receives, and renounce unanimously the belief and worship of a Deity. . . *The atheistical power that ruled in France during the Revolution and the Reign of Terror*, did wage such a war against God and His holy word as the world had never witnessed. . . *It was in 1793 that the decrees which abolished the Christian religion and set aside the Bible passed the French Assembly. Three years and a half later a resolution rescinding these decrees, thus granting toleration to the Scriptures, was adopted by the same body.* The world stood aghast at the enormity of guilt which had resulted from a rejection of the Sacred Oracles, and men recognized the necessity of faith in God and His word as the foundation of virtue and morality.”⁸

This is in agreement with what Uriah Smith wrote in *Daniel and the Revelation*:

⁶ Josiah Litch, *An Address to the Public, and Especially the Clergy* (1841), 98, emphasis added.

⁷ Joshua V. Himes, *Signs of the Times and Expositor of Prophecy*, Feb. 1, 1842, 166, emphasis added.

⁸ EGW, *The Great Controversy*, 269-287, emphasis added.

“In 1793, a decree passed the French Assembly suppressing the Bible. Just three years after, a resolution was introduced into the Assembly superseding the decree, and giving toleration to the Scriptures. That resolution lay on the table six months, when it was taken up, and passed without a dissenting vote. Thus, in just three years and a half, the witnesses ‘stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which saw them.’”⁹

In three and a half years, state-sponsored atheism in France had come to an end. France could no longer be officially considered an atheistic state by the year 1798. Here is the historical evidence to support the above statements by Ellen White and Uriah Smith:

“The Commune of Paris . . . on the 3rd Frimaire of the Year II (24th November, 1793), on the request of Chaumette, . . . decreed ‘that all the churches and chapels of every religion and sect which exist in Paris shall be closed forthwith,’ and also that anyone who asked for their reopening should be arrested as a suspicious person.”¹⁰

November 24, 1793 was the start of the three and a half year prophecy. If we add 42 months (3.5 years), we come to May 24, 1797. If the date—on which a resolution would be voted to abolish atheism as the official policy of the French government—was to fall between May 24 and June 24, 1797, this would be within the 42nd month of this three and one half year time prophecy. Proving the divine origin of prophecy, we find that it was indeed in the 42nd month that atheism was abolished as the official policy of the French government:

“Thus it was that on the *17th of June, 1797* the ‘Council of Five Hundred’ made a ‘Revision of the laws relative to religious worship,’ which consisted of a number of propositions, ‘abolishing alike the Republican restrictions on Popish worship, and the Popist restrictions on Protestants.’ Croly mentions a number of issues that were brought forward in Jordan’s report:

- That all citizens might buy or hire edifices for the free exercise of religious worship.
- That all congregations might assemble by the sound of bells.
- That no test or promise of any sort unrequired from other citizens should be required of the ministers of those congregations.
- That any individual attempting to impede, or in any way interrupt the public worship should be fined, up to 500 livres, and not less than 50; and that if the interruption proceeded from the constituted authorities, such authorities should be fined double the sum.

⁹ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 1912 edition, 535.

¹⁰ A. Aulard, *Christianity and the French Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1927), 109.

- That entrance to assemblies for the purpose of religious worship should be free for all citizens.
- That all other laws concerning religious worship should be repealed.”¹¹

“The Church and the Bible had been slain in France from *November 1793, till June 1797*. The three years and a half were expended, and the Bible, so long and sternly repressed before, was placed in honour, and was openly the book of free Protestantism!”¹²

“As soon as religion became free from the civil administration, and was left to itself, it recovered itself with astonishing rapidity from the discredit into which it had fallen. France witnessed at the close of the eighteenth century the unexpected spectacle of a powerful revival of Christian faith.”¹³

From the following, we can see that the French population was rejecting atheism even before the government officially abolished atheism:

“General Clarke had told him [Napoleon] **toward the end of 1796** that ‘*France has become once more Roman Catholic, and we may be on the point of needing the Pope himself in order to enlist clerical support for the Revolution, and thereby the support of those districts which the clergy again controls.*’ Napoleon realized that true stability could return to France and those areas of Europe unsettled by the revolutionary armies only by an agreement to reestablish Catholicism and the spiritual authority of the pope. Consequently, while he was in Italy, Napoleon was careful to protect traditional Catholic practices and the integrity of the papacy.”¹⁴

So we can see that the population of France, the army, and Napoleon himself was not inspired by atheism in disposing of the pope on February 15, 1798. According to history and Ellen White, atheism had nothing to do with the deadly wound of the papacy.

Here is the ideology behind the infliction of the deadly wound:

“Bonaparte then put Duphot in charge of organizing the troops of the Cisalpine Republic. He rose to Général de brigade in the armée d'Italie on 30 March 1797. He then went to Rome with the French ambassador Joseph Bonaparte, where they both tried to incite a Republican revolt, especially by holding a Republican festival at Joseph's palace. This caused a riot and Duphot was fatally shot in December 1797 by papal troops. His death gave

¹¹ Jan Voerman, *The Reign of Terror*, Andrews University Seminary Studies, Vol. 47, No. 1, 133, emphasis added. <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=3055&context=auss>

¹² George Croly, *The Apocalypse of St. John or Prophecy of the Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Church of Rome; The Inquisition; The Revolution of France; The Universal War; and the Final Triumph of Christianity* (London: C. & J. Rivington, 1827), 180, 181, emphasis added.

¹³ M. Edmond de Pressensé, *Religion and the Reign of Terror* (New York: Carlton & Lanahan, 1868), 292.

¹⁴ Cedric Ward, Ph.D., associate professor of history at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, emphasis added. <https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/1979/06/napoleon-and-the-pope%E2%80%9494what-really-happened-in-1798>

Bonaparte the pretext he needed to occupy Rome, abolish the Papal States and set up the Roman Republic.”¹⁵

The ideology behind the motivation for taking the pope captive was Republicanism, not atheism. From the documentation regarding this event it is evident that atheism was not even remotely a factor in the removal of the pope and the establishment of the Roman Republic:

“About fifty official handbills and circulars, many in paralleling French and Italian columns, were printed and posted in Rome during the papal overthrow and the establishment of the republic under Berthier in 1798. These constitute about the highest source evidence obtainable, and are not commonly accessible. They are therefore summarized here, the more important being quoted from. Nos. 1 and 2 *assure respect for public worship and its ministers* and for ambassadors, and warn French officers of violation.

“Bill No. 9, likewise of the same date (February 15), titled ‘Acte du Peuple [people] Souverain’ (An Act of the Sovereign People) — certified and signed by three notaries, and confirmed by General Berthier — makes this clear-cut declaration: ‘*Assembled in the presence of the Eternal and the whole universe, they solemnly and unanimously declare . . . They have declared that their desire is that no attack against religion or the spiritual authority of the pope should be made and that they reserve to themselves the right by their representatives to provide for the comfortable sustenance [of the Pope] and to ensure the safety of his person by a national guard.*’”¹⁶

“Bill; No. 34, addressed to the Roman people and clergy, signed by the president of the republic and five consuls, and dated February 26, stating that the government is ‘*based on the gospel,*’ and declaring, ‘*God has established a gospel of peace and pardon,*’ commends good priests and warns the evil, and admonishes: ‘*In the pulpit, at the altar, at the confessional, give the people of both sexes to understand that religious interests are separate from politics.*’”¹⁷

If we were to teach the following: **And at the time of the end shall the king of the south** (atheism via atheistic France) **push at him** (the papacy—atheistic France gave the deadly wound to the papacy in February, 1798 by taking the pope captive), we would thereby undermine our teaching of Revelation 11:11—“And after three days and an half the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them.”

Using the day-for-a-year prophetic time chronology, this three-and-a-half days time prophecy requires France to cease its atheistic state three-and-a-half years after it began on

¹⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathurin-L%C3%A9onard_Duphot

¹⁶ Leroy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers*, Volume II, 756, emphasis added.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 758, emphasis added.

November 24, 1793. The historical records assure us that Revelation 11:11 was precisely fulfilled. Atheism officially came to an end on June 17, 1797 and thus had nothing to do with the papacy's deadly wound which took place on February 15, 1798.

According to William Miller's Rule #13, if our interpretation of Daniel 11:40 required an atheistic France to inflict the papal deadly wound, we would need to look for another interpretation:

William Miller's Rule #13: "To know whether we have the true historical event for the fulfillment of a prophecy: If you find every word of the prophecy (after the figures are understood) is literally fulfilled, then you may know that your history is the true event. But if one word lacks a fulfillment, then you must look for another event, or wait its future development. For God takes care that history and prophecy doth agree, so that the true, believing children of God may never be ashamed. Psalms 21:5; Isaiah 14:17-19; 1 Peter 2:6; Revelation 17:17; Acts 3:18."¹⁸

South and its Relation to Alexander's Kingdom

We know that in 1798, atheism could not have been the power that pushed at the "him" in Daniel 11:40. What about Islam? Can Islam be the interpretation for the word *south* in our phrase *king of the south*? And even if it could be, who would be the *king* for which the prepositional phrase modifies?

Before we answer this question, the author will first reveal something else that he believes Uriah Smith misstated in his book:

"When Alexander's empire was divided, the different portions lay toward the four winds of heaven, west, north, east, and south; *these divisions of course to be reckoned from the standpoint of Palestine*, the native land of the prophet. That division of the empire lying west of Palestine would thus constitute the kingdom of the west; that lying north, the kingdom of the north; that lying east, the kingdom of the east; and that lying south the kingdom of the south."¹⁹

What happens when the native land of the prophet is no longer the location of God's people? It might seem reasonable to someone to change the meanings of these terms *north* and *south* as many do.

¹⁸ Joshua V. Himes, *Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology Selected From Manuscripts of William Miller With a Memoir of His Life* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), 22.

¹⁹ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 1912 edition, 249, emphasis added.

But what if Smith was wrong on this point? What if the divisions were reckoned from the standpoint of Alexander's empire rather than from the standpoint of Palestine? What if the four horns have their point of origin, not from Palestine, but from the broken horn of the he goat that represented Alexander and his empire?

We have all assumed that the terms *north* and *south* in the first half of Daniel 11 were referenced from the placement of the people of God located in Palestine. Some have seen it as the territories north and south of Israel and some see north and south as relating to the direction of attack on the people of God.

These are both logical assumptions. But:

“All assumptions and pre-conceived opinions are to be thoroughly tested by the standard of truth.”²⁰

When the author thoroughly tested these assumptions, here is what he came up with: *North* and *south* are not in reference to God's people, but rather they relate to the former kingdom over which Alexander the Great was ruler.

“Therefore the he goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.” {Daniel 8:8, 9}.

The four winds are four compass directions. These four directions relate to the he goat which represented Alexander's empire. One of the four winds was west and it was from the west that Rome rose to power. Rome went south, east and to Palestine.

In Daniel 8:9, we see that south and east are not calculated from Palestine because the pleasant land is included with these two compass directions. South and east are not from the land where God's people are located; but in this verse, it is south and east from Rome, which was in the west.

²⁰ EGW, *1888 Materials*, 46.

This sets a precedent, showing us that it is from the power under discussion that the compass directions emanate. The four winds emanate from the head of the he goat, which represented the empire Alexander founded.

Thus Palestine was not the focal point from which the four winds of heaven are referenced; but rather, they were related to Alexander's empire.

Now when we get to Daniel 11, we see the same four winds of heaven mentioned:

“And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those.” {Daniel 11:4}.

These four directions of the compass relate to Alexander's empire. Two of these four directions are called *north* and *south* in Daniel 11. These two compass directions relate to the former territory of Alexander's empire.

North referred to the northern part of Alexander's former empire and *south* referred to the southern territory of Alexander's empire.

Palestine—the territory where God's people lived—was a part of Alexander's empire and in the division of his empire, Palestine happened to be included in the northern section of the southern division. These compass directions are not because of the location of Palestine; but rather, they are related to Alexander's former empire.

Because of the assumption that *north* and *south* were in relation to God's people, many have changed the meaning of *north* and *south* when God's people no longer existed in Palestine. From verse 22 through verse 45, *north* and *south* become spiritual entities rather than civil territories. This might be logical if *north* and *south* had been related to the location of God's people. In that case, changing from literal geography to a symbolic *ism* might make sense.

We could expect to see the same thing in Daniel 2. Part way through the legs of iron—which represented Imperial Rome—Israel ceased from being God’s people. We would expect to see the lower half of the legs along with the feet and toes to now represent the papacy or some other universal entity. But, as noted above, we can see from the writings of Ellen White, there is no change in what the parts of the image represent.

If the image of Daniel 2 represents civil powers located in the Mediterranean region from start to finish, even though the people of God become world-wide at the end of time, would we not also expect Daniel 11’s *north* and *south* to remain consistent from start to finish, especially given the fact that the terms *north* and *south* were not specifically designated as referencing from the geographical territory of Palestine?

If Smith is wrong on this issue, and *north* and *south* are territories so named independent of Palestine, then when Palestine is no longer the geographical location of God’s people, there would be no reason to change the meaning of these terms *north* and *south*. Interestingly enough, Smith doesn’t make a change to the meaning of these terms. He allows them to remain consistent throughout the prophecy. It was so self-evident to Smith that *north* and *south* were “of course” to be reckoned from the standpoint of Palestine, that he did not need to provide any scriptural support. Had he tried, perhaps he would have found it to be lacking.

Islam and the King of the South

With this being said, we can’t just choose to make South Africa or Saudi Arabia or South Carolina be the “*south*” of Daniel 11:40. The territory of Alexander’s empire must delimit just where *south* is located. So back to our question: Can Islam be the *south* of the phrase, *king of the south*, at the time of the end?

During the years 1798 until 1924, the Islamic Caliphate was located in the northern portion of Alexander’s former empire. During a portion of this time, Islam (headquartered in the north) was

even the subject of an ongoing time prophecy found in Revelation 9—giving this power prophetic significance. Even today, the Islamic country of Turkey rates eighth in the world in military strength, making it the most powerful Islamic country in the world.²¹ Today, many consider the President of Turkey to be the dominant political leader of the Islamic world.²²

So, even if we could find a rule of prophetic interpretation that would allow us to consign the terms *north* and *south* in Daniel 11 to religions rather than regions (which the author doesn't believe we can), it seems like a good choice for Islam would be *north* rather than *south*, given the facts on the ground today.

The King of the South is . . .

Here's a bit of history surrounding the ruler of Egypt in Daniel 11:40:

The Ottoman Empire (whose capital was located in the northern region of Alexander's original empire—qualifying the Ottoman Sultan to be the *king of the north*) took control of Egypt, the territory of the *king of the south*, in 1512, and ruled it until 1879. Therefore, there was no *king of the south*, because the Sultan, who was the *king of the north*, ruled that territory. And without a *king of the south* at the time of the end (1798), verse 40 could not be literally fulfilled. But as providence would have it, Ibrahim and Murad—Mameluke rulers—wrested Egypt from the Ottoman Empire and were co-ruling Egypt from 1791 up until the invasion of Napoleon. So there was indeed a *king of the south* in 1798 to push against an enemy.²³ What are the chances of this simply being coincidental?

Egypt pushed against the invasion of Napoleon, and the Ottoman Empire came against Napoleon like a whirlwind with wagons, horses and many ships. Here's the record of the whirlwind of horses:

²¹ <https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing.asp>

²² <https://www.theodysseyonline.com/erdogan-leader-of-the-islamic-world>

²³ tinyurl.com/q2sxwqi

“It was early in the morning of the 16th of April. The unclouded sun was just rising over the hills of Palestine and revealed to [the French] the whole embattled Turkish host spread out before him. The eye was dazzled with the magnificent spectacle, as proud banners and plumes, and gaudy turbans and glittering steel, and all the barbaric martial pomp of the East, were reflected by the rays of the brilliant morning. **Twelve thousand horsemen, decorated with the most gorgeous trappings of military show, and mounted on the fleetest Arabian chargers,** were prancing and curveting in all directions ... The French, too proud and self-confident to retreat before any superiority in numbers, had barely time to form themselves into one of Napoleon’s impregnable squares, when the whole cavalcade of horsemen, with gleaming sabers and hideous yells, **and like the sweep of the wind, came rushing down upon them.** Every man in the French squares knew that his life depended upon his immobility, and each one stood, shoulder to shoulder with his comrades.”²⁴

Here’s the record of the many ships (the British were allied with the Ottoman Empire against their common enemy—France):

“A Royal Navy flotilla under Commodore Sidney Smith helped to reinforce the Ottoman defences and supplied the city with additional cannon manned by sailors and marines. Smith used his command of the sea to capture the French siege artillery being sent by a flotilla of gunboats from Egypt and to bombard the coastal road from Jaffa. An artillery expert from the fleet, Antoine Le Picard de Phélippeaux, then redeployed against Napoleon’s forces the artillery pieces which the British had intercepted. Smith anchored the line-of-battle ships Tigre and Theseus so their broadsides could assist the defence. The gunboats, which were of shallower draft, could come in closer, and together they helped repel repeated French assaults.”²⁵

“The battle [of the Nile] reversed the strategic situation between the two nations’ forces in the Mediterranean and entrenched the Royal Navy in the dominant position that it retained for the rest of the war. It also encouraged other European countries to turn against France, and was a factor in the outbreak of the War of the Second Coalition. Bonaparte’s army was trapped in Egypt, and Royal Navy dominance off the Syrian coast contributed significantly to its defeat at the Siege of Acre in 1799 which preceded Bonaparte’s return to Europe.”²⁶

After 1798, Napoleon continued to cause France to rule over many:

“Napoleon had now consolidated his hold on France, had taken control of Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and most of Western Germany and northern Italy.”²⁷

Did Napoleon have anything to do with dividing the land for gain as the prophecy states?

Before 1798 France confiscated large land holdings and sold them to raise money for the

²⁴ John Stevens C. Abbott, *The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*, 102-103, emphasis added.

²⁵ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Acre_\(1799\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Acre_(1799))

²⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_the_Nile

²⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napoleonic_Wars

Revolution. Napoleon was at this time a military leader who would have helped empower the government to make this land grab. To quickly facilitate this dividing the land for gain, France issued Assignats:

“Assignats were paper money issued by the National Assembly in France from 1789 to 1796, during the French Revolution. Backed by the value of properties formerly held by the Catholic Church, the assignats were immediately a source of political controversy.”²⁸

After 1798, when Napoleon was the Emperor of France, he again was involved in dividing the land of France for gain:

“Of all the Napoleonic anniversaries to be commemorated in the next few years, one that is very likely to be forgotten is his land grab of 1813. A relatively obscure law, passed on March 20th that year, allowed the French state to seize and sell off plots of village common land. . . . The effects of Napoleon’s seizure and sale of common land are not well known.”²⁹

In what we saw demonstrated in the mid-1790s in France where it appeared that the Spirit of God had taken leave of that nation and men acted more like demons than men in the orgy of killing and wickedness that shocked all of Europe; this experience will be repeated in the future. Notice how the above quotation continues:

“Let all read and understand the prophecies of this book, for we are now entering upon the time of trouble spoken of: [Daniel 12:1-4, quoted].”³⁰

You will see that she quotes Daniel 12:1-4 which deals with a time of trouble such as this world has never seen. It is in this time that the Spirit of the Lord will be withdrawn from man and the whole world will repeat the history of what took place there in France:

“. . . the spirit of unrest, of riot and bloodshed; the world-wide dissemination of the same teachings that led to the French Revolution--all are tending to involve the whole world in a struggle similar to that which convulsed France.”³¹

²⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assignat#France>

²⁹ <http://www.historytoday.com/noelle-plack/napoleons-land-grab>

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ EGW, *Education*, 228.

The papacy is a blasphemous power but is not seen to be such by the world today. This atheistic revealing of the papal power is clearly seen to be a blasphemous power. And it comes from the same place that the papacy arose from – the bottomless pit:

“God's faithful witnesses, slain by the blasphemous power that ‘ascendeth out of the bottomless pit,’ were not long to remain silent.”³²

“In many of the nations of Europe the powers that ruled in church and state had for centuries been controlled by Satan through the medium of the papacy. But here is brought to view a new manifestation of satanic power.”³³

Regarding the pronouns of verse 40, let us be absolutely certain of the identity of the final pronoun *he* in this verse. The understanding of the rest of Daniel 11 is totally dependent upon to whom the pronoun *he* refers in the last phrase of verse 40. Josiah Litch, in his book, *Prophetic Expositions*, which was published in 1842, believed that the *he* referred to the French army:

“Thus ended the Syrian campaign; and the overflowing and passing over of the French army.”³⁴

When our church was conducting its thorough investigation³⁵ of Daniel and Revelation from 1862-1872, they deliberated over this question of the identity of this pronoun *he* and came to the following conclusion:

“‘And he shall overflow and pass over.’ We have found events which furnish a very striking fulfilment of the pushing of the king of the south, and the whirlwind onset of the king of the north against the French power. Thus far there is quite a general agreement in the application of the prophecy. We now reach a point where the views of the expositors begin to diverge. To whom do the words he ‘shall overflow and pass over,’ refer? - to France or to the king of the north? The application of the remainder of this chapter depends upon the answer to this question. From this point two lines of interpretation are maintained. Some apply the words to France, and endeavor to find a fulfilment in the career of Napoleon. Others apply them to the king of the north, and accordingly point for a fulfilment to events in the history of Turkey. . . . Some considerations certainly favor the idea that there is, in the latter part of verse 40, a transfer of the burden of the prophecy from the French power to the king of the north. The king of the north is introduced just before, as coming forth like a whirlwind, with chariots, horsemen, and many ships. The collision between this power and the French we have already noticed. The king of the north, with the aid of his allies, gained

³² EGW, *The Great Controversy*, 287.

³³ EGW, *The Great Controversy*, 268.

³⁴ Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, vol. 2, 106.

³⁵ EGW, *Testimonies*, vol. 4, 592. “By a thorough investigation of the prophecies we understand where we are in this world’s history; and we know for a certainty that the second coming of Christ is near. The result of these investigations must be brought before the world through the press. . . . We are now living in the full blaze of the light of Bible truth.”

the day in this contest; and the French, foiled in their efforts, were driven back into Egypt. Now it would seem to be the more natural application to refer the ‘overflowing and passing over’ to that power which emerged in triumph from that struggle; and that power was Turkey. We will only add that one who is familiar with the Hebrew assures us that the construction of this passage is such as to make it necessary to refer the overflowing and passing over to the king of the north, these words expressing the result of that movement which is just before likened to the fury of the whirlwind.”³⁶

Most students of prophecy today believe that the *he* refers to the *king of the north*. The author is aware of only one currently active prophetic expository³⁷ who takes the position that Josiah Litch presented.

Convincing evidence for Smith’s view is found in noting how the word “overflow” is used elsewhere in this chapter:

“But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces: and one shall certainly come, and *overflow*, and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress.” {Daniel 11:10, emphasis added}.

“Antiochus Magnus, was thereupon proclaimed king, who, taking charge of the army, retook Seleucia and recovered Syria, making himself master of some places by treaty, and of others by force of arms. A truce followed, wherein both sides treated for peace, yet prepared for war; after which Antiochus returned and overcame in battle Nicolas, the Egyptian general, and had thoughts of invading Egypt itself. Here is the ‘one’ who should certainly overflow and pass through.”³⁸

We can see that the term *overflow* refers to the power that prevailed in the conflict being described in the text.

“Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall *overflow*: and many shall fall down slain.” {Daniel 11:26, emphasis added}.

“The cause of Antony's overthrow was the desertion of his allies and friends, those that fed of the portion of his meat. First, Cleopatra, as already described, suddenly withdrew from the battle, taking sixty ships of the line with her. Secondly, the land army, disgusted with the infatuation of Antony, went over to Ceasar, who received them with open arms. Thirdly, when Antony arrived at Libya, he found that the forces which he had there left under Scarpus to guard the frontier, had declared for Caesar. Fourthly, being followed by Caesar into Egypt, he was betrayed by Cleopatra, and his forces surrendered to Caesar. Hereupon, in rage and despair, he took his own life.”³⁹

³⁶ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 1912 edition, 305, 306.

³⁷ James Henderson, *Terror Over Jerusalem*, vol. 1.

³⁸ Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Revelation*, 1912 edition, 253.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 276.

Again, the word *overflow* is used in connection with the power that was victorious in the battle just described. The pattern is thus set and we can be certain that when this word *overflow* is again used in this chapter that it will only refer to the power that prevailed in the conflict that was being described in the text where the word is found. History tells us that Napoleon was defeated in his Egyptian campaign. In this three-way battle described in verse 40, it was the Ottoman Empire who prevailed and so to them alone can the word *overflow* be ascribed. Therefore, Josiah Litch was wrong and Uriah Smith and the Seventh-day Adventist Church in their publications of their “thorough investigation of the prophecies” got it right. The pronouns found in verses 41-45 all refer to the *king of the north*.

A Literal, Civil Interpretation of Daniel 11:30-39

30. For the ships of Chittim (Barbarian invaders of the fourth century) **shall come against him** (Rome): **therefore he** (Theodosius A.D. 379 and later Clovis A.D. 508) **shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant** (Rome generally, but specifically Emperors Probus and Diocletian, who persecuted the Christians on the pretext that the barbarian invasions were thought to have occurred because the Christians offended the gods of Rome): **so shall he** (Rome) **do; he** (Rome generally; specifically Constantine) **shall return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant** (Roman Christianity fell away from the pure faith. After the fall of the Roman Empire in the west, the prophetic narrative continues with the leading western rulers.)

31. And arms (military support) **shall stand on his** (Clovis’) **part** (against the Arian Visigoths, A.D. 507–508), **and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily [sacrifice], and shall place the abomination that makes desolate** (in A.D. 508 Clovis united the state with the church, called here an “abomination” and it would prove to be “desolating” to God’s true church for the next 1,290 years; from A.D. 508 until 1798 at which time France separated the church from the state).

32. And such (the pontiffs) **as do wickedly against the covenant shall he** (Pepin, Charlemagne, and their successors) **corrupt by flatteries: but the people** (faithful Christians) **that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits** (the courageous stand of the saints for the truth, despite intense persecution, as well as their incisive preaching against the rising tide of evil in the church).

33. And they (faithful Christians through the ages) **that understand among the people** (the Christians of Europe) **shall instruct many: yet they** (faithful Christians) **shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days** (the bishops of Rome, through the arm of the state, persecuted the faithful Christians for 1,260 years, the same period of time as the little horn of Daniel 7:25).

34. Now when they (faithful Christians) **shall fall, they** (faithful Christians) **shall be helped with a little help** (the Alpine wilderness, the Great Reformation, and the New World of America provided a refuge for the saints): **but many** (the scholars of the Renaissance and fickle Christians) **shall cleave to them** (faithful Christians) **with flatteries** (prominent Christians, like Erasmus, were offered emoluments to defect from the truth).

35. And some of them (the reformers and faithful Christians) **shall fall, to try them** (faithful Christians), **and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end** (1798): **because it is yet for a time appointed** (the length of papal reign was predetermined to be a “time, times and half of a time” or 1,260 years, after which it would be punished; see Daniel 7:25).

36. And the king (Louis XIV) **shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak** (legislate laws) **marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done** (The eradication of Protestantism from France under Louis XIV resulted in the conditions that bred the Reign of Terror).

37. Neither shall he (Revolutionary France) **regard the God of his fathers** (Revolutionary France turned away from European Christianity), **nor the desire of women** (easy divorce was introduced by France and the family was undermined), **nor regard any god: for he** (Revolutionary France) **shall magnify himself** (Revolutionary France) **above all** (the state is god in atheistic political theory).

38. But in his (Revolutionary France’s) **estate** (realm) **shall he honor the God of forces** (evolutionary atheism, the basis of the socialism and communism of today, was exalted into a state religion by Revolutionary France; men now worshiped the forces of nature and not the God of nature): **and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he** (Revolutionary France) **honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.**

39. Thus shall he (Revolutionary France) **do in the most strong holds with a strange god** (Revolutionary France exported its neopaganism to Europe by sword and influence), **whom he** (Revolutionary France) **shall acknowledge and increase with glory; and he** (Napoleon Bonaparte) **shall cause them to rule over many** (Napoleon began the conquest of nations in 1797), **and shall divide the land for gain** (Before 1798 France confiscated large land holdings and sold them to raise money for the Revolution. Napoleon was at this time a military leader who would have helped empower the government to make this land grab. To quickly facilitate this dividing the land for gain, France issued Assignats.).⁴⁰

Why the Change From Literal to Figurative?

In my research I discovered why we as a church, in the middle of the 20th century, made a major switch, going from a literal to a figurative interpretation for the last six verses of Daniel 11. The majority in our church, for nearly 80 years, held to Uriah Smith’s literal interpretation. What’s

⁴⁰ John C. Witcombe, *Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad*, 110-112.

the back-story for this major shift that took place around 1949? It is the visit of John Nelson Darby to the United States. Darby was the founder of Dispensationalism, and it catalyzed a whole new movement of prophetic interpretation.

Dispensationalism's teachings were expressed at the Niagara Bible Conference in 1878, which issued a 14-point proclamation, which included the following text:

“That the Lord Jesus will come in person to introduce the millennial age, when Israel shall be restored to their own land, and the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord . . .”

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_Zionism

Seventh-day Adventist ministers and evangelists at the turn of the 20th century publically opposed this teaching, believing that Israel would never be restored to their own land.

They were confident that they had the support of Ellen White for their position. For hadn't she had written the following?

“I also saw that Old Jerusalem never would be built up; and that Satan was doing his utmost to lead the minds of the children of the Lord into these things now. . .”⁴¹

But what exactly did Ellen White mean? Jerusalem was already “built up” as a city in the common understanding of this phrase when she penned those words.

The meaning of “built up” had nothing to do with city construction, or even with creating a homeland state for the Jews, but rather, the phrase, “built up”, related to the belief that a third temple would have to be re-built and sacrifices resumed before Jesus could return. Ellen White was shown that this would never take place. Jesus Himself declared this to be so:

“. . . Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” {Luke 21:24}.

Yes, Gentiles will continue to occupy the Temple Mount until the close of probation.

⁴¹ EGW, *Early Writings*, 75.

Adventists countered this dispensational teaching regarding the establishment of a Jewish State with statements such as the following:

“Careful study of both the Old and the New Testament reveals that the literal descendants of Abraham, as a nation, will never be re-established in the Holy Land Political Zionism is but an elusive dream.”⁴²

And when the nation of Israel was established the very next year, in 1948, we were shown to have been wrong. We are not accustomed to being wrong regarding our prophetic understanding. We were embarrassed and were determined to never repeat that mistake again.

And we reacted by spiritualizing prophecies that we had formerly associated with Islam and the Middle East. I can understand why we decided to do that. We had been thoroughly humiliated.

Raymond F. Cottrell and Louis F. Were did all they could to see that we would never again end up with egg on our face as we did in 1948.

In 1949 a paper by Cottrell titled, “The Pioneers on Daniel Eleven and Armageddon”, was published. It spiritualized Daniel 11:40-45. Louis Were also spiritualized Daniel 11:45. He did his best to undermine Uriah Smith’s interpretation of Daniel 11. This spiritualizing of prophecy swept through the seven trumpets of Revelation, and today very few Seventh-day Adventist scholars believe that the fifth and sixth trumpets represent Islam.

Here is what Louis Were wrote in his pamphlet entitled, *The Truth concerning Mrs. E. G. White, Uriah Smith, and The King of The North*:

Page 10 “The most wonderful teaching that our Lord Jesus is preciously near to the Christian in his struggles with the powers of darkness, giving him victory now and in the final conflict, is hidden from those who believe that Turkey is the king of the north”

* Page 12 “And the present writer (basing his judgment upon much data) is firmly of the opinion that that opposition to the message of righteousness by faith to be proclaimed in the Loud Cry, will come from those who will . . . stubbornly follow Uriah Smith’s teaching

⁴² Roy F. Cottrell, *The Jews and Palestine*, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1947, 61, emphasis added.

concerning Turkey being the king of the north . . . and ‘will brace themselves to resist’ the spread of the true light, and ‘will oppose the work’, as declared by the Spirit of Prophecy.”

In essence, Louis Were is saying that belief that Turkey is the king of the north will prevent one from fully embracing righteousness by faith. The problem I see with this theory is that Jones and Wagoner, who brought increased light on the subject of righteousness by faith to our church in 1888; they both believed and taught exactly what Uriah Smith taught regarding the king of the north. If a Turkish belief in the king of the north has the effect that Louis Were says that it will have on our reception of righteousness by faith then Jones and Waggoner should not have been able to bring this most precious message to our people. The prophetic understanding of Daniel 11 had nothing to do with Uriah Smith and George Butler resisting the light that God brought to His people in 1888. Louis Were writes:

* Page 10 “His presentation that Turkey is the king of the north . . . is a part of the Jesuit-fostered system of interpretation - the counterfeit of the Spirit of Prophecy teaching concerning ‘the final conflict’”.

Louis Were provides no evidence that this prophetic interpretation was fostered by the Jesuits. Is it any wonder that the members of our church have lost confidence in Uriah Smith and his book, Daniel and the Revelation? If I believed Louis Were’s statement that Smith’s view on Daniel 11 was fostered by the Jesuits and that if I accepted this view then I could not experience righteousness by faith, I would do all in my power to oppose Smith and his teachings. I too would embrace any interpretation of Daniel 11 other than what was taught by Smith.

But based upon Ellen White’s endorsement of Uriah Smith and his book, I know that Louis Were did wrong in undermining confidence in the prophetic views found in Smith’s book.

To contact the author of this paper: pastorjcw@gmail.com

ThirdWoe.com (Password: 1844)

JerusalemCaliphate.com