

Facebook conversation between John Witcombe and Ivor Myers December 6-11, 2015

[Ivor Myers](#) OK. Here Goes. Islam, Daniel 11, Revelation 9, Revelation 11, the French Revolution. Who are the kings of the South and the North? How do these chapters reveal current events?

Let's start with Daniel 11. (And let's refrain from posting other people's videos, or links to other people's sermons, so we can keep the wall of posts pointed and not cluttered.) I invite my scholar friends and all bible students, and even novices of scripture who want to learn more to be involved.

After we complete one thread and come to a conclusion, I'll start a new one with a new question. So let's stay focused on the question!!! I am as eager to see where this goes as you are.

If you are unfamiliar with this study I'd encourage you to purchase these books:

Louis Were's: *The King of the North at Jerusalem*

Uriah Smith: *Daniel and the Revelation*

Stephen Haskell: *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*

Please try to keep your response on the main thread so we don't have many different conversations happening.

Here are the first relevant questions. (PLEASE Read it slowly, and carefully and try to answer the question fully!!! Please. Stick to the question at hand.)

1. Who is being described in Daniel 11:14-30? Is this entity ever called the "king of the north" (KON)? If so, where? If not, why not? Does that make this entity the king of the north or not? Is this a gap theory, or is there a continual flow?
2. Same question for King of the South (KOS) from verses 25-40.

[John Witcombe](#) Rome is being talked about. Rome is never referred to as king of the north. In Daniel 11 the kings of the north and south rule from these two respective territories. When Rome ruled over all the territory, both north and south, she was never referred to as king of the south or king of the north because she ruled from the west. Her capital was in Rome. To be king of the south the ruler must rule from that territory. The same goes for king of the north. While Rome rules both territories of the north and south there is no mention of the king of the north or south except in verse 25 where there was conflict between Rome and Egypt (king of the south).

[Ivor Myers](#) Hmm. So who is verse 25 referring to in your study?

[John Witcombe](#) Here is what I understand regarding verse 25: And he (Rome) shall stir up his (Rome's) power and his (Rome's) courage against the king of the south (Egypt. Julius Caesar, in 48 B.C., subdued Egypt but did not reduce it to a provincial status. Verses 25-28 now discuss the war between Octavius and Mark Anthony, which resulted in the conquest of Egypt) with a great army and the king of the south (Egypt) shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty

army; but he (Egypt and Mark Anthony) shall not stand: for they (the enemies of Mark Anthony) shall forecast devices against him (Mark Anthony).

26. Yea, they (Cleopatra and Mark Anthony's intimate friends) that feed of the portion of his (Mark Anthony's) meat shall destroy him (Mark Anthony committed suicide after Cleopatra and his friends deserted him), and his (Octavius') army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain (Octavius defeated Mark Anthony at the great sea and land battle at Actium, 31 B.C.).

27. And both these kings' hearts (Octavius' and Mark Anthony's) shall be to do mischief, and they (Octavius and Mark Anthony) shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the appointed time (the appointed time is the end of the 360-year reign of the city of Rome: from 31 B.C. to A.D. 330. Constantine abandoned the city of Rome in A.D. 330 and moved the capital of the empire to Constantinople).

[Ivor Myers](#) John, so you believe that KOS mentioned in verse 25 is still based on geographical location? In other words, still Egypt? If so, do you find an inconsistency in Rome not being called KON based upon its geographical location, but Egypt still being called KOS based upon geographical location in the same verse? And this is not a challenge, just seeing how you would respond to this.

[John Witcombe](#) Yes, it seems consistent for us to stay with the same geographical locations from the beginning of the prophecy right through to the end. Rome conquered both territories (north and south). Would we call Rome king of the south because she ruled that territory? I don't find it inconsistent for Rome to not be called king of the south or king of the north because Rome is in the west. Rome is just referred to as "robbers of thy people", and the leader of Rome is referred to as "a raiser of taxes", "a vile person". Only the rulers of the original northern and southern territorial division of Alexander's kingdom are referred to as kings of the north and south.

[Ivor Myers](#) Ok....Got it.

[Ivor Myers](#) Do you think the King of the North (Papacy) is mentioned before v40, or does the Papacy BECOME the king of the north in v.40? Another question coming after that.

[Ivor Myers](#) In other words, is the Papacy not the king of the north before v.40 and only assumes the title in verse 40, or is he the king of the north before v40?

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, you are asking very significant questions. As a church, we have been somewhat sloppy in dealing with this important chapter. We believe that civil Rome should be called the king of the north and so we say she is even though there is no text that directly states thus. We do this because we believe that papal Rome must also be a king of the north.

But what if there is a consistency in this prophecy from start to finish? What if king of the north and king of the south in the last of the chapter refer to what they referred to at the beginning of the chapter? What if we are not to spiritualize these phrases - king of the north and king of

the south? If we are to switch from literal to spiritual, where do we make the switch and what hermeneutical principle are we using for our authority to make this switch?

[Ivor Myers](#) Yep. That's what I'm after. I'm not against switching from literal to spiritual, etc., there just has to be a consistency with whatever we do in our approach. So I'm observing the various principles of interpretation of Daniel 11, levels of consistency, etc. I think some things are taken for granted, and we gloss over them.

[John Witcombe](#) In Daniel 2 we see a consistency from start to finish. The image parts all refer to civil kingdoms. Even the feet and toes that come into play after the cross still refer to literal civil nations. There is no spiritualizing of the image parts. As I see it, this helps us to know that it would be consistent and proper for us to interpret Daniel 11 in a literal manner from start to finish.

[Ivor Myers](#) Hmm. So how do you see the Papacy then as king of the north, since it is a "spiritual" kingdom? And do you see the French Revolution/atheism as king of the South in 1798?

[John Witcombe](#) If we made a switch to a spiritualized view in verse 40 I can see how we could say that the Papacy was the king of the north and atheism was the king of the south. I can also see how others might come up with some other ideas. When we choose to spiritualize the text we can come up with many options. Which option is right? Now if we stay completely consistently literal from start to finish this chapter becomes very easy to understand and very easy and extremely impactful to use as an entering wedge for the third angel's message. Our evangelists used the Eastern Question (Daniel 11:40-45) with tremendous impact in the days of our pioneers. Here is what Ellen White said:

“The evening meeting was largely attended. Elder Smith spoke with great clearness, and many listened with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the Eastern question. He closed with a very solemn address to those who had not been preparing for these great events in the near future.”—Lt55-1884 (August 24, 1884) par. 7.

“Elder Daniells speaks this evening upon the Eastern Question. May the Lord give His Holy Spirit to inspire the hearts to make the truth plain.”—Ms189-1898 (December 25, 1898) par. 9.

[Ivor Myers](#) Ok. Are you okay with putting out there what you see for KON/KOS in v40?

[John Witcombe](#) The following is what Elder's Smith and Daniells were teaching in those meetings where the folk were listening with open mouths!

40. And at the time of the end (1798. In Daniel 11:35 and 12:7-9, the phrase the time of the end is equated with the end of the “time, times, and half a time”) **shall the king of the south** (south still representing Egypt, as identified in Daniel 11:5-15. The leadership of Egypt was Ibrahim Bey and Murad Bey—Egyptian Mameluke rulers) **push at him** (the king of verse 36

which was France in the person of Napoleon. Egypt pushed against the invasion of France in 1798.): **and the king of the north** (Caliph Selim III of Turkey, the territory of the king of the north; see Daniel 11:5-15) **shall come against him** (France. Turkey declared war on France in 1798) **like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships** (Lord Nelson's fleet of ships supported Turkey in its war with France); **and he** (king of the north—Caliph Selim III of Turkey) **shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over** (the phrase overflow and pass over tells us who prevailed in this battle just described. History records that the Turks prevailed; thus we can be certain that the identity of the pronoun he in this sentence is the king of the north. This lets us know that the remaining pronouns in this chapter all refer to the king of the north).

[Ivor Myers](#) Hmmm. So this is a pretty rare view these days. I know most people hold to Papacy/Atheism, or now Papacy/Islam. How does this view in your eyes play out regarding current events?

[John Witcombe](#) Just today I was able to share the Eastern Question with 4 different people that I've never met before. The terrorist activities in France and San Bernardino are directly related to the Eastern Question (Daniel 11:45). From the Eastern Question I was able to place in their hands material on the third angel's message. The Eastern Question is just an entering wedge for the three angel's messages.

[John Witcombe](#) Here is how it plays out:

45. **And he** (the king of the north—the leader of Turkey) **shall plant** (place or establish) **the tabernacles of his palace** (a religious/political entity—Islamic Caliphate) **between the seas** (Mediterranean and Dead seas) **in the glorious holy mountain** (Jerusalem—Mount of Olives); **yet he** (the king of the north) **shall come to his end, and none shall help him** (something will happen that brings the rule of the king of the north to an end. Only verse 45 of this chapter has yet to be fulfilled).

Does the leader of Turkey want to establish the Caliphate in Jerusalem?

November 11, 2015: The Hurriyet Daily News (which is the leading news source for Turkey and the region) reports that Turks, this time want this caliphate to be established and headquartered in Jerusalem:

The article states:

“Nearly a century ago, the Turkish government asked the British government not to allow the restoration of the caliphate anywhere in imperial British lands, particularly not in Jerusalem. Today, restoring the caliphate in the personality of an Ottomanist Turkish sultan sounds like music to many Turkish ears – especially if the throne should be restored in Turkish-controlled Jerusalem.”

<http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/the-105th-caliph.aspx?pageID=449&nID=90987&NewsCatID=398>

May 28, 2015

JerusalemOnline (Israel's main news outlet) headlines:

Turkish Prime Minister: "We will march to liberate Jerusalem"

During the inauguration of the 55th airport in Hakkari Province, Turkish Prime Minister Ahmet Davutoğlu and Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan spoke of their desire to conquer Jerusalem and to re-establish the Ottoman Empire.

"By Allah's will, Jerusalem belongs to the Kurds, the Turks, the Arabs, and to all Muslims," the Prime Minister declared. "And as our forefathers fought side by side at Gallipoli and just as our forefathers went together to liberate Jerusalem with Saladin, we will march on the same path to liberate Jerusalem. The Turkish government does not differentiate from East to West. We intend to put together all of the regions of our nations and we will bring these regions back together."

<http://www.jerusalemonline.com/news/middle-east/israel-and-the-middle-east/turkish-prime-minister-we-will-march-to-liberate-jerusalem-13709>

[BURAK BEKDİL - The 105th caliph?](#)

It was quite intriguing - or maybe not - when, shortly before the Nov. 1 elections, a staunchly pro-President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan columnist for daily Yeni Akit claimed that Mr. Erdoğan would become the "new ['ecumenical'] caliph" once he has won the executive presidential powers he much desires

HURRIYETDAILYNEWS.COM

[Ivor Myers](#) How does Turkey coming to its end lead to Michael standing up in your understanding?

[John Witcombe](#) Here is how I understand this: When the President of Turkey establishes the Caliphate in Jerusalem we will then see the full force of the third woe which will result in making the nations angry (Rev 11:14-18). The third woe is related to the two woes (Jihads) that came before. Those first two woes (Rev 9) were redemptive punishment upon the nations that supported apostate Catholicism. The third woe will be redemptive punishment upon the nations (Europe and USA) that have historically supported Protestantism which is now also apostate. All three woes are brought to the world by Islam. When the third woe or third Jihad hits planet earth this will bring this nation to its knees (San Bernardino times 100). There will be a demand from the people to return to God and Sunday laws will be passed. Satan will personate Christ and bring support for Sunday worship. The whole world will worship the beast and his image. When Satan appears the work of the Vicar of Christ will come its end. All eyes will be upon this "Christ" instead of the pope. The work of the king of the north (Caliph) will also come to its end and none shall help him. All the world, Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, Hindus, etc. will be worshipping Satan impersonating Christ. After all have made their decisions regarding the Sabbath, Michael shall stand up and probation will close.

[Mariki Erasmus](#) KON=papacy KOS=radical Islam.... Spiritual powers after the cross.

[John Witcombe](#) Hi Mariki, wouldn't we need to see something within the text itself to inform us that we are to switch from a literal reading of the text to a spiritualized or figurative reading?

A set of rules for interpreting Daniel 11 exists—rules the prophet has counseled us to use:

“Those who are engaged in proclaiming the third angel's message are searching the Scriptures upon the same plan that Father Miller adopted. In the little book entitled “Views of the Prophecies and Prophetic Chronology,” Father Miller gives the following simple but intelligent and important rules for Bible study and interpretation: 1. Every word must have its proper bearing on the subject presented in the Bible; 2. All Scripture is necessary, and may be understood by diligent application and study; . . . The above is a portion of these rules; and in our study of the Bible we shall all do well to heed the principles set forth.”—Review and Herald, November 25, 1884.

If Miller's 11th rule were to be carefully followed, I believe that the Seventh-day Adventist Church would once again speak with one voice regarding the last 6 verses of Daniel 11.

Rule 11: “How to know when a word is used figuratively: If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature, then it must be understood literally; if not, figuratively.—William Miller.

Can Daniel 11:40-45 be understood literally? Are there historical records to be found that fit the prophecy of these verses as clearly as we find historical records to fit the first half of this chapter? If we are able to find a perfect literal historical fit then we are not at liberty to spiritualize the text but must understand it literally.

Remember, Daniel 11 is an audition, not a vision. Daniel is simply writing the dictation that the angel is providing. There is no need for an interpretation such as was given in Daniel 2, 7 and 8 where an angel provides an interpretation for the figurative vision that Daniel had been given because this audition is a literal (not a figurative) delineation of events that would be transpiring.

Ellen White expresses Rule 11 this way:

“The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed. . . . If men would but take the Bible as it reads, if there were no false teachers to mislead and confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.”—The Great Controversy, p. 598.

Our church believed that Smith's book followed the correct rules of interpretation:

“Daniel and the Revelation BY URIAH SMITH: Daniel and the Revelation is a verse-by-verse study of the prophecies recorded, in the books of Daniel and the Revelation of the Bible. These books of the Bible have been considered difficult to understand; but this book is a key which makes plain what was before dark and obscure. It follows the correct rule of interpretation, which has guided every reformer in the past from darkness to light. The field of history is carefully scanned, and the emphatic response it gives in thrilling confirmation of the voice of prophecy is shown to be clear and beyond dispute. A prophecy fulfilled is a most powerful antidote against skepticism. The book of Daniel reveals many prophecies fulfilled, and cites others still future. It also gives scenes of the most startling nature which are yet future, and should be understood.” Review and Herald General Conference Bulletin June 1, 1905

[David H. Thiele](#) As Pastor John Witcombe points out, and as I quoted him in a Note on my Facebook wall:

“No one is able to show from the text of Daniel 11 itself where it is actually stated that civil Rome was ever the king of the north, and yet it is believed that civil Rome just had to be the king of the north. It is believed that if civil Rome was a king of the north then it would naturally follow that papal Rome would also have to be a king of the north. Important hermeneutical rules of prophetic interpretation are violated by this approach to the prophecies thus leading to inaccurate conclusions. We treat no other prophecy with such disregard of the prophetic interpretive rules.

Typically, the following presuppositions are brought to Daniel 11:

1. The last power brought to view in Dan. 7 and 8 is papal Rome; thus the last power must be the same in Dan. 11;
2. Jesus is the true King of the North—a position Satan wants thus Dan. 11:40-45 is a spiritual battle—not literal;
3. Babylon was the king of the north—any power that attacked Israel from the north became the king of the north;
4. Civil Rome was the king of the north even though she conquered and occupied both the north and south territories.

There are no scriptural references that directly state these four points and yet many surmise that they must be true. If we would adopt the same rules of prophetic interpretation that William Miller identified—rules endorsed by the Spirit of Prophecy—that, by the way, dictate a literal interpretation of these verses, I believe that we too would come to the same conclusions on Daniel 11:40-45 as those of our early pioneers.” John Witcombe

[Carl Grey](#) Interesting to me that you consider Pr. Witcombe substance on this.

[David H. Thiele](#) Why? Pastor Witcombe has been a contributor to Adventists Affirm. He was kind enough to review both of my books (What Wondrous Love, and, Have the Faith of Jesus)

before they were published by Teach Services. He could have continued in the direction of supporting conclusions contrary to Smith, but instead, prayerfully and carefully studied out the matter. His comments, which I posted in the Notes on my wall are The results of that study.

[Carl Grey](#) I'll take a look some time. I read just a bit of his early work and was not encouraged to continue.

[David H. Thiele](#) I'm curious to understand what you mean by "early work." He's presently pastoring in Oregon, and has been quite conservative in his ministry.

[Carl Grey](#) Maybe I have the wrong man.

[Carl Grey](#) It turns out I do not have the wrong man. I simply did not agree with the man's conclusions, nor presuppositions.

[David H. Thiele](#) Since you are opposed to Witcombe's support of Smith's book, are you also opposed to Smith's conclusions?

[Carl Grey](#) I'm not opposed to his support for Smith's conclusions. There were other conclusions he drew that appeared to me to be without foundation. I am sorry, Br. David, I cannot speak with clarity on the matter right now and I will not have time to pore over the book for the remainder of this month (ending nursing semester this coming week and have a ton of work lined up for December along with read/prep for next semester nursing which will be a bear).

[David H. Thiele](#) God bless with your workload!

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, if Daniel 11 is to be understood as strictly a repetition and enlargement of Daniel 7 and 8 then it would make sense to see nothing but the activities of papal Rome following pagan Rome. But if Daniel 11 is more like Daniel 2 then another picture can emerge. The image of Daniel 2 is a delineation of rise and fall of civil powers in a certain region of the earth. Even after the cross it stays with civil powers right up to the crushing event of Christ's kingdom. Daniel 2 is an entering wedge prophecy we share with the world. I see Daniel 11 as also an entering wedge prophecy.

Uriah Smith saw it as simply news headlines from a certain region of the world. When we viewed it this way we used this chapter in every evangelistic meeting to great advantage (Eastern Question). Once we spiritualized it and made it all about the papacy, loud cry, etc. we stopped using this chapter entirely evangelistically and have lost an important tool in evangelizing the world.

There has never been a more relevant and opportune time to present this chapter as taught in Smith's book. When Eastern Question issues are used in mass-mailed brochures advertising evangelistic meetings we see a two fold increase in response as compared to the standard

prophecy mail-outs. As the Eastern Question heats up as it is currently, I would expect we will see a much greater response than two fold.

Ivor Myers For those holding that Turkey/ France are the KON KOS scenario of Daniel 11, you believe that Turkey will invade Jerusalem, or set up its tabernacles in Jerusalem in accordance with Uriah Smith correct? Does this mean that Jerusalem still holds prophetic significance after the 70 week prophecy? It would have to, correct? What does this do for our understanding of the 144,000 in Rev. as spiritual, or the "treading down of the holy city" for 42 months in Rev.11? Wouldn't that city need to be the same as the "glorious land" in Daniel 11:16, and 45, literal Jerusalem, since both Daniel and Revelation are speaking about the same events?

John Witcombe Ivor, Uriah Smith taught that the leader of the Ottoman Empire was the king of the north and that the leader of Egypt (Mameluke ruler) was the king of the south in 1798 (not France).

Yes, according to a literal interpretation of the text, the leader of Turkey would plant the tabernacles of his palace in Jerusalem.

Jerusalem, as a city, holds no prophetic significance after it was destroyed in 70 AD. I see the Mount of Olives as holding prophetic significance in that this will be the spot that Christ steps onto at the end of the thousand years. This very spot will be where the capital of the Universe, New Jerusalem will be located.

Regarding Jerusalem being "trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke 21:24) our pioneers believed that this was literal Jerusalem and harmonized with Daniel 9:26, 27. You can download a short paper I wrote on the difference between Luke 21:24 and Revelation 11:2 at this site:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/6zymnb4840onoyf/Times%20of%20the%20Gentiles.pdf?dl=0>

The 144,000 is a symbolic number and Revelation 11:2 is spiritual/symbolic and ended in 1798.

Daniel 9:26, 27 and Luke 21:24 are speaking of the same event and it is about the literal desolation of literal Jerusalem. Revelation 11:2 is speaking of the spiritual desolation of truth for the 42 months of papal supremacy.

The glorious land of Daniel 11:16 is the literal land of Israel. The glorious holy mountain of Daniel 11:45 is the Mount of Olives which today lies within the city limits of Jerusalem. For my evidence on this you can download this short paper:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/elrx84y4o4eg6rs/Glorious%20Holy%20Mountain.pdf?dl=0>

Ivor Myers So how would you reconcile Jerusalem having no prophetic significance after the 70 week prophecy, yet Daniel 11:45 speaks the same location, the glorious mt. (according to Smith, Jerusalem) with prophetic significance? (I'll check out your paper, but give me the short fb answer 😊).

John Witcombe Jerusalem did have prophetic significance after the 70 week prophecy that ended in 34 AD. There is the prophecy of its destruction that took place in 70 AD and then its continual desolation until the close of probation. Jerusalem does not have any significance such as the Evangelicals give to it today or the “Age to Come” people were giving it in Ellen White’s day (“... others would be looking to old Jerusalem, or as they called it the age-to-come.”-- Letter 8, 1851, p. 4).

But the Mount of Olives does hold significance in the fact that it will be the very spot that the center of the City of God will be located. Satan knows that the real estate of the Mount of Olives holds this future significance and so it would make sense that he would like to plant his banner there through the actions of the king of the north.

Ivor Myers My understanding is that the destruction in 70 ad was the byproduct of 70 week prophecy. Jerusalem lost its prophetic significance in 34 ad. Not until the end of the millennium, were Jerusalem descends on Mount olive will this city have prophetic significance again. This is in line with the principles of literal and spiritual. But making Jerusalem prophetic after the cross, doesn't that destroy all such principles of literal/spiritual?

John Witcombe Yes, I can see it as you do. That makes sense that it was a byproduct. Jerusalem as capital of God’s people lost all significance in 34 AD. But just as we have an ongoing fulfillment of prophecy regarding the desolation of the literal city of Babylon so we have an ongoing fulfillment of prophecy regarding the desolation of the literal city of Jerusalem.

What are the principles of literal/spiritual? I believe that we make a mistake when we contrast literal Jews BC with spiritual Jews AD. Our pioneers taught that there never was a change from literal Israel to spiritual Israel. James Rafferty and I discussed this issue. Here is where you can download our conversation on this question:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/j1xici6s2xky6by/Literal%20Jews%20versus%20Spiritual%20Jews.pdf?dl=0>

Ivor Myers Without having a preconceived, predetermined or favored outcome of Daniel 11, and based purely upon linguistics, how would we deal with all the verbal connections between Daniel 8's little horn and Daniel 11:22-31 and onward. Most commentators (Non-sda) correctly connect Daniel 11:22 onward with the little horn of Daniel 8, but erroneously claim this power in Daniel 11:22 onward to be Antiochus. They do this because of all the linguistic connections between Daniel 11:22 onward and the little horn of Daniel 8. For example:

1. Both attack the prince of the covenant. 11:22, 8:11
2. Both start out small and wax great. 11:23, 8:9
3. Both prosper through "peace". 11:24, 8:25
4. Both “scatter” the prey. 11:24, 8:10, 24, 7:25, 12:7
5. Both war against the holy covenant. 11:28, 8:12

The connection between these verses is not mere coincidence is it? So then the identity of the little horn of Daniel 8 should determine the identity of the power described from Daniel 11:22 onward linguistically. As Adventist, we usually counter the false teaching that the little horn of

Daniel 8 is Antiochus, and the 2300 days relate to him, with the teaching that the little horn is the papacy. Wouldn't this make the Papacy the power coming to view in Daniel 11:22 onward, or at the least Pagan/Papal Rome mingled just as it is in Daniel 8 under the little horn?

[John Witcombe](#) I agree that it is Pagan/Papal Rome spoken of in Daniel 11:22-35. But where in these verses do we find Papal Rome alluded to? If we think it is in verse 23 and onward we would need to find Papal history that would fit every point of every verse according to Rule 13:

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".

Smith was able to find historical events to fit a Pagan Rome view for each of these verses. If we wanted to see Papal Rome in these verses wouldn't there be a problem with verse 27? "And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed." Is the leader of Papal Rome ever given the title of king anywhere in the prophecies of Daniel 7, 8, Revelation 13, 17? It seems that term king refers solely to civil leaders of nations. There are crowns on some of the horns in some of the prophecies. I don't believe there is ever a crown associated with the prophetic symbols that represent the Papacy. I may be wrong here and may be overlooking something obvious, if so, please help me out. Is the Papacy ever clearly identified as a king in scripture? In Revelation 17 Smith sees the papacy as the 8th power. The text says these are seven kings, not eight kings. So the papacy, in this line up, is not called a king. So if the Papacy is never called a king elsewhere in scripture it would be unlikely that the kings spoken of in Daniel 11 would be referring to the Papacy.

[Ivor Myers](#) Have you considered Daniel 8:23-25 regarding the papacy as a king?

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, I have never considered this. You are talking to someone who has been totally ignorant of prophecy. Six years ago you could have told me that the king of the north was Santa Clause. I was clueless. Not until my friend Tim Roosenberg came to Grants Pass and presented his views on Daniel 11 had I ever given any attention to this chapter. My members were asking me what I thought of his views and I didn't have an answer so I opened up Smith's book to see what we as a church taught. It made sense to me and when I found out that Ellen White said that his book was "God's helping hand" and that she said to get this book into the hands of the general public I knew that I could teach anything from that book and have God's approval. If I decided to come up with my own interpretations I could not have that same confidence that I was teaching truth.

So that is why I haven't tried to make any drastic changes to what I find in Smith's book

especially when I found out how his book came together. I wrote that all out in a document that you can download at this link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/5tndr5rchvt88kf/Unholy%20War...%20and%20the%20King%20of%20the%20South%20is%20...pdf?dl=0>

Let me add this edit: As I reread your question and my answer I realized that I had read Daniel 11:23-25 instead of Daniel 8:23-25 and for these verses I have never considered them to be speaking of the papacy. Uriah Smith and all his fellow pioneers all believed that these verses were referring to civil Rome and I agree with their understanding.

[Ivor Myers](#) Understood.

[Ivor Myers](#) That's the challenging part. Listening to the various interpretations among our brethren and then determining the good of each, the bad of each, if any exists, and then bringing it all together to see the big picture. I would share this statement though on considering a blanket endorsement of Uriah Smith's Daniel and the Revelation. "It was but natural that as time advanced, some points became more clear and some errors which had been embodied in his earlier work were seen. This led the author [Uriah Smith] from time to time to make a number of corrections and adjustments in his former statements. Of one such revision, W. C. White wrote in 1910: 'In 1886, 1887, and 1888 there was considerable controversy over some of the expositions in Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation. There was quite a group of men, including myself, who became convinced that there were some errors in this most excellent book that ought to be corrected But finally a number of corrections were made, if I remember correctly, about thirty.'-W. C. White, Letter to A. F. Harrison, June 26, 1910.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, if a blanket endorsement means that one believes that Smith's book is without error then a blanket endorsement would be wrong. There were several important additional items that the 1944 revision corrected. And I am sure there are still more to be found. But none of the corrections ever changed the trajectory of any of the major lines of prophecy.

The important question at hand is whether or not a literal interpretation of the last 6 verses of Daniel 11 as Smith presents is the right approach.

If Smith and Daniells had presented a figurative/spiritualized (Papal) view of these verses in their public presentations and if the Lord's messenger made the following comments on their lectures then I would believe that a figurative/spiritualized interpretation would be the correct hermeneutic to apply to Daniel 11:40-45:

"The evening meeting was largely attended. Elder Smith spoke with great clearness, and many listened with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the Eastern question [Daniel 11:40-45]. He closed with a very solemn address to those who had not been preparing for these great events in the near future."—Lt55-1884 (August 24, 1884)

par. 7.

“Elder Daniells speaks this evening upon the Eastern Question. May the Lord give His Holy Spirit to inspire the hearts to make the truth plain.”—Ms189-1898 (December 25, 1898) par. 9.

What was the plain truth of the Eastern Question that Elder Daniells spoke on? It was a lecture on Daniel 11:40-45 that presented a literal/civil view of these verses as we find recorded in Smith’s book.

In three separate years—1877, 1884, and 1898—Ellen White spoke of the Eastern Question. It seems from the plain reading of these statements that Ellen White endorsed the interpretation that Smith and Daniells were giving to Daniel 11:45. If this is true, then we too can present the interpretation of Daniel 11:36-45 as taught in Smith's book Daniel and the Revelation with confidence, knowing that we are teaching truth.

But be prepared to be ridiculed and laughed at by our leadership if you dare to teach a literal view of these verses.

When Tim Roosenberg’s book came out the North Pacific Union Conference convened a two day meeting of a select group of church administrators, scholars, pastors and evangelists to examine Tim’s message. We were each to present our evaluation of Tim’s book. After I presented my review I was asked by the chairman what my view of Daniel 11:40-45 was. When I said that I believed what Smith had written, they thought I was joking and actually laughed.

But before anyone laughs off the Eastern Question I would invite them to invest 50 minutes of their time and watch a presentation of the Eastern Question that Elder Ken LeBrun (a pastor in the Upper Columbia Conference) presented at their camp meeting this past summer. Pastor LeBrun believed and taught the Papal view of Daniel 11:40-45 for many years. After he read an email correspondence on these verses between James Rafferty and me, he saw the strength of Smith’s view and accepted it. You can read this correspondence on the Documents page at <http://www.thirdwoe.com/> (Password: 1844). I also have Pastor LeBrun’s Eastern Question lecture posted on this same page.

Ivor Myers I will check that out too. Quick question. Daniel 11:40-45 is central to end time events. Why do you think this scenario was not included in any of Ellen White's writings with the eastern question being so central?

John Witcombe Smith wrote his book between 1862 and 1872, over a 10 year period of time. Ellen White published her book The Great Controversy in 1888. In her book, she focused on the issues surrounding Revelation 13 that deal with the work of the Papacy, apostate Protestantism and the United States. She was aware that Smith’s book adequately covered the prophecies relating to Islam found in Revelation 9 and Daniel 11. She knew that there was no other book that could take the place of Smith’s book and that there was to be interest in this book until the close of probation. It was to be a companion book to The Great Controversy.

“The interest in Daniel and the Revelation is to continue as long as probationary time shall last. God used the author of this book as a channel through which to communicate light to direct minds to the truth. Shall we not appreciate this light, which points us to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, our King?” 1MR 63

“Daniel and Revelation, Great Controversy, Patriarchs and Prophets, and Desire of Ages should now go to the world. The grand instruction contained in Daniel and Revelation has been eagerly perused by many in Australia. This book has been the means of bringing many precious souls to a knowledge of the truth. Everything that can be done should be done to circulate Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation. I know of no other book that can take the place of this one. It is God's helping hand.” MS 76, 1901.

“Patriarchs and Prophets, Daniel and The Revelation, and The Great Controversy are needed now as never before. They should be widely circulated because the truths they emphasize will open many blind eyes. . . . Many of our people have been blind to the importance of the very books that were most needed. Had tact and skill then been shown in the sale of these books, the Sunday-law movement would not be where it is today.” Review and Herald, Feb. 16, 1905

You can see how she includes Smith's book with her book The Great Controversy as companion books that were most needed and would continue to speak truth until the close of probation.

Islam and Catholicism are both significant enemies of the truth. They both have several time prophecies associated with them. The Papacy has the 42 month, 1260 day and times, time and the dividing of time (3.5 year) prophecies all relating to the same period.

Islam has nearly as long a period of time prophecies relating to it – 1218 years. There are also three time prophecies – the 150 year that began at the rise of Islam and the 150 year that ended the first woe of Revelation 9. And then the 391 year and 15 day prophecy that ended August 11, 1840. This is an amazing prophecy in that it pinpoints an exact day.

“In the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest. Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman Empire.” GC 334

[Ivor Myers](#) Also, what do you think Sister White may have meant here? If these things are to be repeated...who is the power spoken of in the verse quoted? "We have no time to lose. Troublous times are before us. The world is stirred with the spirit of war. Soon the scenes of trouble spoken of in the prophecies will take place. The prophecy in the eleventh of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment. Much of the history that has taken place in fulfillment of this prophecy will be repeated. In the thirtieth verse a power is spoken of that "shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." [Verses 31-36, quoted.] {13MR 394.1}

Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them. 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.] {13MR 394.2}

Wouldn't this "repeat" point out the identity of the power as the same power as king of the North in Daniel 11:40-45? Or do you think Turkey will "repeat" the actions of the papacy?

[John Witcombe](#) Good question. I think the civil and religious powers that brought trouble to God's people back in the time of these verses will repeat this trouble. Neither the king of the north nor Turkey is spoken of in Daniel 11:30-36. Civil Rome, Papal Rome and France are spoken of in verses according to the views of our pioneers. Turkey will not "repeat" the actions of the papacy. It will be apostate Protestants here is the USA and the Catholics in the Old World in connection with their respective civil powers who will repeat the actions of the Dark Ages.

Verses 30 through 35 speak of pagan and papal Rome and their persecution of the Christian Church during the Dark Ages. Much of the history of this persecution will be repeated just before the Second Coming of Jesus by civil and religious powers.

Ellen White also says that the history of verse 36 will be repeated.

What power is spoken of in verse 36 is the big question. If it is atheistic France as many of our pioneers taught, will that history be repeated in the final days of earth's history? In what we saw demonstrated in the mid-1790s in France where it appeared that the Spirit of God had taken leave of this nation and men acted more like demons than men in the orgy of killing and wickedness that shocked all of Europe; will this experience be repeated in the future? Yes it will. Notice how the quotation continues:

"Scenes similar to those described in these words will take place. We see evidence that Satan is fast obtaining the control of human minds who have not the fear of God before them. 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.] The Spirit of the Lord is being withdrawn from the world. It is no time now for men to exalt themselves."—Letter 103, 1904. EGW

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."—Education, p. 228. EGW

So I see a very good reason for Ellen White to quote verse 36 in connection with 30-35. Not only will God's people be persecuted, in addition, the Spirit of the Lord will be withdrawn from man

and the history of what took place in atheistic France will be repeated.

To read into this statement the idea that Ellen White was changing the published view of the church that France was the power of verse 36 and that now we should see it as being the papacy I don't believe is warranted.

[Ivor Myers](#) John, can you send me where she quotes verse 36? If it is in the same quote, what do you think about her describing a singular power, then referencing v.31-36 to describe that singular power? Also, (I know I'm asking a bunch of questions, but) what do you do with the fact that the papacy as KON in Daniel 11:40-45 was the predominant and published view until Uriah Smith changed it? Smith changed his view and believed that the papacy had no real significance after it was wounded in 1798, and that it could not, in light of current events of the time, have any real significance again. Regarding Daniel 11: he says

"The natural conclusion would be that when the time of the end should come, this power which the Church of Rome had possessed to punish heretics, which had been the cause of so much persecution, and which for a time had been restrained, would now be taken ENTIRELY AWAY; and the conclusion would be equally evident that this taking away of the papal supremacy would mark the commencement of the period here called the "time of the end." IF this application is correct, the time of the end commenced in 1798; for there, as already noticed, the papacy was overthrown by the French, and has NEVER SINCE been able to wield the power it before possessed. {1897 UrS, DAR 290.3} Do you agree with this interpretation, or think White agreed with it? Here is another, "But the deadly wound was healed when the papacy was re-established, THOUGH with a Diminution of its former power, by the election of a new pope, March 14, 1800. (See Bower's History of the Popes, pp. 404-428; Croly on the Apocalypse, London edition, p. 251.) {1897 UrS, DAR 563.3}. In other words, the conflict between James White, and Smith, the old view and the new view respectively, was over the relevance of the Papacy after 1798. Do you think Uriah was right, that the papacy would 'never" again be "able to wield the power it possessed before"? I think this would be a significant insight as to Uriah seeking to find a new interpretation of 40-45 based upon current events.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, let's look at these questions in order.

First question: Yes, it is in the same quote. I think it may be a singular power. It was civil Rome that persecuted God's people and it continued to be civil Rome along with other civil governments whom the Papal powers enlisted to punish heretics.

Second question: Let's look at what the published view was on the king of the north. The published position of both James White and Uriah Smith show that they were in complete unity on the identity of the king of the south:

Advent Review and Sabbath Herald

By Uriah Smith

July 22, 1858

"There is scarcely so uniform an agreement among interpreters concerning any part of the apocalypse as respecting the application of the fifth and sixth trumpets, or the first and second wo, to the Saracens and Turks. It is so obvious that it can scarcely be misunderstood. Instead of a verse or two designating each, the whole of the ninth chapter of the Revelation, in equal portions, is occupied with a description of both.

"The Roman Empire declined, as it arose, by conquest; but the Saracens and the Turks were the instruments by which a false religion became the scourge of an apostate church; and hence, instead of the fifth and sixth trumpets, like the former, being marked by that name alone, they are called woes. It was because the laws were transgressed, the ordinances changed, and the everlasting covenant broken, that the curse came upon the earth or the land.

"We have passed the period, in the political history of the world, when the western empire was extinguished; and the way was thereby opened for the exaltation of the papacy. The imperial power of the city of Rome was annihilated, and the office and the name of the emperor of the west was abolished for a season. The trumpets assume a new form, as they are directed to a new object, and the close coincidence, or rather express identity between the king of the south, or the king of the north, as described by Daniel, and the first and second wo, will be noted in the subsequent illustration of the latter. The spiritual supremacy of the pope, it may be remembered, was acknowledged and maintained, after the fall of Rome, by the emperor Justinian. And whether in the character of a trumpet or a wo, the previous steps of history raise us, as on a platform, to behold in a political view the judgments that fell on apostate Christendom, and finally led to the subversion of the eastern empire."

James White used these exact words in a book he published in 1859: *The Sounding of the Seven Trumpets of Revelation 8 and 9*.

Both of these men were quoting Josiah Litch who had written these paragraphs in 1842. So all three of these men taught that the powers of the king of the north and king of the south in the time of the end dealt with the same powers spoken of in Revelation 9—that is, Islamic powers. We know that Josiah Litch and Uriah Smith were in perfect agreement regarding Daniel 11:40. For James White to quote these paragraphs in his book tells us that he too agreed with Litch and Smith in 1859. This tells us that all our pioneers were in agreement on Daniel 11:40. When James White gave his conflicting view in 1878 we can believe his son's testimony that his father didn't really believe what he presented on that occasion but was desperate to relieve the debt on several institutions. He was reproved by the Lord for what he did. We should not use this isolated incidence to destroy the unity of our pioneers on the significant prophecy of Daniel 11. James White's published book lets us know that Litch, White and Smith were all in agreement on the identities of the kings of the north and south in Daniel 11:40.

The teaching in the Seventh-day Adventist Church on Daniel 11:40-45 can be divided into three periods.

First Period

During the first period, which extended from about 1841 to about 1872, Seventh-day

Adventists had two views to choose from:

1. Literal View: In 1841 Josiah Litch published a verse-by-verse exposition on the entire chapter of Daniel 11 (1841 JoL, APEC 88-103). The position brought forth from his research was that the king of the north in Daniel 11:40 was the Ottoman Empire, and the king of the south was Egypt. Verse 40 was fulfilled by the Napoleonic/Egyptian/Ottoman Empire war of 1798.

2. Figurative View: In *A Word to the Little Flock*, James White wrote in 1847: “Michael is to stand up at the time that the last power in chap. 11, comes to his end, and none to help him. This power is the last that treads down the true church of God: and as the true church is still trodden down, and cast out by all christendom, it follows that the last oppressive power has not ‘come to his end;’ and Michael has not stood up. This last power that treads down the saints is brought to view in Rev. 13:11-18. His number is 666.”—(1847 JW, WLF 8.4).

There is no record showing how it was that James White came up with his 1847 view that the king of the north was the papacy. We do know that the Protestant churches inherited this view from the days of the Reformation.

In the foreword to his [Martin Luther’s] translation of Daniel, he identified the Antichrist of Daniel 11 as the papacy; the ‘small horn’ of Daniel 7 was the invading Turks.—
(<http://tinyurl.com/msgk3wt>).

You can see in this next reference that Martin Luther switched from a literal view of the kings of the north and south to a figurative view for Daniel 11:40-45:

After the latter-day Roman king’s promotion of the ‘strange god’ of the Mass (at Daniel 11:39), in Daniel 11:40—comments Luther—“there follows how the Papacy will fall and sink.... We cannot here understand King Ptolemy of Egypt to be the ‘king of the south’—just as little as we can understand King Antiochus to be the ‘king of the north’.... By ‘the king of the north’—as throughout the chapter—we are here to understand the Antichrist alias the Pope. His adversary is the right, spiritual King...of Holy Christianity—Christ [the ‘King of the south’] as a ‘Counter-Saviour’ against the Pope.... ‘At the time of the end, shall the King of the south push at him’ [the Pope]. That is, when the wrath of God is coming to an end, and the Pope too is also more about to come to his end, Christ will give a ‘push’ [to the Pope]—and somehow stir up several godly Christians against him!”— (<http://tinyurl.com/l5rebgo>).

There is no documentation showing that either James White or anyone else did a careful verse-by-verse exposition to explain how it was that the king of the north transitioned from being the leader of the northern portion of Alexander’s former empire to being the papacy in verse 40. In fact, there was very little said about Daniel 11 in the published writings in the early years of the Seventh-day Adventist movement.

Not until 1862-1872 did our Church do a careful verse-by-verse study, such as Josiah Litch had done back in 1841. Our church published Smith’s book, *Daniel and the Revelation*, with this

verse-by-verse exposition, showing why it was reasonable and biblically consistent to view the king of the north in Daniel 11:40 as being the Ottoman Empire.

Second Period

The second period began around 1872 and ended around 1940. During this period the view published in Daniel and the Revelation was the predominantly accepted and publicly presented view of our denomination.

Third Period

The third period began around 1940 and continues to the present. Louis F. Were was instrumental in bringing back the Reformation figurative view that the papacy was the king of the north.

Today we have Uriah Smith's view still being published and sold in Adventist Book Centers, along with several figurative interpretations that have recently come on the scene.

Third question: Smith's view on the role of the papacy in the final days can be seen in his book where he is commenting on Revelation 13. He teaches just what Ellen White teaches in The Great Controversy. True there was a period of time after the deadly wound when her power to punish heretics was curtailed that she did not wield the power that she once had and will have again after the Sunday laws are passed.

The power to punish heretics was taken ENTIRELY AWAY. And it is true that since it was taken away it has NEVER SINCE been able to wield the power it before possessed. Smith also teaches that the papacy will once again possess this power to punish heretics but this will only be after the Sunday law. So his statement is accurate and in harmony with what Ellen White wrote:

"I saw that the two-horned beast had a dragon's mouth, and that his power was in his head, and that the decree would go out of his mouth. Then I saw the Mother of Harlots; that the mother was not the daughters, but separate and distinct from them. She has had her day, and it is past, and her daughters, the Protestant sects, were the next to come on the stage and act out the same mind that the mother had when she persecuted the saints. I saw that as the mother has been declining in power, the daughters had been growing, and soon they will exercise the power once exercised by the mother." {SpM 1.4}

So, yes, I agree with the interpretation of the statement you quoted from Smith's book and believe that Ellen White agreed with it.

You can download a paper I wrote on this issue to see more evidence for this position:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/mbfydebdzsf7tit/Role%20of%20the%20Papacy.pdf?dl=0>

Ellen White and Uriah Smith were in perfect agreement with the relevancy of the Papacy after 1798. Look more carefully at Smith's statement and you will see that he did not say that the papacy would never again wield the power she once had before her deadly wound. He clearly

taught that the papacy would once again, in unity with apostate Protestantism, persecute God's people. The truth that the papacy lost its power to punish heretics after its deadly wound did not cause Smith to view Daniel 11:40-45 as he did. The view he wrote was arrived at by simply applying Miller's rules of prophetic interpretation.

Excellent questions. Keep them coming. God's people are to press together and speak the same things.

[Ivor Myers](#) So we can say that what was published regarding the KON in A Word to the Little Flock, was the first published view after 1844, when our understanding of endgame events opened in further to include the third angel's message, etc. which is why James would have urged such caution to Smith regarding his view on Turkey instead of the Papacy. James could not have arrived at this conclusion haphazardly. He expounds on it at length in later publications, utilizing the arguments of consistency in the book of Daniel, repeat and enlarge, etc. But what do you think of Uriah's view of t the papacy having no major significance after 1798, and not being able to regain their power, the deadly wound being healed just a few years after 1798, but with nothing significant attached to it? Also, in the above quote, I see Ottomans being described as a fulfillment of the 5th and 6th woe, but not being described as the KOS in Daniel 11:40, at least not in the quote presented.

[John Witcombe](#) James White's view reflected the view of the Protestants pre 1798, before God's people were given increased light on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. Post 1798 we have the careful study that Josiah Litch gave to the prophecies during the time of increased light. He understood time prophecies of Revelation 9 and gave careful study to Daniel 11. James White's brief statement in A Word to the Little Flock does not compare to the work that Josiah Litch and Uriah Smith did.

Take a more careful look at what James White quoted from Josiah Litch in his 1859 book:

"The trumpets assume a new form, as they are directed to a new object, and the close coincidence, or rather express identity between the king of the south, or the king of the north, as described by Daniel, and the first and second wo, will be noted in the subsequent illustration of the latter."

The language of this sentence declares that there is an express identity between the KOS and KON of Daniel 11 and the identity of the powers of the first and second woe. This express identity is Islamic powers. He is saying that Islamic powers are both found in the first and second woe and in the KOS and KON in Daniel 11. The papacy is not the subject of the first and second woe nor of the KOS or KON.

Look at the history of this event where James White wrote and spoke out of harmony with the church in 1878.

In the latter half of the 1800s most of our pioneers taught that the king of the north in Daniel

11:40-45 was the Turkish Ottoman Empire. Our pioneers believed that the Ottoman Empire would, through some set of circumstances, find themselves established in Jerusalem in fulfillment of 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."

This teaching was part of the "Eastern Question" topic that is mentioned some 364 times in the Words of the Adventist Pioneers compilation found on the EGW Writings CD.

James White took exception to the view of most of the pioneers regarding the Eastern Question. In a sermon and in an article (*Where Are We?*, Review and Herald, Oct. 3, 1878, p. 116), he taught that the Eastern Question had nothing to do with Bible prophecy, by presenting the view that the papacy was the king of the north in Daniel 11:40-45.

His son, Willie White, did not think that his father actually believed what he presented on Daniel 11. He thought perhaps James White presented this conflicting view because of budget concerns. Willie White wrote:

"In father's efforts to arouse our brethren to clear of the B. C. College debt, and to raise money for the B. C. San. and for the European Mission, and for the proposed British Mission, and other things, he had met the plea, "It is too late, Eld. White to plan for all these things. TOO LATE, TOO LATE." And when he heard Eld. Smith's presentation, fear seized his soul, and he threw in his exposition on Daniel 11, not so much that he really believed it, as that he thought it would check a movement that he thought was bordering into fanaticism, and might lead to the hindrance of the work to be done. He was reproved by the Lord for bringing in distrust as to the unity of the leaders, and sank down in discouragement, and thus the great financial campaign collapsed."—Letter from Willie White to Elder John Vuilleumier, March 6, 1919.

Our church had a published position on these verses of Daniel 11 that was being taught in our schools and in our public evangelism. The Spirit of God reproved James White for introducing a differing view and creating disunity back then.

James White's son, Willie, would later offer his recollection of his father's views:

"During the few months preceding this meeting, I had read Daniel and Revelation by Elder Uriah Smith. I loved the writer; I admired his style; I loved his teaching: and I was shocked when Elder White presented another view regarding the king of the North. One day I said to him, "Father, I have just read Elder Smith's book and his exposition seems clear to me. Do you really believe that Rome is the king of the North?" His answer was, "I think Elder Smith is going too fast in his exposition, and I thought it was time to present something to check the current of belief that what is transpiring was the beginning of Armageddon."—Letter from Willie White to Elder Froom, December 12, 1930.

James White was teaching that the glorious holy mountain was the United State of America and the seas mentioned in verse 45 were the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. He was teaching that the

Vatican would be moved from Italy to the USA (RH Nov 29, 1877, page 172). This was indeed quite shocking to say the least! You can see why his son Willie stated that he was shocked when he heard what his father was teaching.

But when you understand the health issues James White was dealing with during this period of his life, we must not be critical of his actions.

Ellen White wrote: "Some things my husband has said and the course he has pursued has not been all as it should be. It has thrown you into uncertainty and plunged you into unbelief. Satan has come in and has tempted and has suggested many things to your mind. God does not, neither has He, justified my husband in any thought, word, or action contrary to the plain Christian course marked out in His Word. But God has been very merciful, for His shattered nerves, and his diseased head has led to the extremes he has shown in his life. Some cannot understand his condition; but the Lord knows and bears with his weakness. {Lt1a-1880 (January 5, 1880) par. 5}

The view that had been and continued to be publicly presented was the published view that was found in Smith's book. James White's papal view was not to be presented to the Church. He had already written part one in the Review on his papal view of Daniel 11:40-45, when he was told by God's messenger to stop (Where Are We?, Review and Herald, Oct. 3, 1878, p. 116). Part two was never written.

Revelation 13:3 "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast." When the wound is healed all the world will wonder after the Catholic Church. This is one thing I disagree with Smith on. He believes the wound was healed after a new pope was elected. The wound was not the fact that the pope was taken captive. Other popes before this one had been taken captive. The wounding had to do with the taking away of the power that had been granted to her in 538 AD. Through the issuing of a document, she had been granted the power to correct heretics. The deadly wound was inflicted when Napoleon issued a document to the papacy in 1798 that removed this authority. No longer could she use the power of the state to enforce her dogmas. This was her deadly wound. When the state returns this power to correct heretics then her deadly wound will be healed and all the world will be forced to worship the beast through Sunday legislation. That wound is not healed until she can use the state to enforce her dogmas once again.

[Ivor Myers](#) John, this is why I typically don't get into a "who taught what" strategy as a defense for any particular position that I take. (I say that respectfully!!! ☺). When it comes to so many issues (2520, Daily, etc.) I've seen many people resort to this method to stand behind a particular teaching.

Miller did not have it all correct, neither did Litch, J. White or Smith. After all, these were not prophets speaking as God's mouthpiece. Uriah saw no significance in the papacy after 1798, a position you and I disagree with, thus his very reason for switching from a papacy based KON to

find another application was erroneous in the first place. And though that erroneous teaching is in the book that Sister White recommended, surely she did not agree with him on that very major point as can be seen in the Great Controversy, which paints a picture of Daniel 11:40-45, 12:1 that is totally different from that painted in Smith's book. Remember the GC was given to her in vision in 1858 lasting a full two hours and was the summation of her of all her visions regarding the plan of salvation. It just seems strange that such a major and pivotal point would not have been shown her in this vision meant to condense everything regarding the grand theme of the controversy?

(White states in the Preface of the GC, "As the Spirit of God has opened to my mind the great truths of his Word, and the scenes of the past and the future, I have been bidden to make known to others what has thus been revealed,—to trace the history of the controversy in past ages, and especially to so present it as to shed a light on the fast-approaching struggle of the future. In pursuance of this purpose, I have endeavored to select and group together events in the history of the church in such a manner as to trace the unfolding of the great testing truths that at different periods have been given to the world, that have excited the wrath of Satan, and the enmity of a world-loving church, and that have been maintained by the witness of those who "loved not their lives unto the death." {GC88 g.3}

..."To unfold the scenes of the great controversy between truth and error... is the object of this book."

So to see Smith's scenario totally absent from the vision given to Ellen White just seems strange to me. Either way, this I believe that our evidences must be based upon a thorough study of the word, and not who taught what.

"We have the truth brought out in publications, but it is not enough to rely upon other men's thoughts. We must examine for ourselves, and learn the reasons of our faith by comparing scripture with scripture. Take the Bible, and on your knees plead with God to enlighten your mind. --Review and Herald, March 4, 1884. {CSW 22.2}

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, I agree with you. Only the Bible and the writings of Ellen White speak as God's mouthpiece.

But I believe you are mistaken when you say Uriah saw no significance in the papacy after 1798. The evidence below from his writings says differently. It is a supposition to say that he switched from a papal view because he saw no future significance for the papacy. He did indeed see huge significance in the role of the papacy in the final events. Uriah Smith and Ellen White were in complete agreement on the future role of the papacy.

If The Great Controversy was indeed painting a picture of Daniel 11:40-45 as you suggest, it seems odd that she would not use any verses from this chapter to paint this picture.

If the last six verses of Daniel 11 are not about the Middle East, but are rather about the global

papacy, then God was completely silent in regard to the Eastern Question. And we are told:

“Matters of vital importance have been plainly revealed in the Word of God. These subjects are worthy of our deepest thought. But we are not to search into matters on which God has been silent.”—Selected Messages, Book One, p. 173.

If God was silent on the Eastern Question; if the Eastern Question is not in the Bible, then it certainly should not have been presented in our public efforts. And the Messenger of the Lord would not have written positively regarding Smith’s and Daniells' lectures on the Eastern Question. But because she did we can know that the Eastern Question is a Bible subject and the only place it can be found in is Daniel 11:40-45.

We can see in the following statement that Smith believed that the USA would compel its citizens to worship the Papal Power at the end of time:

“The two-horned beast also symbolizes a government which is Protestant in religion, or which, at least, is a non-Catholic power. It has been shown that the preceding beast symbolized the papacy; and of the two-horned beast we read that he causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast. But in all Catholic countries, the people voluntarily worship the beast, or obey the dictates of Catholicism, without being "caused," or compelled, to do so by the government. The fact that the people of this government do not render this worship till caused to do so by the civil power, shows that the religion they entertain is not Catholicism.”
{1897 UrS, DAR 580.2}

Smith is saying that we will be compelled by our government to render worship to the Catholic Church.

Here Smith shows just what Ellen White taught that the papacy is growing in strength:

“Evil is also threatened from another quarter. Roman Catholicism, which has grown strong through immigration, has fixed its rapacious eyes on the United States, determined to bring this government under its power. Votes rule here, and Romanism controls an immense suffrage, which it carefully manipulates to its own ends. With such a weapon in its hands, its power for evil is almost unlimited; for multitudes of unscrupulous politicians, who under their country's pay, labor not for their country's good but for their own selfish aggrandizement, stand ready to help any party carry out any scheme, no matter how wicked, if that party will keep them in office. {1897 UrS, DAR 582.1}

“Within recent years we have witnessed the ominous phenomenon of the consolidation of the Catholic elements in this country into one gigantic society, or "federation," as it is known, which holds annual conventions in our large cities, and conducts an active campaign in the interests of the Catholic church. The federation has been careful to announce that it was not going into politics, - meaning by this that it would not ally itself with any one political party, knowing of course that to form such an alliance would be to incur the opposition of other political parties. It is however in politics with the idea of controlling all political parties, and having the

opposition of none, which is the very worst sense in which any church party can be in politics. This great federation, which now has more than two million members, can swing its vote and its influence solidly against any political or governmental action to which it is opposed; and as between the political parties which are contending for the mastery in this country, it easily holds the balance of power, and can dictate terms to either; so that no matter how an election turns, it is sure to go in favor of the papacy. Already this organization has boasted of its power over Congress. When it seemed likely that this government would join with England in some action toward putting an end to the atrocities practiced in the so-called Congo Free State under the rule of his Catholic Majesty Leopold I of Belgium, the federation intervened, and a feature of the secretary's report at the next convention (held at Indianapolis, July, 1907), was a lengthy statement setting forth how the federation had taken action "refraining the United States from any act of intervention in Congo Affairs." {1897 UrS, DAR 582.2}

"And not only does the federation aim to control legislation, national and state, but it is conducting an active campaign for the suppression of all anti-Catholic literature in public libraries, and even from circulation in the mails. {1897 UrS, DAR 583.1}

"The regular attendance of the President, and other high government officials, at mass in a Catholic Church in Washington on Thanksgiving days, and the participation of the President and Vice-president, and Ex-president, and leading members of Congress, at the Jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons (June, 1911) are marked indications of the strong hold which Rome is securing upon this Protestant republic." {1897 UrS, DAR 583.2}

So I don't think it is accurate to say that Smith taught anything different from what is taught in The Great Controversy regarding the future work of the papacy. All he was saying was that since 1798 she lost power just as Ellen White also taught. But she is growing in strength and when Sunday laws are passed she will be a persecuting power just as she was before she received her deadly wound.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, if Elder Daniells and Elder Smith were going to lecture on the Age-to-Come teaching we can be certain that the Spirit of God would never have permitted Ellen White to write the following:

"The evening meeting was largely attended. Elder Smith spoke with great clearness, and many listened with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the [Age-to-Come]. He closed with a very solemn address to those who had not been preparing for these great events in the near future."—Lt55-1884 (August 24, 1884) par. 7.

"Elder Daniells speaks this evening upon the [Age-to-Come]. May the Lord give His Holy Spirit to inspire the hearts to make the truth plain."—Ms189-1898 (December 25, 1898) par. 9.

The reason why she would not have written those statements is because the Age-to-Come is not taught in the Bible. True, those who lectured on the Age-to-Come believed it was taught in the Bible. They could show you all the relevant verses. But they were misinterpreting those verses. Those verses were not teaching what they thought they were teaching. Yes, it concerned the Middle East as does the Eastern Question, but because this teaching is not found

in scripture, it was not to be presented to the public.

But replace the term, Age-to-Come, with the term, Eastern Question, as it is actually found in those two statements and the only conclusion we can come to is that the Eastern Question must be found in the Bible somewhere. The scriptures that were used to lecture on the topic of the Eastern Question were not being misinterpreted as were the scriptures that were used to teach the Age-to-Come.

Where in the Bible is the Eastern Question found? It is only found in Daniel 11:40-45.

If Smith and Daniells were misinterpreting these Bible verses that they used to present the Eastern Question we can be absolutely certain that the Spirit of God would never have allowed Ellen White to have penned those words.

Can you not see that the Spirit of God, through these two statements, has given endorsement to the interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45 as found in Smith's book, Daniel and the Revelation?

We as a church should no longer be debating this issue but rather we should be putting our energy and intellect to work in finding the best ways to present the Eastern Question to the world today. I can assure you that the world would listen to you "with open eyes, ears and mouths". Outsiders would be intensely interested right now, as never before, if you were to present a lecture on the Eastern Question.

This is present truth for our day and God is looking for "Daniells' and Smiths" to tell it to the world.

[Ivor Myers](#) Okay, I do believe the eastern question is in the Bible, is in Daniel 11, and is addressed by Ellen White in the Great controversy. The difference is the level of importance of the eastern question and how it is applied.

Regarding his view on the Papacy losing power, it would seem contradictory in some places in his writings and thinking. Notice from the article here from Ministry Magazine. <https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/1954/03/research>

"The committee also studied the possible causes that prompted Uriah Smith and others to depart from this historic denominational interpretation, substituting the history of France during the French Revolution for papal Rome as fulfilling Daniel 11:35, 36, and Turkey as the power in later verses, as well as the results of this shift of position in our denominational teaching. Some of the causes for the shift of position were found to be:

a. The complete loss of temporal power by the Papacy in 1870, resulting in Pius X proclaiming himself a "prisoner in the Vatican." For example, Uriah Smith states in the 1873 edition of Thoughts on Daniel in referring to the events of 1870, which he believed knocked "the last prop from under the papacy": "Victor Emmanuel, seizing his opportunity to carry out the long-

cherished dream of a United Italy, seized Rome to make it the capital of his kingdom. To his troops, under General Cadorna, Rome surrendered, September 20, 1870. Then the last vestige of temporal power departed, nevermore, said Victor Emmanuel, to be restored; and the Pope has been virtually a prisoner in his own palace since that time. . . . The last vestige of temporal power was swept from his grasp." Pages 146, 147.

b. The conviction expressed in the secular and religious press that the Papacy had fallen to rise no more. This led Uriah Smith to state in the 1883 edition of *Thoughts on Daniel*: "The attempt which some make to bring in the Papacy here (that is, in Daniel II:36-45) is so evidently wide of the mark that its consideration need not detain us."-Page 383.

c. The bringing of France, Turkey, and Egypt into the interpretation of these verses, and those following, seemed to bring a series of current events into the fulfillment of the prophecy, which to those who advocated it gave "great confirmation of faith in the soon loud cry and close of our message." (Comment by James White on the new theories, *Review and Herald*, November 29, 1877.)

d. Russian armies seemed about ready to close in on Constantinople, and the world press was full of declarations that the "sick man of the East" would soon be expelled from Europe. Uriah Smith, it seems, reflected the popular Protestant and secular viewpoint as he wrote under the title, "Turkish Empire's Downfall," and similar titles, during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

e. Earlier Protestant commentators, such as Bishop Newton, Adam Clarke, and others, had generally held that the Ottoman Empire was one of the powers designated in Daniel 11:40-45, and events in the decade from 1870 to 1880 seemed undeniably to substantiate this line of reasoning, with current history pointing in the same direction.

f. Uriah Smith was evidently not in agreement with James White, who gave definite warnings that the positions being taken on the Eastern question were based on prophecies that had not yet met their fulfillment. White said, "But what will be the result of the positiveness in unfulfilled prophecies should things not come as very confidently expected, is an anxious question." (Emphasis his. James White in *Review and Herald*, Nov. 29, 1877.) He then proceeded to point out the parallel between Daniel II and the prophecies of Daniel in earlier chapters that were to him convincing proof "that the last power mentioned in that chapter is Rome!"

James White's position was clearly stated in 1878 as follows: "And there is a line of historic prophecy in chapter eleven, where the symbols are thrown off, beginning with the kings of Persia, and reaching down past Grecia and Rome, to the time when that power 'shall come to his end, and none shall help him.' If the feet and ten toes of the metallic image are Roman, if the beast with ten horns that was given to the burning flames of the great day be the Roman beast, if the little horn which stood up against the Prince of princes be Rome, and if the Page 24 same field and distance are covered by these four prophetic chains, then the last power of the

eleventh chapter, which is to 'come to his end and none shall help him,' is Rome. But if this be Turkey, AS SOME TEACH, then the toes of the image of the second chapter are Turkish, the beast with ten horns of the seventh chapter represents Turkey, and it was Turkey that stood up against the Prince of princes of the eighth chapter of Daniel. True, Turkey is bad enough off; but its waning power and its end is the subject of the prophecy of John and not of Daniel." -Review and Herald, Oct. 3, 1878, p. 116.

I also wonder why James would write "as some teach"? This signifies to me that the dominant view was certainly Papacy as the King of the North, a view that is affirmed by Uriah Smith in Review and Herald 1862.

For these reasons, I think it much safer to depend not upon Smith or J.W. but the scripture itself. The truth of the matter can be resolved by appealing to scripture and history without alone. This is what I'm after.

[John Witcombe](#) The Eastern Question dealt with the Ottoman Empire as king of the north in Daniel 11:40-45. Where do you find this being addressed in the book, The Great Controversy?

The level of importance is related to this issue being one of our most powerful entering wedges for the three angel's message. The Eastern Question is only the bait. The hook is the third angel's message. If you try to make the bait the hook you have by so doing eliminated the bait. And without the bait it is more difficult to attract the fish. You can see the effect of the bait in the words Ellen White used: ". . . many listened with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the Eastern Question."

You ask: "Why James White would write 'as some teach'?" He wrote that in 1878. But in the RH Nov 29, 1877 James White wrote regarding the Eastern Question: "It may be said that there is a general agreement upon this subject . . ."

The "some" he was referring to was the church!

The committee that you quoted from wrongly stated that Smith departed from the historic denominational interpretation.

Smith's view was the historic denominational interpretation according to the testimony of James White. It was the view of Josiah Litch in 1842 and the view that James White presented in his book he published in 1859. And the one that Smith presented in his book published in 1858.

Daniel 11 is a prophecy of future events that will take place in a certain region of the world. How is it to be understood? Take for instance Daniel 11:11 "And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, [even] with the king of the north: and he shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand."

We do not go to the Bible to figure out what this means. We can only go to secular history:

11. And the king of the south (Ptolemy IV Epiphanes), **shall be moved with choler** (anger), **and shall come forth and fight with him** (Antiochus III), **even with the king of the north: and he** (Antiochus III) **shall set forth a great multitude** (Antiochus III invaded Egypt with 70,000 foot soldiers, 6,000 cavalry, and 102 elephants in 217 B.C.); but the multitude shall be given into his (Ptolemy IV's) hand (Antiochus III was defeated at the battle of Raphia).

No other text in the Bible could have helped us understand this text. Historical records alone provide understanding for this verse. This is what makes this chapter so relevant as an entering wedge for the world. We are to read every text in this chapter just like we read verse 11. We go to secular history to find a fit. When we show the world how this works for verses 40-44, it is most powerful. This is why the outsiders were listening with open mouths as Ellen White describes it.

The world can see the logic of how this chapter is to be understood. They can see that God knew the minute details of the future. And when you understand the first 44 verses the final verse becomes obvious.

You don't need James White or Uriah Smith. All you need is access to historical records and Miller's Rules of Prophetic Interpretation. God saw to it that a historian recorded what was needed for each verse. We just have to be diligent researchers. But if we switch from literal to figurative half way through the chapter we will destroy the purpose for which this chapter was given to us.

[Ivor Myers](#) Well, I think this backs the point. We can't depend upon who taught what when, because even here is disagreement. The Bible and history. With this, I agree. I find The Great Controversy addressing the eastern question on page 334 dealing with Josiah Litch. I don't think the eastern question was on Turkey as the King of the North, but rather the role of Turkey in Prophecy, and in this instance, 1840, and the 6th trumpet.

[John Witcombe](#) Fortunately we don't have to guess what it was that was being taught when Smith and Daniells spoke on the Eastern Question. The lecture Smith gave was posted in the local newspaper. You can read what it was that Smith actually taught when he lectured on the Eastern Question in this document on page 2, 5th column that you can download at this site: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/2hsul7oal7rmw9x/1877%20Eastern%20Question%20page%202%2C%205th%20column.pdf?dl=0>

The issue with Josiah Litch and August 11, 1840 was not the subject of the Eastern Question that Smith and Daniells were lecturing on but was the subject of presentations on the first and second woes of Revelation 9.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, we can also see what the Eastern Question was all about by reading the chapter by that title in the book, Bible Readings for the Home Circle published in 1888. You can

download this chapter at this link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/c7cx8ycwns8d41t/The%20Eastern%20Question%20Bible%20Readings%20for%20the%20Home.pdf?dl=0>

You will see that the subject of the woes of Revelation 9 are not a part of the Eastern Question.

Ivor Myers Either way, my purpose in this posts is to have an objective look at Daniel 11, instead of based off of Smith, J. White, Miller, or others. An objective search will verify one of these views, regardless of the individual who originated it.

John Witcombe The purpose in your Facebook post is to objectively look at Daniel 11. Here are some good statements to consider as you seek to find the truth on this chapter:

“The prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation are misinterpreted. These persons do not consider that the truth has been set forth at the appointed time by the very men whom God was leading to do this special work. These men followed on step by step in the very fulfillment of prophecy, and those who have not had a personal experience in this work, are to take the Word of God and believe on "their word" who have been led by the Lord in the proclamation of the first, second, and third angels' messages.” 2SM 111

“It is true that there are prophecies yet to be fulfilled. But very erroneous work has been done again and again, and will continue to be done by those who seek to find new light in the prophecies, and who begin by turning away from the light that God has already given. . . . But the Lord does not lay upon those who have not had an experience in His work the burden of making a new exposition of those prophecies which He has, by His Holy Spirit, moved upon His chosen servants to explain.”—Manuscript Release, vol. 17, p. 15.

“There must be no long discussions, no presenting of new theories in regard to prophecies that God has already made plain.”—Review and Herald, November 27, 1900, par. 13.

Why should we go back to the 1800s for our understanding of Daniel 11:40-45? Maybe God has given to our generation a new interpretation of this important prophecy.

“In every age there is a new development of truth, a message of God to the people of that generation. The old truths are all essential; new truth is not independent of the old, but an unfolding of it. It is only as the old truths are understood that we can comprehend the new.”—Christ’s Object Lessons, p. 128.

As you can see, any new development of truth will simply be an unfolding of the old. The old must first be understood and accepted. New truth will not discard the old and take us in an entirely new direction.

Ivor Myers I agree with this. Truth will never contradict itself. Truth is not subject to change. How we arrive may be refined and made clearer, but it should never change the outcome.

Investigation of Doctrine.--There is no excuse for anyone in taking the position that there is no more truth to be revealed, and that all our expositions of Scripture are without an error. The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our people, is not a proof that our ideas are infallible. Age will not make error into truth, and truth can afford to be fair. No true doctrine will lose anything by close investigation. {CW 35.2}

"We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed." (RH: July 26, 1892).

"Whenever the people of God are growing in grace, they will be constantly obtaining a clearer understanding of His word. They will discern new light and beauty in its sacred truths. This has been true in the history of the church in all ages, and thus will continue to the end. But as real spiritual life declines, it has ever been the tendency to cease to advance in the knowledge of the truth. Men rest satisfied with the light already received from God's word, and discourage any further investigation of the Scriptures. They become conservative, and seek to avoid discussion...When no new questions are started by investigation of the Scriptures, when no difference of opinion arises which will set men to searching the Bible for themselves, to make sure that they have the truth, there will be many now, as in ancient times, who will hold to tradition, and worship they know not what." (5T pp. 706-707).

[John Witcombe](#) We can arrive at "new light" if we simply change our hermeneutic. Those who believe that women may be ordained as elders have arrived at that view by bringing in new methods of interpreting the Bible. Based upon their new methods of interpreting scripture, their conclusions are consistent.

James White came up with a new hermeneutic which we today call Repeat and Enlarge. This teaches that we are to understand that every prophecy in Daniel 11 will simply repeat and enlarge upon what came before. It precludes any view that is not simply a repeat and enlargement of what came before.

This rule is not found in Miller's list of rules.

It is true that we can observe in some of the prophecies a repetition and an enlargement of information but this is different from this being a rule that governs how we must interpret prophecy.

In order to implement this new rule people must violate Rule 11 which says: "How to know when a word is used figuratively: If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature, then it must be understood literally; if not, figuratively."

Ellen White affirms this rule: "The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed." GC 598.3

Because of this new rule of Repeat and Enlarge people insist that the Papacy has be to the last power spoken of in Daniel 11. And in order to fit the Papacy into these verses these verses are seen as figurative. Even though a perfect literal application can be found in the historical records, this is rejected in order to apply this new rule.

If Repeat and Enlarge is truly a rule of prophetic interpretation and Miller just didn't discover it and if it is to take precedence over Rule 11 then a papal view of Daniel 11:40-45 would be what we would have to see in these verses.

But if we could agree to not change our rules of interpretation and stay with what the Spirit of Prophecy endorsed then we would all be able to arrive at the same understanding of these verses.

Am I overlooking something?

[Ivor Myers](#) I see repeat and enlarge as a biblical rule endorsed by SOP. "Some prophecies God has repeated, thus showing that importance must be given to them. The Lord does not repeat things that are of no great consequence.—Manuscript 107, 1897, pp. 1, 2. ("Search the Scriptures," no date.) 9MR 7.5

[Ivor Myers](#) It would be strange for the prophetic chapters of Daniel to follow this repetition principle including the first 36 verses of Daniel 11, to then suddenly disregard this principle.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, a valid biblical rule of prophetic interpretation must be able to be applied to all prophecy. In this statement she is saying that only some prophecies have been repeated. The context of her statement is that very important prophecies found in Daniel are repeated in Revelation. So I would not see Repeat and Enlarge as a rule that is to be applied to all prophecy as are the rules listed in Miller's Rules of Interpretation.

When the papacy received its deadly wound the prophecies in Revelation go silent on the Papacy. They only pick up again when the deadly wound is healed. The attention goes from the papacy to the two horned beast, Protestant America.

Revelation 13:3 "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast."

All the world wonders after the beast only after the wound is healed. So from 1798 to the national Sunday law, the prophecies of Revelation are silent on the activities of the beast and the focus is placed on the two horned beast.

In Daniel 11 we have the time of the end mentioned in verse 40. This is 1798. The papacy has had her 1260 years of supremacy. Now she has a deadly wound. If 40-45 was all about the papacy during her wounded state this would not be in sync with what we find in Revelation 13.

The focus in that chapter is on the two horned beast during the time that the papacy is wounded.

Now if God wanted to provide his people waymarks during this period of time between when the papacy was wounded until the papacy is healed He could do that by continuing on with the same track of waymarks that began the chapter. If we see this chapter as simply waymarks, mile markers, marking off events leading to the close of probation, what would be wrong with using literal events in the same region of the world that the rest of Daniel 11 has been dealing with? If it is just waymarks, why couldn't God continue on with the same theme as found in the first half of the chapter? Using France and the Ottoman Empire is not totally out of line. These powers are brought to view in Revelation. In fact the Ottoman Empire is still under a time prophecy in 1798 when history records events that perfectly match a literal application for verse 40.

[Ivor Myers](#) As far as the Papacy not being mentioned after the wounding in 1798, I think the opposite is true. Rev.13:4 describes the deadly wound being healed. This is a "process" of reunification of church and state, occurring after 1798 and before the passing of the mark of the beast. "The infliction of the deadly wound points to the abolition of the papacy in 1798. After this, says the prophet, "His deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast." Paul states plainly that the man of sin will continue UNTIL the second advent. [2 Thessalonians 2:8.] To the very close of time he will CARRY FORWARD his work of deception... Marvelous in her shrewdness and cunning is the Romish Church. She can read what is to be. She bides her time...Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. {GC88 580.2}" Then Daniel 11:40-45 would include the Papacy being wounded, but eventually regaining power in accordance with Revelation 13:3, the deadly wound inflicted and healing.

[Ivor Myers](#) As far as White's quote about repeat and enlarge, Ellen White was saying that like Daniel which repeats and enlarges, so does Revelation. Moreover, note how Uriah Smith himself powerfully breaks down the reason behind repeat and enlarge, utilizing none other than Daniel 2, 7, and 8. He used this principle, then disregarded it for Daniel 11, which continues along the "world's great highway."

"The ground covered by this vision is the same in its main features as that covered by the great image of chapter ii. The question may be asked; then, why this vision was given. Why repeat what had once been so forcibly expressed? We answer, Prophecies are repeated because all the instruction that God wishes to convey, and all the particulars concerning nations and kingdoms, cannot well be embodied in one series of symbols. Thus the head of gold represents the grandeur and glory of the Babylonian kingdom; but it could not represent the fact that that kingdom bore the same relation to other kingdoms that the lion does to other beasts; or, in other words, it could not show its warlike character, its ability to conquer, its bravery and daring, and the rapidity of its conquests; all which plainly appear in the symbol of the lion with eagle's wings. But while the lion shows these qualities, it does not represent the grandeur and glory shadowed forth by the head of gold. Hence both lines of prophecy are necessary to bring out the whole truth. So with Medo-Persia. The bear raising himself up on one side, does not so

well represent the two lines of kings in that empire, as the two arms of the image. But on the other hand, the breast and arms of the image cannot represent the cruel and oppressive nature of that power, shown by the bear with three ribs in his mouth. Likewise Grecia, while it continued a unit, is well represented by the belly and sides of brass; but this portion of the image could not represent its division into four kingdoms, and the rapidity of its aggressive marches, as brought out by the four heads and four wings of the leopard.

{1864 UrS, KPC 17.1} ...THE RAM, GOAT, AND LITTLE HORN OF DAN.VIII Standing at the right of the series of beasts last described will be seen another line of prophecy, consisting of a Ram, Goat and Little Horn. This vision is found in Daniel viii, and in it we are AGAIN CONDUCTED OVER THE world's great highway, with additional particulars concerning the mighty kingdoms that we pass along our journey. THUS WE HAVE LINE UPON LINE till the subject is made so plain that no man, however poor or wayfaring he may be, need err therein. On the symbols of this chapter, the ram, he-goat, and little horn which waxed exceeding great, the prophet received the following instruction: The ram which thou sawest having two horns, are the kings of Media and Persia. The higher of the two horns came up last. Verse 3. This represented the Persian division of the empire, which rose last, and became the leading influence in the nation. The ram with the two horns was the well-known emblem of the Medes and Persians. This symbol is placed on the Chart, on a line with the breast and arms and THE BEAR, as it denotes the SAME POWER. {1864 UrS, KPC 19.1}

The goat which came against the ram had at his first appearance, not represented on the Chart, a notable horn between his eyes. This goat and horn are explained by the angel, in verse 21, thus: "And the rough goat is the king of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king." This king was Alexander the Great, a man of unbridled appetite and lust, and who eight years after he overthrew the Persian empire at the battle of Arbela, B.C.331, died at Babylon in a drunken fit, at the age of 33, B.C.323. This horn was thus broken, and four came up in its stead, as represented on the Chart. In explanation of this change, the angel said, "And whereas, the great horn being broken, four came up in its stead;" "four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation." Verse 22. {1864 UrS, KPC 20.1} These kingdoms were Macedonia, Thrace, Syria and Egypt, into which the empire was divided shortly after Alexander's death, governed respectively by Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus and Ptolemy. {1864 UrS, KPC 20.2} "And out of one of them came forth a little horn," verses 9,23-27, represented on the Chart by the side of the cross, below the goat . {1864 UrS, KPC 20.3} Rome was not connected with the people of God, and hence is not introduced into prophecy, till after its conquest of Macedonia, one of the horns of the goat; hence, it is represented as coming forth from one of these horns. That this little horn which waxed exceeding great was Rome, the following considerations prove: {1864 UrS, KPC 20.4} ... It was the only power which succeeded the four kingdoms which waxed "exceeding great." 8. In this vision, Grecia succeeds Medo-Persia, just as it had been seen twice before; and it is absurd to suppose that the power which follows them in this vision is a different power from the one which twice before had been seen succeeding them, in chapters ii and vii; and that power was Rome." 9. "He shall be broken without hand." How clear a reference to the stone cut out without hand which smites the image upon its feet. Chap.ii,34. {1864 UrS, KPC 21.1}

[Ivor Myers](#) "As these beasts denote four kings, or kingdoms, we inquire, What four? Where shall we commence to enumerate? These beasts do not rise all at once, but consecutively, as they are spoken of as first, second, etc.; and the last one is in existence when all earthly scenes are brought to an end by the final Judgment. Now, from the time of Daniel to the end of this world's history, there were to be but four universal kingdoms, as we learn from Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image in chapter 2. Daniel was still living under the same kingdom which he had declared, in his interpretation of the king's dream, about sixty-five years before, to be the head of gold. The first beast of this vision must therefore denote the same as the head of gold of the great image, namely, the kingdom of Babylon, and the other beasts the succeeding kingdoms shown by that image. But if this vision covers essentially the same ground as the image of chapter 2, the query may arise why it is given; why was not the vision of chapter 2 sufficient? We answer, The ground is PASSED OVER AGAIN and again that additional characteristics may be brought out, and additional facts and features may be presented. It is thus that we have "line upon line." Here earthly governments are viewed as represented in the light of Heaven. Their true character is shown by the symbol of wild and ravenous beasts. {1897 UrS, DAR 127.1}

[John Witcombe](#) That is an interesting perspective. I've not considered that Revelation 13:4 is dealing with the wounded state of the beast. I see this text as following the healing of the wound, after the papacy once again gains the power to correct heretics.

Revelation 13:4 "And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?"

In the only place Ellen White uses this verse she puts it into the context of after the Sunday laws, after the appearance of Satan personating Christ, thus after the wound is healed:

"In the last days Satan will appear as an angel of light, with great power and heavenly glory, and claim to be the lord of the whole earth. He will declare that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week; and as lord of the first day of the week he will present this spurious sabbath as a test of loyalty to him. Then will take place the final fulfilment of the Revelator's prophecy: {Ms153-1902 (November 5, 1902) par. 8}

"They worshiped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshiped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?" {Ms153-1902 (November 5, 1902) par. 9}

I agree that there is a process of growing into power that does take place before the Sunday laws which has been taking place ever since she received her deadly wound. I just don't find any Bible prophecies relating to this period of time while she is wounded. Yes, Ellen White has a lot to say about her silent growth into power during this period of time. But I don't see Revelation 13:4 speaking of this growth but rather speaking of her power after the growth has taken place and the wound has been healed.

If we make Daniel 11:40-45 figurative then there is a way to fit the papacy into these verses.

People see verse 40 as talking about Reagan, the pope and the fall of communism.

They see the word “ships” in this verse as a figure for economic pressure that was exerted on the Soviet Union. And yet while this word “ships” is viewed figuratively, the word “ships” in verse 30 is interpreted literally. Do you see a problem with this? Both verses deal with events that took place after the cross. Why is one “ships” a figure and the other is literal? What hermeneutic permits this inconsistency?

[Ivor Myers](#) Well, I wouldn't totally bank on the Soviet Union/ships explanation either. But, okay, earlier you stated this: “The context of her statement is that very important prophecies found in Daniel are repeated in Revelation.”

And this: “In Daniel 11 we have the time of the end mentioned in verse 40. This is 1798. The papacy has had her 1260 years of supremacy. Now she has a deadly wound. If 40-45 was all about the papacy during her wounded state this would not be in sync with what we find in Revelation 13. The focus in that chapter is on the two horned beast during the time that the papacy is wounded.”

You appear to be linking Daniel 11 and Revelation 13, in stating that both supposedly reveal a period of silence when it comes to the papacy because the papacy momentarily falls of the scene of importance until the deadly wound is fully healed. I agree with linking the two, but don't agree with the silence part, but let's assume that it so for the moment.

Ellen White tells us: "In the Revelation all the books of the Bible meet and end. Here is the complement of the book of Daniel. One is a prophecy; the other a revelation. The book that was sealed is not the Revelation, but that portion of the prophecy of Daniel relating to the last days. The angel commanded, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end." Daniel 12:4. {AA 585.1} “The books of Daniel and the Revelation are one. One is a prophecy, the other a revelation; one a book sealed, the other a book opened. {7BC 971.5}

This being the case, here is one more question for you. I can trace Daniel 2, 7, 8, 9 in the book of Revelation since Revelation is simply the unfolding of Daniel, the "repeating and enlarging" of "important prophecies" of it. In fact, I can trace Daniel 11 as well, if I understand the Papacy to be KON and the French Revolution to be KOS. This reveals a powerful consistency of the relationship between the two books. But if I use Uriah Smith's 11:40-45 scenario, I cannot find nor teach that scenario anywhere from the book of Revelation. Remember, Revelation repeats, “important prophecies” from Daniel, so can you show me where the actions of Turkey, after 1840 are found in the book Revelation? I know of no other portion of Daniel that is not repeated in Revelation. Why would Daniel 2,7,8,9, and 11:1-40 be repeated but the MOST important part of Daniel as it relates to last day events (40-45) be so absolutely missing from the book of Revelation, or not even mentioned until the 6th plague according to Smith? If the silence of the Papacy is loud to you because it is absent from Revelation 13:10 onward to the end of the chapter, then wouldn't the silence of Turkey be deafening since it is not mentioned

again till after probation closes according to Uriah? Where can we prove the interpretation of the Eastern question of Daniel 11:40-45 given by Uriah Smith in the book of Revelation?

If it is not repeated in Revelation, there is only one of three options.

1. It was not a part of "important prophecies."
2. It is an incorrect scenario.
3. Both of the above.

How would you answer this?

[John Witcombe](#) Very good question. Here in Grants Pass, OR which is on the I-5 corridor, I live about 50 miles away from the California border. The mile markers warn me regarding how close I am to this state and its border guards who will take away my oranges and forbid me to conceal-carry my handgun. The mile markers are nice but they really are not absolutely essential. They are not as important as the road, border, vehicle, etc.

This is how I see Daniel 11. How really important is the following prophecy: "So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities: and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand." Daniel 11:15. Should we expect to see it repeated somewhere in Revelation? I don't think so. These prophecies are simply waymarks; they are mile markers on the road to the close of probation.

Yes, the last 6 miles before the scary border of California are a bit more important than the mile markers 150 miles north of the border. And when I am in those last 6 miles I might pay more attention to the mile markers than I did when I was passing through Eugene, OR.

So no, I would not expect to see Daniel 11:40-45 repeated in the book of Revelation any more than I would expect to see Daniel 11:15 repeated. Ellen White said that it was the important prophecies that are repeated in each of the two apocalyptic books. Daniel 11:40-45 is simply the bait to attract the fish. It is the hook that is all important and it is the hook prophecies that are repeated.

[Ivor Myers](#) Daniel 11:15 is a pretty minor detail in regards to the great controversy. The grand theme of Daniel 11:40-45 can hardly be likened to simple "way marks". These are the events that lead up to Michael standing up. This so called "Eastern Question" was what Uriah claimed all should be focused on and watching, for when these things happened, they would signal the time of trouble. So how could so important an event as Turkey occupying Jerusalem suddenly be missing on the Revelation Highway? See the importance Smith puts on this interpretation:

"This much desired change in Turkish governmental conditions, however, can not prevent the inevitable. The Turk must depart from Europe. Where will he then plant the tabernacles of his palace? In Jerusalem? That certainly is the most probable point. Newton on the Prophecies, p. 318, says: "Between the seas in the glorious holy mountain must denote, as we have shown, some part of the Holy Land. There the Turk shall encamp with all his powers; yet he 'shall come

to his end, and none shall help him,' - shall help him effectually, or deliver him." {1897 UrS, DAR 318.1}

Time will soon determine this matter. And when this takes place, what follows? - events of the MOST MOMENTOUS interest to all the inhabitants of this world, as the next chapter immediately shows. {1897 UrS, DAR 318.2}

"At that time." What time? - The time to which we are brought by the closing verse of the preceding chapter, - the time when the king of the north shall plant the tabernacles of his palace in the glorious holy mountain; or, in other words, when the Turk, driven from Europe, shall hastily make Jerusalem his temporary seat of government. We noticed, in remarks upon the latter portion of the preceding chapter, some of the agencies already in operation for the accomplishment of this end, and some of the indications that the Turk will soon be obliged to make this move. And when this event takes place, he is to come to his end; and then, according to this verse, we look for the standing up of Michael, the great prince. This movement on the part of Turkey is THE SIGNAL for the standing up of Michael; that is, it marks this event as next in order. And to guard against all misunderstanding, let the reader note that the position is not here taken that the next movement against the Turks will drive them from Europe, or that when they shall establish their capital at Jerusalem, Christ begins his reign without the lapse of a day or an hour of time.

So how could such a marker of momentous events, the SIGNAL for Michael standing up not be mentioned in Revelation? Revelation "repeats" important prophecies of Daniel, to verify the truthfulness of them. I see Revelation speaking of KON-Papacy, KOS-French Revolution. It works for this scenario, it does not for Turkey as KON. I don't think this is something that can be skipped over lightly. It is not a minor point like Daniel 11:15. And either way, the big picture of Greece (11:15) is in Revelation.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, Ellen White does say some (not all) of the prophecies are repeated because of their importance. The crux of our difference boils down to which rules of interpretation we are going to follow. If we don't agree upon this point we can never come into unity on the presentation of this prophecy.

Let me spell out our difference: I have chosen to use only Miller's Rules of interpretation for these verses. You have chosen to make the fact that some important prophecies in Daniel are repeated in Revelation into an additional rule of interpretation which you call Repeat and Enlarge. This rule requires you to make the last 6 verses in Daniel 11 all about the papacy.

Rule 11: How to know when a word is used figuratively: If it makes good sense as it stands, and does no violence to the simple laws of nature, then it must be understood literally; if not, figuratively.

A literal reading of Daniel 11:40 would mean that the king of the south in this verse would refer to the same power that it referred to in the previous 39 verses where it is mentioned—the civil ruler of the literal land mass we call Egypt.

Without doing violence to the text or to the historical record, is it possible to find a fit from history that would allow us to stay with a literal interpretation of the term, king of the south?

Does it make good sense as it stands? Did the king of the south push at an invader at the time of the end (1798)? And did the historic literal king of the north who would have been the leader of the Ottoman Empire in that year, come at this same invader with literal ships and horseman and wagons and did he overflow and pass over which is code for winning the conflict? This is exactly what this text says and in 1798 an exact conflict took place.

Rule 11 says that we must go with this interpretation.

Even if it goes against what we want it to say, we must interpret the text literally.

Are you in agreement that the history that Smith uses for verse 40 provides an unforced, perfect fit for a literal reading of this verse; a fit that makes good sense?

If you didn't have your new rule that is requiring you to see the papacy in verse 40, I believe that you would see that there is a perfect fit from history for a literal reading of this verse.

Do you see how easily the public could follow this understanding? They were able to see it in Smith's and Daniells' day and they were held spellbound.

What do you offer the public for verse 40? Share with me your papal view of this verse. Have you been presenting this verse in your public evangelistic meetings? How has it been received?

[Ivor Myers](#) Who would you say followed Miller's rules of interpretation regarding Daniel 11:40, Smith, or Miller?

Miller rules of interpretation led Miller to the following conclusion which differed from Uriah's conclusion.

"40. And the time of the end (of Antichrist,) shall the king of the south (Spain) push at France (Vendean war) and the king of the north (Great Britian) shall come against France, like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and the French (or Bonaparte the principle ruler;) shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over. {1833 WiM, ESH 27.5} 41. "Bonaparte shall enter also into the glorious land (Italy) and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of Bonaparte's hands, even Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon" Ottomons and eastern nations." {1833 WiM, ESH 28.1}

Again, Miller, following his own rules sees v.36-39 as the papacy, where Smith sees them as France. "36. verse. "And the king shall do according to his will, and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God, and shall, speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper, till the indignation be accomplished: for that, that is determined shall be

done." The king spoken of in this verse, is the little horn, in allusion to the papal power which should exalt himself "sitting in the place of God," above all the heathen gods; and even oppose the God of gods, by dispensing with his laws, and claim the prerogative of making new laws for his kingdom; and also Antichrist would prosper until the "indignation be accomplished;" or Judgement of the great day. {1833 WiM, ESH 26.5} 37. verse. "Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any God: for he shall magnify himself above all." He (papal Rome) would not regard the pagan gods, and would forbid to marry, not regard the christian God, but would exalt himself above all that is called God. See Thess. 2:4. {1833 WiM, ESH 26.6}

So who would you say is following Miller's Rules regarding v36-39, Miller or Smith?

Now my issue with this literal interpretation of Daniel 11, based solely on geography is that when we go the route of nationalities which is not Christ centered (Turkey, Israel, and Egypt have nothing to do with a Jesus centered understanding) then we can make anyone fit the bill "historically". Consider the apparent detailed fulfillment given of Daniel 11 by commentators such as Clarke, Barnes, Gill, and the majority of others, who having ignoring the principle of repeat and enlarge, end Daniel 11 with Antiochus, seeing no reason to move into Rome in a literal interpretation of KON/KOS who both rise out of Seleucid and Ptolemy in Greece. Literally, strictly literally, Rome doesn't even come in the picture. It Ptolemies and Seleucids.

So I think a good place to start is at verse 23 with the simple question (and I'm not totally sold on this yet, but, is there sufficient reason to assume a loop back in verse 23 to the beginning of the Roman empire? What if there is no loopback but we are actually being introduced to a new power, (which would be the natural reading) that rises "small" but becomes strong, or waxes great. If we worked from v.23 forward instead of 40 backward, we might get a better idea of who the kings are from verse 23 onward. To me, verse 23 appears crucial to understanding the rest of the chapter. Again, I'm not set on this as yet.

[John Witcombe](#) You make a good point. But you have to give William Miller credit for trying. His dream indicates that he had only a small casket of jewels. After they were scattered, the dirt brush man produced a much larger casket and the jewels "shone with ten times their former glory". Miller had the Sabbath wrong, state of the dead, and many other doctrines wrong. He had a totally messed up understanding of eschatology. Smith had the advantage in that he was living in the time when the jewels "shone with ten times their former glory". There was one thing that Miller had right and that was his rules of prophetic interpretation. But as you pointed out even with the right rules you can get many things wrong.

You say the literal interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45 is not Christ centered. Is the interpretation of the prophecy of Daniel 11:2-10 Christ centered? I would say that it is. It starts out saying: "And now will I show thee the truth." Daniel 11:2. Jesus is the truth. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life:" John 4:6.

Let me say a word about the Christocentric principle: every sermon preached must be Christ

centered.

Let me ask you a question: if you heard Jesus preach the Sermon on the Mount – Matthew 5, 6 and 7 would you consider that to be a Christ centered sermon? Did you know that the name of Jesus and the cross is not mentioned even once in that sermon? What made the sermon Jesus gave Christ centered? It was the word of truth, the very word of God that the people heard that day. It was Christ centered because it was the truth of God and John 14:6 says that Jesus is the truth.

Who is speaking in Revelation 9? Is the name of Jesus found in Revelation 9? What makes Revelation 9 Christ centered? It is Christ centered because it is Jesus who is speaking. The same Jesus who gave the Sermon on the Mount.

We could go to an evangelical meeting and in that sermon on the state of the dead every point made could have the love of Jesus wrapped around every concept and yet a dangerous lie be taught. That sermon was not Christ centered. Then you could have Job teach us a lesson on the state of the dead from his book not using the name of Jesus even once and it would be thoroughly Christ centered just as was the Sermon on the Mount because it is exulting the truth and the truth reveals the character and love of God.

We could have a sermon on the cross of Jesus and the way of salvation and that sermon could be absolutely void of Christ. If in that sermon you are taught that the law has been done away with and no one can live a victorious life then that sermon was not Christ centered.

As you read Smith's book on Daniel and Revelation you might be inclined to think that it fails to implement the Christocentric principle of interpretation. But it doesn't. God's view of this book is that it was His helping hand, that there was no other book that could take its place. Every page is Christ centered because it presents truth. The truth reveals God's character of love and the truth sets us free and draws us heavenward.

“The present truth, the special message given to our world, even the third angel’s message, comprehends a vast field, containing heavenly treasures. No one can be excusable who says, ‘I will no longer have anything to do with these special messages; I will preach Christ.’ No one can preach Christ, and present the truth as it is in Jesus, unless he presents the truths that are to come before the people at the present time, when such important developments are taking place.” Manuscript 33, 1897

And so I maintain that the interpretation Smith gave of Daniel 11:40-45 is thoroughly Christ centered.

[Ivor Myers](#) Agreed. I believe these prophecies are indeed Christ centered, and not just because they originate from Jesus. I think the Christ centeredness of Revelation 9 can be best understood in light of the purpose of the trumpets, under which the fall. etc. And yes, Miller was at a disadvantage.

[Ivor Myers](#) Hmm. You owe to yourself and others 😊, to explore the history of Daniel 11, particular from verse 14 where Rome begins. I think it is imperative to look at all the data to come to a good conclusion regarding 40-45. 40-45 is the house, but the verses before are the foundation.

[John Witcombe](#) Yes, and the foundation has to do with the thread that runs all the way through this chapter – king of the north and king of the south. Just like we have a thread that runs all the way through the image of chapter two – the metal. The metal always continues to mean the same thing from the head to the toes – civil powers. This is the foundation for chapter 2. This is how we know that the feet and toes are the civil powers of Europe. God has given us a thread in chapter 11 and that is the two kings. Once you identify what they are at the beginning you know for a certainty that they will remain constant from start to finish just as the metallic material did in chapter 2.

[Ivor Myers](#) I think that's one of the issues I have with Daniel 11 suddenly turning into a purely historical account of intrigue within kingdoms. Daniel 2, 7,8,9 all carry congregation gripping information, then suddenly Daniel 11 loses everyone's attention until v.40. Something is not right with that, or the way it is being presented. If you feel that 1-35 is over your head, imagine the common person to whom we try to explain this history? (i.e. I bet many people have tuned out of this conversation already!!!!) But if the ""over the head history is limited to a smaller amount of verses, we have much more to preach on in this chapter, not just v.40-45.

[John Witcombe](#) Ivor, I agree with you on this. Nothing is more boring and tedious than the battles back and forth between the remnants of Alexander's kingdom. When I present the Eastern Question to the public, I only go through the first 4 verses and then I use verse 11.

I do this to show how this chapter is constructed, how it is to be understood and as an introduction to the kings of the north and south. They see that this chapter is simply historical events that would have made news headlines at the time.

Then I go through the last 6 verses. It is fast paced and my lecture is only around an hour. I give everyone a free book that I wrote, Jerusalem Caliphate and the Third Jihad. The lecture peeks their interest, they read the book which has the hook of the third angle's message embedded. It deals with the coming Sunday laws, the mark of the beast, the identity of the beast, and the gospel message of salvation.

The significant part of this chapter for us are those verses that deal with events during the time of the end which are the last 6 verses. The public have not been confused by the concept that we must see the papacy in these verses and they listen “. . . with open eyes, ears, and mouths. The outsiders seemed to be intensely interested in the Eastern question.”

I can only imagine what you would be able to do with this message of the heaven-endorsed Eastern Question given the skill-set God has given to you.

But you would have to do something somewhat difficult and that is to forego independence of judgement, the right to come up with your own new interpretation of prophecy and believe that God gave to our forefathers a correct understanding of the Eastern Question based upon the fact of Ellen White's multiple positive comments regarding the public presentation of the Eastern Question.

Most of us are unable to do this. We want to have a new message to bring to the people. I know that this is my weakness. If you knew my history you would see that the following was written especially for me:

"The natural stubbornness of the human heart resists the light of truth. Its natural pride of opinion leads to independence of judgment and a clinging to human ideas and philosophy. There is with some a constant danger of becoming unsettled in the faith by the desire for originality. They wish to find some new and strange truth to present, to have a new message to bring to the people; but such a desire is a snare of the enemy to captivate the mind and lead away from the truth." {RH, August 19, 1909 par. 3}

I am praying that you will see the import of the Eastern Question as it was presented by Smith and Daniells. There has never been a more relevant time than right now to use this message as an entering wedge for our third angel's message.

Giving this message as they did does not take away from our message regarding the role of the papacy in the last days. You can teach our message regarding the papacy from the very same verses that The Great Controversy uses. It's not necessary to reinvent our approach of warning the world about the papal deceptions by trying to squeeze it into the last 6 verses of Daniel 11. None of our pioneers or none of our current public evangelists except Tim Roosenberg use these verses in exposing the deceptions and work of the papacy. It would not be wrong for you to experiment with using these last 6 verses in the way Smith and Daniells did. If Ellen White was alive today she would speak positively of you for using the Eastern Question to attract the public to the third angel's message just as she did of Smith and Daniells.

[Ivor Myers](#) Thank you for the exchange! Lots of good stuff here. Let's continue to pray and seek the Lord's guidance in all things. One thing is certain, time is wrapping up. There is much I agree with in your last post! Good connecting with you!!! Happy Sabbath and keep preaching the word!

[Jozsef Kurucity](#) I read this all from beginning till the end. ☺ But I had to share my opinion about Revelation 17:9-11

17:9: And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth.

17:10: And there 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.

17:11: And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth

into perdition.

The beast is the eight. Eight what? King. That's how I read it and see it written. And the beast is of the seven. If the seven were kings and the beast is of them, then the beast must be a king too.

[John Witcombe](#) HI Jozsef, I see your reasoning. Here is my reasoning on this. There is a woman sitting on seven mountains. We know that the mountains are different from the woman. The woman is the papal church. What are the seven mountains she is sitting on? The verse says that the apostate church is sitting on seven kings. Then it speaks of the seven kings. Then it says that the beast that was and is not is the eighth. To say that the beast is the eighth king would be reading into the text what it doesn't say. I see how you could think it was a logical conclusion but when we are dealing with these prophecies we must be careful what we assume. If it doesn't say the eight is identified as a king we must simply let the eighth be identified with the words the Bible gives to us and that is that the eighth power to follow seven kings is the beast power. The sentence structure does not require that we call the beast a king.

[Jozsef Kurucity](#) Thanks for reply. What does it mean then that the eighth is of the seven? And who or what are those seven kings?

[John Witcombe](#) Let me add a few thoughts to my post. We are always tempted to add to the words of the prophecy but we have been warned not to do this. For instance, in Daniel 11:36 it speaks of a king and many add the words "of the north" because we believe this is referring to the papacy and in verse 40 we believe it is calling the papacy the king of the north. Without any textual support we also call civil Rome the king of the north in this chapter. When we introduce such static into any prophecy it is hard to hear what God is trying to say to us.

It is true that it is easy to see the papacy in Daniel 11:36-39. But it is also just as easy to see atheistic France in these verses as Smith so ably demonstrates. The wording fits both because both come from the same source. We know how terrible atheistic France was for those 3.5 years. The papacy is just as dangerous. But we can know that it can't be the papacy because it is referred to as a king and the papacy is never referred to as a king in the Bible. Kings always refer to either earthly civil rulers or heavenly rulers. The Catholic Church is referred to as a woman, little horn (different from the 10 who were civil rulers) a beast but never a king.

We have to read the text in Revelation 17 just as it reads. There are 7 kings in this line up of eight. If there were 8 kings the text would have plainly stated thus.

The eighth is of the seven in that paganism was the ruling principle of the seven and is also the ruling principle of the eighth – the papacy (baptized paganism).

Here is how Smith describes these seven kings:

"The seven heads are explained to be, first, seven mountains, and then seven kings, or forms of

government; for the expression in verse 10, "And there are seven kings," should read, and these are seven kings. "Five are fallen," says the angel, or passed away; "one is;" the sixth was then reigning; another was to come, and continue for a short space; and when the beast reappeared in its bloody and persecuting character, it was to be under the eighth form of government, which was to continue till the beast went into perdition. The seven forms of government that have existed in the Roman empire are usually enumerated as follows: (1) kingly; (2) consular; (3) decemvirate; (4) dictatorial; (5) triumvirate; (6) imperial; and (7) papal. Kings, consuls, decemvirs, dictators, and triumvirs had passed away in John's day. He was living under the imperial form. Two more were to arise after his time. One was only to continue a short space, and hence is not usually reckoned among the heads; while the last, which is usually denominated the seventh, is in reality the eighth. The head which was to succeed the imperial, and continue a short space, could not be the papal; for that has continued longer than all the rest put together. We understand, therefore, that the papal head is the eighth, and that a head of short continuance intervened between the imperial and papal. In fulfilment of this, we read that after the imperial form had been abolished, there was a ruler who for about the space of sixty years governed Rome under the title of the "Exarch of Ravenna." Thus we have the connecting link between the imperial and papal heads. The third phase of the beast that was, and is not, and yet is, is the Roman power under the rule of the papacy; and in this form it ascends out of the bottomless pit, or bases its power on pretensions which have no foundation but a mixture of Christian errors and pagan superstitions." {1897 UrS, DAR 704.3}

Under the title: The Eighth Head of the Beast, the following is found in the Review and Herald:

"When the western empire fell in a. d. 476, Rome fell into the hands of barbarian kings, who continued "a short space" the rulers of Rome, about 62 years; and the beast, or imperial Rome, was not, during this short period. In a. d. 538 the dignity of the sovereign pontificate was legally conferred on the pope, when the emperor Justinian constituted him the head of all the holy churches. Then the beast that was—the old Roman empire and its religion, was revived under the administration of the popes. {February 2, 1864 JWe, ARSH 77.25}

"The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." Verse 11. Then papal Rome is the eighth head, and is of the seven. {February 2, 1864 JWe, ARSH 77.26}

It is generally conceded that the empire of the Casars, was the sixth head; the seventh was the next head in order, which continued "a short space;" then followed the papal empire, based upon ten horns, or kings, who protected the papal throne, and enforced the papal religion, and the commands of the pope. {February 2, 1864 JWe, ARSH 77.27}

The seventh head was the embryo state of the papal empire. During this period the western kings were mostly converted, or subjugated to the pope. The eighth was the grand organization of the papal empire perfected; and it continued until the papal head received "a deadly wound by a sword," in 1798; but it "did live," and "was healed;" for the little horn, which is a symbol of the papal sovereigns, is to "speak great words," and make war with the saints, just before he goes into perdition. Dan. vii, 11, 21, 22." {February 2, 1864 JWe, ARSH 77.28}

[Jozsef Kurucity](#) Thanks! 😊