

DANIEL AND THE REVELATION VOLUME 1

Uriah Smith



Preface

With Enoch, the seventh from Adam, and for three hundred and eight years contemporary with Adam, the voice of prophecy began to be heard through human lips. For so the apostle Jude declares: “And Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.” (Jude 14:15) This sublime and earliest prophecy reaches to the end of time. And through all the intervening ages, other prophecies have covered all the more important events in the great drama of history.

2. The coming to pass of these great events has been but the response of history to what the prophecies had declared. And thus amid the ever-present evidences of the short-sightedness of men, and the ever-recurring failures of human schemes,

a voice has continually gone up from earth to heaven, “The word of the Lord endureth forever.”

3. It is for the purpose of calling attention to some of these important prophetic-historical lessons, if we may be permitted to coin a word, that this volume is written. And the books of Daniel and the Revelation are chosen for this purpose, because in some respects their prophecies are more direct than are to be found elsewhere upon the prophetic page, and the fulfilments more striking. The object before us is threefold: (1) To gain an understanding of the wonderful testimony of the books themselves; (2) To acquaint ourselves with some of the more interesting and important events in the history of civilized nations, and mark how accurately the prophecies, some of them depending upon the developments of the then far-distant future, and upon conditions the most minute and complicated, have been fulfilled in these events; and (3) To draw from these things important lessons relative to practical Christian duties, which were not given for past ages merely, but are for the learning and admonition of the world to-day.

4. The books of Daniel and the Revelation are counterparts of each other. They naturally stand side by side, and should be studied together.

5. We are aware that any attempt to explain these books and make an application of their prophecies, is generally looked upon as a futile and fanatical task, and is sometimes met even with open hostility. It is much to be regretted that any portions of that volume which all Christians believe to be the book wherein God has undertaken to reveal his will to mankind, should come to be regarded in such a light. But a great fact, to which the reader's attention is called in the following paragraph, is believed to contain for this state of things both an explanation and an antidote.

6. There are two general systems of interpretation adopted by different expositors in their efforts to explain the sacred Scriptures. The first is the mystical or spiritualizing system invented by Origen, to the shame of sound criticism and the curse of Christendom; the second

is the system of literal interpretation, used by such men as Tyndale, Luther, and all the Reformers, and furnishing the basis for every advance step which has thus far been made in the reformation from error to truth as taught in the Scriptures. According to the first system, every declaration is supposed to have a mystical or hidden sense, which it is the province of the interpreter to bring forth; by the second, every declaration is to be taken in its most obvious and literal sense, except where the context and the well-known laws of language show that the terms are figurative, and not literal; and whatever is figurative must be explained by other portions of the Bible which are literal.

7. By the mystical method of Origen, it is vain to hope for any uniform understanding of either Daniel or the Revelation, or of any other book of the Bible; for that system (if it can be called a system) knows no law but the uncurbed imagination of its adherents; hence there are on its side as many different interpretations of Scripture as there are different fancies of different writers. By the literal method, everything is subject to well-

established and clearly-defined law; and, viewed from this standpoint, the reader will be surprised to see how simple, easy, and clear many portions of the Scriptures at once become, which, according to any other system, are dark and unsolvable. It is admitted that many figures are used in the Bible, and that much of the books under consideration, especially that of the Revelation, is clothed in symbolic language; but it is also claimed that the Scriptures introduce no figure which they do not somewhere furnish literal language to explain. Those two volumes are offered as a consistent exposition of the books of Daniel and the Revelation according to the literal system.

8. The study of prophecy should by no means be neglected; for it is the prophetic portions of the word of God which especially constitute it a lamp to our feet and a light to our path. So both David and Peter unequivocally testify. (Psalms 119:105; 2 Peter 1:19)

9. No sublimer study can occupy the mind than the study of those books in which He who sees the

end from the beginning, looking forward through all the ages, gives, through his inspired prophets, a description of coming events for the benefit of those whose lot it would be to meet them.

10. An increase of knowledge respecting the prophetic portions of the word of God was to be one of the characteristics of the last days. Said the angel to Daniel, “But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased;” or, as Michaelis’s translation reads: “When many shall give their sedulous attention to the understanding of these things, and knowledge shall be increased.” It is our lot to live this side the time to which the angel told Daniel to thus shut up the words and seal the book. That restriction has now expired by limitation. In the language of the figure, the seal has been removed, and many are running to and fro, and knowledge has marvelously increased in every department of science; yet it is evident that this prophecy specially contemplates an increase of knowledge concerning those prophecies that are designed to

give us light in reference to the age in which we live, the close of this dispensation, and the soon-coming transfer of all earthly governments to the great King of Righteousness, who shall destroy his enemies, and crown with an infinite reward every one of his friends. The fulfillment of the prophecy in the increase of this knowledge, is one of the pleasing signs of the present time. For more than half a century, light upon the prophetic word has been increasing, and shining with ever-growing luster to our own day.

11. In no portion of the word of God is this more apparent than in the books of Daniel and the Revelation; and we may well congratulate ourselves on this, for no other parts of that word deal so largely in prophecies that pertain to the closing scenes of this world's history. No other books contain so many chains of prophecy reaching down to the end. In no other books is the grand procession of events that leads us through to the termination of probationary time, and ushers us into the realities of the eternal state, so fully and minutely set forth. No other books embrace so

completely, as it were in one grand sweep, all the truths that concern the last generation of the inhabitants of the earth, and set forth so comprehensively all the aspects of the times, physical, moral, and political, in which the triumphs of earthly woe and wickedness shall end, and the eternal reign of righteousness begin. We take pleasure in calling attention especially to these features of the books of Daniel and the Revelation, which seem heretofore to have been too generally overlooked or misinterpreted.

12. There seems to be no prophecy which a person can have so little excuse for misunderstanding as the prophecy of Daniel, especially as relates to its main features. Dealing but sparingly in language that is highly figurative, explaining all the symbols it introduces, locating its events within the rigid confines of prophetic periods, it points out the first advent of the Messiah in so clear and unmistakable a manner as to call forth the execration of the Jews upon any attempt to explain it, and gives so accurately, and so many ages in advance, the outlines of the great events of

our world's history, that infidelity stands confounded and dumb before its inspired record.

13. And no effort to arrive at a correct understanding of the book of the Revelation needs any apology; for the Lord of the prophecy has himself pronounced a blessing upon him that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein; for the time is at hand. (Revelation 1:1-3) And it is with an honest purpose of aiding somewhat in arriving at this understanding, which is set forth by the language above referred to as not only possible but praiseworthy, that an exposition of those books, according to the literal rule of interpretation, has been attempted.

14. With thrilling interest we behold to-day the nations marshaling their forces, and pressing forward in the very movements described by the royal seer in the court of Babylon twenty-five hundred years ago, and by John on Patmos eighteen hundred years ago; and these movements--hear it, ye children of men--are the last political

revolutions to be accomplished before this earth plunges into her final time of trouble, and Michael, the great Prince, stands up, and his people, all who are found written in the book, are crowned with full and final deliverance. (Daniel 12:1, 2)

15. Are these things so? “Seek,” says our Saviour, “and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” God has not so concealed his truth that it will elude the search of the humble seeker.

With a prayer that the same Spirit by which those portions of Scripture which form the basis of those volumes were at first inspired, and whose aid the writer has sought in his expository efforts, may rest abundantly upon the reader in his investigations, according to the promise of the Saviour in John 16:7, 13, 15, this work is commended to the candid and careful attention of all who are interested in prophetic themes. U. S.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.,

January, 1897.

Introduction

That the book of Daniel was written by the person whose name it bears, there is no reason to doubt. Ezekiel, who was contemporary with Daniel, bears testimony, through the spirit of prophecy, to his piety and uprightness, ranking him in this respect with Noah and Job: “Or if I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood, to cut off from it man and beast; though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness.” (Ezekiel 14:19, 20) His wisdom also, even at that early day, had become proverbial, as appears from the same writer. To the prince of Tyrus he was directed of the Lord to say, “Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee.” (Ezekiel 28:3) But above all, our Lord recognized him as a prophet of God, and bade his disciples understand the predictions given through him for the benefit of his church: “When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the

prophet, stand in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand), then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.” (Matthew 24:15, 16)

Though we have a more minute account of his early life than is recorded of that of any other prophet, yet his birth and lineage are left in complete obscurity, except that he was of the royal line, probably of the house of David, which had at this time become very numerous. He first appears as one of the noble captives of Judah, in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, at the commencement of the seventy years' captivity, B. C. 606. Jeremiah and Habakkuk were yet uttering their prophecies. Ezekiel commenced soon after, and a little later, Obadiah; but both these finished their work years before the close of the long and brilliant career of Daniel. Three prophets only succeeded him, Haggai and Zechariah, who exercised the prophetic office for a brief period contemporaneously, B. C. 520-518, and Malachi, the last of the Old-Testament prophets, who flourished a little season about B. C. 397.

During the seventy years' captivity of the Jews, B. C. 606-536, predicted by Jeremiah (Jer. 25:11), Daniel resided at the court of Babylon, most of the time prime minister of that brilliant monarchy. His life affords a most impressive lesson of the importance and advantage of maintaining from earliest youth strict integrity toward God, and furnishes a notable instance of a man's maintaining eminent piety, and faithfully discharging all the duties that pertain to the service of God, while at the same time engaging in the most stirring activities, and bearing the weightiest cares and responsibilities that can devolve upon men in this earthly life.

What a rebuke is his course to many at the present day, who, having not a hundredth part of the cares to absorb their time and engross their attention that he had, yet plead as an excuse for their almost utter neglect of Christian duties, that they have no time for them. What will the God of Daniel say to such, when he comes to reward his servants impartially, according to their improvement or neglect of the opportunities

offered them?

But it is not alone nor chiefly his connection with the Chaldean monarchy, the glory of kingdoms, that perpetuates the memory of Daniel, and covers his name with honor. From the height of its glory he saw that kingdom decline, and pass into other hands. Its period of greatest prosperity was embraced within the limits of the lifetime of one man. So brief was its supremacy, so transient its glory. But Daniel was intrusted with more enduring honors. While beloved and honored by the princes and potentates of Babylon, he enjoyed an infinitely higher exaltation, in being beloved and honored by God and his holy angels, and admitted to a knowledge of the counsels of the Most High.

His prophecy is, in many respects, the most remarkable of any in the sacred record. It is the most comprehensive. It was the first prophecy giving a consecutive history of the world from that time to the end. It located the most of its predictions within well-defined prophetic periods,

though reaching many centuries into the future. It gave the first definite chronological prophecy of the coming of the Messiah. It marked the time of this event so definitely that the Jews forbid any attempt to interpret its numbers, since that prophecy shows them to be without excuse in rejecting Christ; and so accurately had its minute and literal predictions been fulfilled down to the time of Porphyry, A. D. 250, that he declared (the only loophole he could devise for his hard-pressed skepticism) that the predictions were not written in the age of Babylon, but after the events themselves had transpired. This shift, however, is not now available; for every succeeding century has borne additional evidence to the truthfulness of the prophecy, and we are just now, in our own day, approaching the climax of its fulfilment.

The personal history of Daniel reaches to a date a few years subsequent to the subversion of the Babylonian kingdom by the Medes and Persians. He is supposed to have died at Shushan, or Susa, in Persia, about the year B. C. 530, aged nearly ninety-four years; his age being the probable

reason why he returned not to Judea with other Hebrew captives, under the proclamation of Cyrus (Ezra 1:1), B. C. 536, which marked the close of the seventy years' captivity.

Chapter 1

Daniel in Captivity

Verse 1. In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. 2. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God: which he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his god; and he brought the vessels into the treasure-house of his god.

With a directness characteristic of the sacred writers, Daniel enters at once upon his subject. He commences in the simple, historical style, his book, with the exception of a portion of chapter 2, being of a historical nature, till we reach the seventh chapter, when the prophetic portion, more properly so called, commences. Like one conscious of uttering only well-known truth, he proceeds at once to state a variety of particulars by which his accuracy could at once be tested. Thus, in the two verses quoted, he states five particulars purporting

to be historical facts, such as no writer would be likely to introduce into a fictitious narrative: (1) That Jehoiakim was king of Judah; (2) That Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon; (3) That the latter came against the former; (4) That this was in the third year of Jehoiakim's reign; and (5) That Jehoiakim was given into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, who took a portion of the sacred vessels of the house of God, and carrying them to the land of Shinar, the country of Babylon (Genesis 10:10), placed them in the treasure-house of his heathen divinity. Subsequent portions of the narrative abound as fully in historical facts of a like nature.

This overthrow of Jerusalem was predicted by Jeremiah, and immediately accomplished, B. C. 606. (Jeremiah 25:8-11) Jeremiah places this captivity in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Daniel in the third. This seeming discrepancy is explained by the fact that Nebuchadnezzar set out on his expedition near the close of the third year of Jehoiakim, from which point Daniel reckons. But he did not accomplish the subjugation of Jerusalem

till about the ninth month of the year following; and from this year Jeremiah reckons.[1] Jehoiakim, though bound for the purpose of being taken to Babylon, having humbled himself, was permitted to remain as ruler in Jerusalem, tributary to the king of Babylon.

This was the first time Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar. Twice subsequently, the city, having revolted, was captured by the same king, being more severely dealt with each succeeding time. Of these subsequent overthrows, the first was under Jehoiachin, son of Jehoiakim, B. C. 599, when all the sacred vessels were either taken or destroyed, and the best of the inhabitants, with the king, were led into captivity. The second was under Zedekiah, when the city endured the most formidable siege it ever sustained, except that by Titus, in A. D. 70. During the two years' continuance of this siege, the inhabitants of the city suffered all the horrors of extreme famine. At length, the garrison and king, attempting to escape from the city, were captured by the Chaldeans. The sons of the king were slain before his face. His

eyes were put out, and he was taken to Babylon; and thus was fulfilled the prediction of Ezekiel, who declared that he should be carried to Babylon, and die there, but yet should not see the place. (Ezekiel 12:13) The city and temple were at this time utterly destroyed, and the entire population of the city and country, with the exception of a few husbandmen, were carried captive to Babylon, B. C. 588.

Such was God's passing testimony against sin. Not that the Chaldeans were the favorites of Heaven, but God made use of them to punish the iniquities of his people. Had the Israelites been faithful to God, and kept his Sabbath, Jerusalem would have stood forever. (Jeremiah 17:24-27) But they departed from him, and he abandoned them. They first profaned the sacred vessels by sin, in introducing heathen idols among them; and he then profaned them by judgments, in letting them go as trophies into heathen temples abroad.

During these days of trouble and distress upon Jerusalem, Daniel and his companions were

nourished and instructed in the palace of the king of Babylon; and, though captives in a strange land, they were doubtless in some respects much more favorably situated than they could have been in their native country.

Verse 3. And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; 4. Children in whom was no blemish, but well-favored, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans. 5. And the king appointed them a daily provision of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank; so nourishing them three years, that at the end thereof they might stand before the king.

We have in these verses the record of the probable fulfillment of the announcement of coming judgments made to King Hezekiah by the

prophet Isaiah, more than a hundred years before. When this king had vaingloriously shown to the messengers of the king of Babylon all the treasures and holy things of his palace and kingdom, he was told that all these good things should be carried as trophies to the city of Babylon, and nothing should be left; and that even his own children, his descendants, should be taken away, and be eunuchs in the palace of the king there. (2 Kings 20:14-18) It is probable that Daniel and his companions were treated as indicated in the prophecy; at least we hear nothing of their posterity, which can be more easily accounted for on this hypothesis than on any other; though some think that the term eunuch had come to signify office rather than condition.

The word children, as applied to these captives, is not to be confined to the sense to which it is limited at the present time. It included youth also. And we learn from the record that these children were already skilful in all wisdom, cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and had ability in them to stand in the king's palace. In other words, they had already acquired a good

degree of education, and their physical and mental powers were so far developed that a skilful reader of human nature could form quite an accurate estimate of their capabilities. They are supposed to have been about eighteen or twenty years of age.

In the treatment which these Hebrew captives received, we see an instance of the wise policy and the liberality of the rising king, Nebuchadnezzar.

1. Instead of choosing, like too many kings of later times, means for the gratification of low and base desires, he chose young men who should be educated in all matters pertaining to the kingdom, that he might have efficient help in administering its affairs.

2. He appointed them daily provision of his own meat and wine. Instead of the coarse fare which some would have thought good enough for captives, he offered them his own royal viands.

For the space of three years, they had all the advantages the kingdom afforded. Though

captives, they were royal children, and they were treated as such by the humane king of the Chaldeans.

The question may be raised, why these persons were selected after suitable preparation, to take part in the affairs of the kingdom. Were there not enough native Babylonians to fill these positions of trust and honor? It could have been for no other reason than that the Chaldean youth could not compete with those of Israel in the qualifications, both mental and physical, necessary to such a position.

Verse 6. Now among these were of the children of Judah, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah: 7. Unto whom the prince of the eunuchs gave names; for he gave unto Daniel the name of Belteshazzar; and to Hananiah, of Shadrach; and to Mishael, of Meshach; and to Azariah, of Abed-nego.

This change of names was probably made on account of the signification of the words. Thus,

Daniel signified, in the Hebrew, God is my judge; Hananiah, gift of the Lord; Mishael, he that is a strong God; and Azariah, help of the Lord. These names each having some reference to the true God, and signifying some connection with his worship, were changed to names the definition of which bore a like relation to the heathen divinities and worship of the Chaldeans. Thus Belteshazzar, the name given to Daniel, signified keeper of the hid treasures of Bel; Shadrach, inspiration of the sun (which the Chaldeans worshiped); Meshach, of the goddess Shaca (under which name Venus was worshiped); and Abed-nego, servant of the shining fire (which they also worshiped).

Verse 8. But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank; therefore he requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself. 9. Now God had brought Daniel into favor and tender love with the prince of the eunuchs. 10. And the prince of the eunuchs said unto Daniel, I fear my lord the king, who hath appointed

your meat and your drink; for why should he see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort? then shall ye make me endanger my head to the king. 11. Then said Daniel to Melzar, whom the prince of the eunuchs had set over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, 12. Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink. 13. Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the children that eat of the portion of the king's meat; and as thou seest, deal with thy servants. 14. So he consented to them in this matter, and proved them ten days. 15. And at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat. 16. Thus Melzar took away the portion of their meat, and the wine that they should drink; and gave them pulse.

Nebuchadnezzar appears upon this record wonderfully free from bigotry. It seems that he took no means to compel his royal captives to

change their religion. Provided they had some religion, he seemed to be satisfied, whether it was the religion he professed or not. And although their names had been changed to signify some connection with heathen worship, this may have been more to avoid the use of Jewish names by the Chaldeans than to indicate any change of sentiment or practice on the part of those to whom these names were given.

Daniel purposed not to defile himself with the king's meat nor with his wine. Daniel had other reasons for this course than simply the effect of such a diet upon his physical system, though he would derive great advantage in this respect from the fare he proposed to adopt. But it was frequently the case that the meat used by the kings and princes of heathen nations, who were often the high priests of their religion, was first offered in sacrifice to idols, and the wine they used, poured out as a libation before them; and again, some of the meat of which they made use, was pronounced unclean by the Jewish law; and on either of these grounds Daniel could not, consistently with his religion,

partake of these articles; hence he requested, not from any morose or sullen temper, but from conscientious scruples, that he might not be obliged to defile himself; and he respectfully made his request known to the proper officer. The prince of the eunuchs feared to grant Daniel's request, since the king himself had appointed their meat. This shows the great personal interest the king took in these persons. He did not commit them to the hands of his servants, telling them to care for them in the best manner, without himself entering into its details; but he himself appointed their meat and drink. And this was of a kind which it was honestly supposed would be best for them, inasmuch as the prince of the eunuchs thought that a departure from it would render them poorer in flesh and less ruddy of countenance than those who continued it; and thus he would be brought to account for neglect or ill-treatment of them, and so lose his head. Yet it was equally well understood that if they maintained good physical conditions, the king would take no exception to the means used, though it might be contrary to his own express direction. It appears that the king's sincere object was to secure in them,

by whatever means it could be done, the very best mental and physical development that could be attained. How different this from the bigotry and tyranny which usually hold supreme control over the hearts of those who are clothed with absolute power. In the character of Nebuchadnezzar we shall find many things worthy of our highest admiration.

Daniel requested pulse and water for himself and his three companions. Pulse is a vegetable food of the leguminous kind, like peas, beans, etc. Bagster says, “Zeroim denotes all leguminous plants, which are not reaped, but pulled or plucked, which, however wholesome, were not naturally calculated to render them fatter in flesh than the others.”

A ten days’ trial of this diet resulting favorably, they were permitted to continue it during the whole course of their training for the duties of the palace. Their increase in flesh and improvement in countenance which took place during these ten days, can hardly be attributed to the natural result

of the diet; for it would hardly produce such marked effects in so short a time. Is it not much more natural to conclude that this result was produced by a special interposition of the Lord, as a token of his approbation of the course on which they had entered, which course, if persevered in, would in process of time lead to the same result through the natural operation of the laws of their being?

Verse 17. As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom; and Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams. 18. Now at the end of the days that the king had said he should bring them in, then the prince of the eunuchs brought them in before Nebuchadnezzar. 19. And the king communed with them; and among them all was found none like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah; therefore stood they before the king. 20. And in all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king required of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his

realm. 21. And Daniel continued even unto the first year of king Cyrus.

To Daniel alone seems to have been committed an understanding in visions and dreams. But the Lord's dealing with Daniel in this respect does not prove the others any the less accepted in his sight. Preservation in the midst of the fiery furnace was as good evidence of the divine favor as they could have had. Daniel probably had some natural qualifications that peculiarly fitted him for this special work.

The same personal interest in these individuals heretofore manifested by the king, he still continued to maintain. At the end of the three years, he called them to a personal interview. He must know for himself how they had fared, and what proficiency they had made. This interview also shows the king to have been a man well versed in all the arts and sciences of the Chaldeans, else he would not have been qualified to examine others therein. As the result, recognizing merit wherever he saw it, without respect to religion or nationality,

he acknowledged them to be ten times superior to any in his own land.

And it is added that Daniel continued even unto the first year of King Cyrus. This is an instance of the somewhat singular use of the word unto, or until, which occasionally occurs in the sacred writings. It does not mean that he continued no longer than to the first year of Cyrus, for he lived some years after the commencement of his reign; but this is the time to which the writer wished to direct especial attention, as it brought deliverance to the captive Jews. A similar use of the word is found in Psalms 112:8 and Matthew 5:18.

Note:

1. Prideaux, Vol. I, pp. 99, 100.

Chapter 2

The Great Image

Verse 1. And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him.

Daniel was carried into captivity in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar. For three years he was placed under instructors, during which time he would not, of course, be reckoned among the wise men of the kingdom, nor take part in public affairs. Yet in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, the transactions recorded in this chapter took place. How, then, could Daniel be brought in to interpret the king's dream in his second year? The explanation lies in the fact that Nebuchadnezzar reigned for two years conjointly with his father, Nabopolassar. From this point the Jews reckoned, while the Chaldeans reckoned from the time he commenced to reign alone, on the death of his father. Hence, the year here mentioned was the

second year of his reign according to the Chaldean reckoning, but the fourth according to the Jewish. It thus appears that the very next year after Daniel had completed his preparation to participate in the affairs of the Chaldean empire, the providence of God brought him into sudden and wonderful notoriety throughout all the kingdom.

Verse 2. Then the king commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king.

The magicians were such as practiced magic, using the term in its bad sense; that is, they practiced all the superstitious rites and ceremonies of fortune-tellers, casters of nativities, etc. Astrologers were men who pretended to foretell future events by the study of the stars. The science, or the superstition, of astrology was extensively cultivated by the Eastern nations of antiquity. Sorcerers were such as pretended to hold communication with the dead. In this sense, we

believe, it is always used in the Scriptures. Modern Spiritualism is simply ancient heathen sorcery revived. The Chaldeans here mentioned were a sect of philosophers similar to the magicians and astrologers, who made physic, divinations, etc., their study. All these sects or professions abounded in Babylon. The end aimed at by each was the same; namely, the explaining of mysteries and the foretelling of future events, the principal difference between them being the means by which they sought to accomplish their object. The king's difficulty lay equally within the province of each to explain; hence he summoned them all. With the king it was an important matter. He was greatly troubled, and therefore concentrated upon the solution of his perplexity the whole wisdom of his realm.

Verse 3. And the king said unto them, I have dreamed a dream, and my spirit was troubled to know the dream. 4. Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriack, O King, live forever; tell thy servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation.

Whatever else the ancient magicians and astrologers may have been deficient in, they seem to have been thoroughly schooled in the art of drawing out sufficient information to form a basis for some shrewd calculation, or of framing their answers in so ambiguous a manner that they would be equally applicable, let the event turn either way. In the present case, true to their cunning instincts, they called upon the king to make known to them his dream. If they could get full information respecting this, they could easily agree on some interpretation which would not endanger their reputation. They addressed themselves to the king in Syriac, a dialect of the Chaldean language which was used by the educated and cultured classes. From this point to the end of chapter 7, the record continues in Chaldaic.

Verse 5. The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me; if ye will not make known unto me the dream, with the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill. 6. But

if ye show the dream, and the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honor; therefore show me the dream, and the interpretation thereof. 7. They answered again and said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation of it. 8. The king answered and said, I know of certainty that ye would gain the time, because ye see the thing is gone from me. 9. But if ye will not make known unto me the dream, there is but one decree for you; for ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me, till the time be changed; therefore tell me the dream, and I shall know that ye can show me the interpretation thereof. 10. The Chaldeans answered before the king, and said, There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter; therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked such things at any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean. 11. And it is a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh. 12. For this cause the king was angry and very

furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon. 13. And the decree went forth that the wise men should be slain; and they sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain.

These verses contain the record of the desperate struggle between the wise men, so called, and the king; the former seeking some avenue of escape, seeing they were caught on their own ground, and the latter determined that they should make known his dream, which was no more than their profession would warrant him in demanding. Some have severely censured Nebuchadnezzar in this matter, as acting the part of a heartless, unreasonable tyrant. But what did these magicians profess to be able to do?--To reveal hidden things; to foretell future events; to make known mysteries entirely beyond human foresight and penetration; and to do this by the aid of supernatural agencies. If, then, their claim was worth anything, could they not make known to the king what he had dreamed?--They certainly could. And if they were able, knowing the dream, to give a reliable interpretation thereof, would they not also be able to make

known the dream itself when it had gone from the king?--Certainly, if there was any virtue in their pretended intercourse with the other world. There was therefore nothing unjust in Nebuchadnezzar's demand that they should make known his dream. And when they declared (verse 11) that none but the gods whose dwelling was not with flesh could make known the king's matter, it was a tacit acknowledgment that they had no communication with these gods, and knew nothing beyond what human wisdom and discernment could reveal. For this cause, the king was angry and very furious. He saw that he and all his people were being made the victims of deception. He accused them (verse 9) of endeavoring to dally along till the "time be changed," or till the matter had so passed from his mind that his anger at their duplicity should abate, and he would either recall the dream himself, or be unsolicitous whether it were made known and interpreted or not. And while we cannot justify the extreme measures to which he resorted, dooming them to death, and their houses to destruction, we can but feel a hearty sympathy with him in his condemnation of a class of miserable impostors.

The severity of his sentence was probably attributable more to the customs of those times than to any malignity on the part of the king. Yet it was a bold and desperate step. Consider who these were who thus incurred the wrath of the king. They were numerous, opulent, and influential sects. Moreover, they were the learned and cultivated classes of those times; yet the king was not so wedded to his false religion as to spare it even with all this influence in its favor. If the system was one of fraud and imposition, it must fall, however high its votaries might stand in numbers or position, or however many of them might be involved in its ruin. The king would be no party to dishonesty or deception.

Verse 14. Then Daniel answered with counsel and wisdom to Arioch the captain of the king's guard, which was gone forth to slay the wise men of Babylon. 15. He answered and said to Arioch the king's captain, Why is the decree so hasty from the king? Then Arioch made the thing known to Daniel. 16. Then Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him

time, and that he would show the king the interpretation. 17. Then Daniel went to his house, and made the thing known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his companions; 18. That they would desire mercies of the God of heaven concerning this secret; that Daniel and his fellows should not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon.

In this narrative we see the providence of God working in several remarkable particulars.

1. It was providential that the dream of the king should leave such a powerful impression upon his mind as to raise him to the greatest height of anxiety, and yet the thing itself be held from his recollection. This led to the complete exposure of the false system of the magicians and other pagan teachers; for when put to the test to make known the dream, it was found that they were unable to do what their profession made it incumbent on them to do.

2. It was remarkable that Daniel and his

companions, so lately pronounced by the king ten times better than all his magicians and astrologers, should not sooner have been consulted, or, rather, should not have been consulted at all, in this matter. But there was a providence in this. Just as the dream was held from the king, so he was unaccountably held from appealing to Daniel for a solution of the mystery. For had he called on Daniel at first, and had he at once made known the matter, the magicians would not have been brought to the test. But God would give the heathen systems of the Chaldeans the first chance. He would let them try, and ignominiously fail, and confess their utter incompetency, even under the penalty of death, that they might be the better prepared to acknowledge his hand when he should finally reach it down in behalf of his captive servants, and for the honor of his own name.

3. It appears that the first intimation Daniel had of the matter was the presence of the executioners, come for his arrest. His own life being thus at stake, he would be led to seek the Lord with all his heart till he should work for their deliverance.

Daniel gains his request of the king for time to consider the matter,--a privilege which probably none of the magicians could have secured, as the king had already accused them of preparing lying and corrupt words, and of seeking to gain time for this very purpose. Daniel at once went to his three companions, and engaged them to unite with him in desiring mercy of the God of heaven concerning this secret. He could have prayed alone, and doubtless would have been heard; but then, as now, in the union of God's people there is prevailing power; and the promise of the accomplishment of that which is asked, is to the two or three who shall agree concerning it. (Matthew 18:20)

Verse 19. Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven. 20. Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are his; 21. And he changeth the times and the seasons; he removeth kings, and setteth up kings; he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding, 22. He revealeth the

deep and secret things; he knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him. 23. I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee; for thou hast now made known unto us the king's matter.

Whether or not the answer came while Daniel and his companions were yet offering up their petitions, we are not informed. If it did, it shows their importunity in the matter; for it was through a night vision that God revealed himself in their behalf, which would show that they continued their supplications, as might reasonably be inferred, far into the night, and ceased not till the answer was obtained. Or, if their season of prayer had closed, and God at a subsequent time sent the answer, it would show us that, as is sometimes the case, prayers are not unavailing though not immediately answered. Some think the matter was made known to Daniel by his dreaming the same dream that Nebuchadnezzar had dreamed; but Matthew Henry considers it more probable that “when he was

awake, and continuing instant in prayer, and watching in the same, the dream itself and the interpretation of it were communicated to him by the ministry of an angel, abundantly to his satisfaction.” The words, “night vision,” mean anything that is seen, whether through dreams or visions.

Daniel immediately offered up praise to God for his gracious dealing with them; and while his prayer is not preserved, his responsive thanksgiving is fully recorded. God is honored by our rendering him praise for the things he has done for us, as well as by our acknowledging through prayer our need of his help. Let Daniel’s course be our example in this respect. Let no mercy from the hand of God fail of its due return of thanksgiving and praise. Were not ten lepers cleansed? “But where,” asks Christ sorrowfully, “are the nine?” (Luke 17:17)

Daniel had the utmost confidence in what had been shown him. He did not first go to the king, to see if what had been revealed to him was indeed

the king's dream; but he immediately praised God for having answered his prayer.

Although the matter was revealed to Daniel, he did not take honor to himself as though it were by his prayers alone that this thing had been obtained, but immediately associated his companions with himself, and acknowledged it to be as much an answer to their prayers as to his own. It was, said he, "what we desired of thee," and thou hast made it "known unto us."

Verse 24. Therefore Daniel went in unto Arioch, whom the king had ordained to destroy the wise men of Babylon; he went and said thus unto him: Destroy not the wise men of Babylon; bring me in before the king, and I will show unto the king the interpretation.

Daniel's first plea is for the wise men of Babylon. Destroy them not, for the king's secret is revealed. True, it was through no merit of theirs or their heathen systems of divination that this revelation was made; they were worthy of just as

much condemnation as before. But their own confession of utter impotence in the matter was humiliation enough for them, and Daniel was anxious that they should so far partake of the benefits shown to him as to have their own lives spared. Thus they were saved because there was a man of God among them. And thus it ever is. For the sake of Paul and Silas, all the prisoners with them were loosed. Acts 16:26. For the sake of Paul, the lives of all that sailed with him were saved. Chapter 27:24. Thus the wicked are benefited by the presence of the righteous. Well would it be if they would remember the obligations under which they are thus placed. What saves the world to-day? For whose sake is it still spared?--For the sake of the few righteous persons who are yet left. Remove these, and how long would the wicked be suffered to run their guilty career?--No longer than the antediluvians were suffered, after Noah had entered the ark, or the Sodomites, after Lot had departed from their polluted and polluting presence. If only ten righteous persons could have been found in Sodom, the multitude of its wicked inhabitants would, for their sakes, have been spared. Yet the

wicked will despise, ridicule, and oppress the very ones on whose account it is that they are still permitted the enjoyment of life and all its blessings.

Verse 25. Then Arioch brought in Daniel before the king in haste, and said thus unto him, I have found a man of the captives of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation.

It is ever a characteristic of ministers and courtiers to ingratiate themselves with their sovereign. So here Arioch represented that he had found a man who could make known the desired interpretation; as though with great disinterestedness, in behalf of the king, he had been searching for some one to solve his difficulty, and had at last found him. In order to see through this deception of his chief executioner, the king had but to remember, as he probably did, his interview with Daniel (verse 16), and Daniel's promise, if time could be granted, to show the interpretation thereof.

Verse 26. The king answered and said to Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, Art thou able to make known unto me the dream which I have seen, and the interpretation thereof? 27. Daniel answered in the presence of the king, and said, The secret which the king hath demanded cannot the wise men, the astrologers, the magicians, the soothsayers, show unto the king; 28. But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these.

Art thou able to make known the dream? was the king's doubtful salutation to Daniel, as he came into his presence. Notwithstanding his previous acquaintance with Daniel, the king seems to have questioned his ability, so young and inexperienced, to make known a matter in which the aged and venerable magicians and soothsayers had utterly failed. Daniel declared plainly that the wise men, the astrologers, the soothsayers, and the magicians

could not make known this secret. It was beyond their power. Therefore the king should not be angry with them, nor put confidence in their inefficient superstitions. He then proceeds to make known the true God, who rules in heaven, and is the only revealer of secrets. And he it is, says Daniel, who maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days.

Verse 29. As for thee, O king, thy thoughts came into thy mind upon thy bed, what should come to pass hereafter; and he that revealeth secrets maketh known to thee what shall come to pass. 30. But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living, but for their sakes that shall make known the interpretation to the king, and that thou mightest know the thoughts of thy heart.

Here is brought out another of the commendable traits of Nebuchadnezzar's character. Unlike some rulers, who fill up the present with folly and debauchery without regard

to the future, he thought forward upon the days to come, with an anxious desire to know with what events they should be filled. His object in this was, doubtless, that he might the better know how to make a wise improvement of the present. For this reason God gave him this dream, which we must regard as a token of the divine favor toward the king, as there were many other ways in which the truth involved in this matter could have been brought out, equally to the honor of God's name, and the good of his people both at that time and through subsequent generations. Yet God would not work for the king independently of his own people; hence, though he gave the dream to the king, he sent the interpretation through one of his own acknowledged servants. Daniel first disclaimed all credit for himself in the transaction, and then to modify somewhat the feelings of pride which it would have been natural for the king to have, in view of being thus noticed by the God of heaven, he informed him indirectly, that, although the dream had been given to him, it was not for his sake altogether that the interpretation was sent, but for their sakes through whom it should be made

known. Ah! God had some servants there, and it was for them that he was working. They are of more value in his sight than the mightiest kings and potentates of earth. Had it not been for them, the king would never have had the interpretation of his dream, probably not even the dream itself. Thus, when traced to their source, all favors, upon whomsoever bestowed, are found to be due to the regard which God has for his own children. How comprehensive was the work of God in this instance. By this one act of revealing the king's dream to Daniel, he accomplished the following objects: (1) He made known to the king the things he desired; (2) He saved his servants who trusted in him; (3) He brought conspicuously before the Chaldean nation the knowledge of the true God; (4) He poured contempt on the false systems of the soothsayers and magicians; and (5) He honored his own name, and exalted his servants in their eyes.

Verse 31. Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. 32. This image's head was

of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, 33. His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. 34. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. 35. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.

Nebuchadnezzar, practicing the Chaldean religion, was an idolator. An image was an object which would at once command his attention and respect. Moreover, earthly kingdoms, which, as we shall hereafter see, were represented by this image, were objects of esteem and value in his eyes. With a mind unenlightened by the light of revelation, he was unprepared to put a true estimate upon earthly wealth and glory, and to look upon earthly governments in their true light. Hence the striking

harmony between the estimate which he put upon these things, and the object by which they were symbolized before him. To him, they were presented under the form of a great image, an object in his eyes of worth and admiration. With Daniel the case was far different. He was able to view in its true light all greatness and glory not built on the favor and approbation of God; and therefore to him these same earthly kingdoms were afterward shown (see chapter 7) under the form of cruel and ravenous wild beasts.

But how admirably adapted was this representation to convey a great and needful truth to the mind of Nebuchadnezzar. Besides delineating the progress of events through the whole course of time for the benefit of his people, God would show Nebuchadnezzar the utter emptiness and worthlessness of earthly pomp and glory. And how could this be more impressively done than by an image commencing with the most precious of metals, and continually descending to the baser, till we finally have the coarsest and crudest of materials,--iron mingled with the miry

clay,--the whole then dashed to pieces, and made like the empty chaff, no good thing in it, but altogether lighter than vanity, and finally blown away where no place could be found for it, after which something durable and of heavenly worth occupies its place? So would God show to the children of men that earthly kingdoms were to pass away, and earthly greatness and glory, like a gaudy bubble, would break and vanish; and the kingdom of God, in the place so long usurped by these, should be set up, to have no end, and all who had an interest therein should rest under the shadow of its peaceful wings forever and ever. But this is anticipating.

Verse 36. This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. 37. Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. 38. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold.

Now opens one of the sublimest chapters of human history. Eight short verses of the inspired record tell the whole story; yet that story embraces the history of this world's pomp and power. A few moments will suffice to commit it to memory, yet the period which it covers, commencing more than twenty-five centuries ago, reaches on from that far-distant point past the rise and fall of kingdoms, past the setting up and overthrow of empires, past cycles and ages, past our own day, over into the eternal state. It is so comprehensive that it embraces all this; yet it is so minute that it gives us all the great outlines of earthly kingdoms from that time to this. Human wisdom never devised so brief a record which embraced so much. Human language never set forth in so few words, so great a volume of historical truth. The finger of God is here. Let us heed the lesson well.

With what interest, as well as astonishment, must the king have listened, as he was informed by the prophet that he, or rather his kingdom, the king being here put for his kingdom (see the following

verse), was the golden head of the magnificent image which he had seen. Ancient kings were grateful for success; and in cases of prosperity, the tutelar deity to whom they attributed their success, was the adorable object upon which they would lavish their richest treasures and bestow their best devotions. Daniel indirectly informs the king that in his case all these are due to the God of heaven, since he is the one who has given him his kingdom, and made him ruler over all. This would restrain him from the pride of thinking that he had attained his position by his own power and wisdom, and would enlist the gratitude of his heart toward the true God.

The kingdom of Babylon, which finally developed into the golden head of this great historic image, was founded by Nimrod, the great-grandson of Noah, over two thousand years before Christ. Genesis 10:8-10: “And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel

[margin, Babylon], and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar.” It appears that Nimrod also founded the city of Nineveh, which afterward became the capital of Syria. (See marginal reading of Genesis 10:11, and Johnson’s Cyclopaedia, art. Syria.) The following sketch of the history of Babylon, from Johnson’s Universal Cyclopaedia, art. Babylon, is according to the latest authorities on this subject:--

“About 1270 B. C., the Assyrian kings became masters of Chaldea, or Babylonia, of which Babylon was the capital. This country was afterward ruled by an Assyrian dynasty of kings, who reigned at Babylon, and sometimes waged war against those who reigned in Assyria proper. At other times the kings of Babylon were tributary to those of Assyria. Several centuries elapsed in which the history of Babylon is almost a blank. In the time of Tiglath-pileser of Assyria, Nabonassar ascended the throne of Babylon in 747 B. C. He is celebrated for the chronological era which bears his name, and which began in 747 B. C. About 720 Merodach-baladan became king of Babylon, and

sent ambassadors to Hezekiah, king of Judah (see 2 Kings 20, and Isaiah 39). A few years later, Sargon, king of Assyria, defeated and dethroned Merodach-baladan. Sennacherib completed the subjection of Babylon, which he annexed to the Assyrian empire about 690 B. C. The conquest of Nineveh and the subversion of the Assyrian empire, which was effected about 625 B. C., by Cyaxeres the Mede, and his ally Nabopolassar, the rebellious governor of Babylon, enabled the latter to found the Babylonian empire, which was the fourth of Rawlinson's 'Five Great Monarchies,' and included the valley of the Euphrates, Susiana, Syria, and Palestine. His reign lasted about twenty-one years, and was probably pacific, as the history of it is nearly a blank; but in 605 B. C. his army defeated Neco, king of Egypt, who had invaded Syria. He was succeeded by his more famous son, Nebuchadnezzar (604 B. C.), who was the greatest of the kings of Babylon."

Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the first year of his reign, and third year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah (Daniel 1:1), B. C. 606.

Nebuchadnezzar reigned two years conjointly with his father, Nabopolassar. From this point the Jews computed his reign, but the Chaldeans from the date of his sole reign, 604 B. C., as stated above. Respecting the successors of Nebuchadnezzar, the authority above quoted adds:--

“He died in 561 B. C., and was succeeded by his son Evil-merodach who reigned only two years. Nabonadius (or Labynetus), who became king in 555 B. C., formed an alliance with Croesus against Cyrus the Great. He appears to have shared the royal power with his son, Belshazzar, whose mother was a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar. Cyrus besieged Babylon, which he took by stratagem in 538 B. C., and with the death of Belshazzar, whom the Persians killed, the kingdom of Babylon ceased to exist.”

When we say that the image of Daniel 2 symbolizes the four great prophetic universal monarchies, and reckon Babylon as the first of these, it is asked how this can be true, when every country in the world was not absolutely under the

dominion of any one of them. Thus Babylon never conquered Grecia or Rome; but Rome was founded before Babylon had risen to the zenith of its power. Rome's position and influence, however, were then altogether prospective; and it is nothing against the prophecy, that God begins to prepare his agents long years before they enter upon the prominent part they are to perform in the fulfillment of prophecy. We must place ourselves with the prophet, and view these kingdoms from the same standpoint. We shall then, as is right, consider his statements in the light of the location he occupied, the time in which he wrote, and the circumstances by which he was surrounded. It is a manifest rule of interpretation that we may look for nations to be noticed in prophecy when they become so far connected with the people of God that mention of them becomes necessary to make the records of sacred history complete. When this was the case with Babylon, it was, from the standpoint of the prophet, the great and overtowering object in the political world. In his eye, it necessarily eclipsed all else; and he would naturally speak of it as a kingdom having rule over all the earth. So far as

we know, all provinces or countries against which Babylon did move in the height of its power, were subdued by its arms. In this sense, all were in its power; and this fact will explain the somewhat hyperbolic language of verse 38. That there were some portions of territory and considerable numbers of people unknown to history, and outside the pale of civilization as it then existed, which were neither discovered nor subdued, is not a fact of sufficient strength or importance to condemn the expression of the prophet, or to falsify the prophecy.

In 606 B. C. Babylon came in contact with the people of God, when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem and led Judah into captivity. It comes at this point, consequently, into the field of prophecy, at the end of the Jewish theocracy.

The character of this empire is indicated by the nature of the material composing that portion of the image by which it was symbolized--the head of gold. It was the golden kingdom of a golden age. Babylon, its metropolis, towered to a height never

reached by any of its successors. Situated in the garden of the East; laid out in a perfect square sixty miles in circumference, fifteen miles on each side; surrounded by a wall three hundred and fifty feet high and eighty-seven feet thick, with a moat, or ditch, around this, of equal cubic capacity with the wall itself; divided into six hundred and seventy-six squares, each two and a quarter miles in circumference, by its fifty streets, each one hundred and fifty feet in width, crossing each other at right angles, twenty-five running each way, every one of them straight and level and fifteen miles in length; its two hundred and twenty-five square miles of inclosed surface, divided as just described, laid out in luxuriant pleasure-grounds and gardens, interspersed with magnificent dwellings,--this city, with its sixty miles of moat, its sixty miles of outer wall, its thirty miles of river wall through its center, its hundred and fifty gates of solid brass, its hanging gardens, rising terrace above terrace, till they equaled in height the walls themselves, its temple of Belus, three miles in circumference, its two royal palaces, one three and a half, and the other eight miles in circumference,

with its subterranean tunnel under the River Euphrates connecting these two palaces, its perfect arrangements for convenience, ornament, and defense, and its unlimited resources,--this city, containing in itself many things which were themselves wonders of the world, was itself another and still mightier wonder. Never before saw the earth a city like that; never since has it seen its equal. And there, with the whole earth prostrate at her feet, a queen in peerless grandeur, drawing from the pen of inspiration itself this glowing title, "The glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," sat this city, fit capital of that kingdom which constituted the golden head of this great historic image.

Such was Babylon, with Nebuchadnezzar, in the prime of life, bold, vigorous, and accomplished, seated upon its throne, when Daniel entered its impregnable walls to serve a captive for seventy years in its gorgeous palaces. There the children of the Lord, oppressed more than cheered by the glory and prosperity of the land of their captivity, hung their harps on the willows of the sparkling

Euphrates, and wept when they remembered Zion.

And there commenced the captive state of the church in a still broader sense; for, ever since that time, the people of God have been in subjection to, and more or less oppressed by, earthly powers. And so they will be, till all earthly powers shall finally yield to Him whose right it is to reign. And lo! the day of deliverance draws on apace.

Into another city, not only Daniel, but all the children of God, from least to greatest, from lowest to highest, from first to last, are soon to enter; a city not merely sixty miles in circumference, but fifteen hundred miles; a city whose walls are not brick and bitumen, but precious stones and jasper; whose streets are not the stone-paved streets of Babylon, smooth and beautiful as they were, but transparent gold; whose river is not the mournful waters of the Euphrates, but the river of life; whose music is not the sighs and laments of broken-hearted captives, but the thrilling paeans of victory over death and the grave, which ransomed multitudes shall raise; whose light is not the

intermittent light of earth, but the unceasing and ineffable glory of God and the Lamb. Into this city they shall enter, not as captives entering a foreign land, but as exiles returning to their father's house; not as to a place where such chilling words as "bondage," "servitude," and "oppression," shall weigh down their spirits, but to one where the sweet words, "home," "freedom," "peace," "purity," "unutterable bliss," and "unending life," shall thrill their bosoms with delight forever and ever. Yea; our mouths shall be filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing, when the Lord shall turn again the captivity of Zion. (Psalms 126:1, 2; Revelation 21:1-27)

Verse 39. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth.

Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-three years, and was succeeded by the following rulers: His son, Evil-merodach, two years; Neriglissar, his son-in-law, four years; Laborosoarchod, Neriglissar's son,

nine months, which, being less than one year, is not counted in the canon of Ptolemy; and lastly, Nabonadius, whose son, Belshazzar, grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, was associated with him on the throne, and with whom that kingdom came to an end.

In the first year of Neriglissar, only two years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, broke out that fatal war between the Babylonians and the Medes, which was to result in the utter subversion of the Babylonian kingdom. Cyaxeres, king of the Medes, who is called “Darius” in Daniel 5:31, summoned to his aid his nephew, Cyrus, of the Persian line, in his efforts against the Babylonians. The war was prosecuted with uninterrupted success on the part of the Medes and Persians, until, in the eighteenth year of Nabonadius (the third year of his son Belshazzar), Cyrus laid siege to Babylon, the only city in all the East which then held out against him. The Babylonians, gathered within their impregnable walls, with provision on hand for twenty years, and land within the limits of their broad city sufficient to furnish food for the

inhabitants and garrison for an indefinite period, scoffed at Cyrus from their lofty walls, and derided his seemingly useless efforts to bring them into subjection. And according to all human calculation, they had good ground for their feelings of security. Never, weighed in the balance of any earthly probability, with the means of warfare then known, could that city be taken. Hence, they breathed as freely and slept as soundly as though no foe were waiting and watching for their destruction around their beleaguered walls. But God had decreed that the proud and wicked city should come down from her throne of glory; and when he speaks, what mortal arm can defeat his word?

In their very feeling of security lay the source of their danger. Cyrus resolved to accomplish by stratagem what he could not effect by force; and learning of the approach of an annual festival, in which the whole city would be given up to mirth and revelry, he fixed upon that day as the time to carry his purpose into execution. There was no entrance for him into that city except he could find it where the River Euphrates entered and emerged,

passing under its walls. He resolved to make the channel of the river his own highway into the stronghold of his enemy. To do this, the water must be turned aside from its channel through the city. For this purpose, on the evening of the feast-day above referred to, he detailed three bodies of soldiers, the first, to turn the river at a given hour into a large artificial lake a short distance above the city; the second, to take their station at the point where the river entered the city; the third, to take a position fifteen miles below, where the river emerged from the city; and these two latter parties were instructed to enter the channel, just as soon as they found the river fordable, and in the darkness of the night explore their way beneath the walls, and press on to the palace of the king, where they were to meet, surprise the palace, slay the guards, and capture or slay the king. When the water was turned into the lake mentioned above, the river soon became fordable, and the soldiers detailed for that purpose followed its channel into the heart of the city of Babylon.

But all this would have been in vain, had not

the whole city, on that eventful night, given themselves over to the most reckless carelessness and presumption, a state of things upon which Cyrus calculated largely for the carrying out of his purpose. For on each side of the river, through the entire length of the city, were walls of great height, and of equal thickness with the outer walls. In these walls were huge gates of solid brass, which, when closed and guarded, debarred all entrance from the river bed to any and all of the twenty-five streets that crossed the river; and had they been thus closed at this time, the soldiers of Cyrus might have marched into the city along the river bed, and then marched out again, for all that they would have been able to accomplish toward the subjugation of the place. But in the drunken revelry of that fatal night, these river gates were all left open, and the entrance of the Persian soldiers was not perceived. Many a cheek would have paled with terror, had they noticed the sudden going down of the river, and understood its fearful import. Many a tongue would have spread wild alarm through the city, had they seen the dark forms of their armed foe stealthily threading their

way to the citadel of their strength. But no one noticed the sudden subsidence of the waters of the river; no one saw the entrance of the Persian warriors; no one took care that the river gates should be closed and guarded; no one cared for aught but to see how deeply and recklessly he could plunge into the wild debauch. That night's work cost them their kingdom and their freedom. They went into their brutish revelry subjects of the king of Babylon; they awoke from it slaves to the king of Persia.

The soldiers of Cyrus first made known their presence in the city by falling upon the royal guards in the very vestibule of the palace of the king. Belshazzar soon became aware of the cause of the disturbance, and died vainly fighting for his imperiled life. This feast of Belshazzar is described in the fifth chapter of Daniel; and the scene closes with the simple record, "In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old."

Thus the first division of the great image was completed. Another kingdom had arisen, as the prophet had declared. The first instalment of the prophetic dream was fulfilled.

But before we take leave of Babylon, let us glance forward to the end of its thenceforth melancholy history. It would naturally be supposed that the conqueror, becoming possessed of so noble a city, far surpassing anything in the world, would have taken it as the seat of his empire, and maintained it in its primitive splendor. But God had said that that city should become a heap, and the habitation of the beasts of the desert; that their houses should be full of doleful creatures; that the wild beasts of the islands should cry in their desolate dwellings, and dragons in their pleasant palaces. Isaiah 13:19-22. It must first be deserted. Cyrus removed the imperial seat to Susa, a celebrated city in the province of Elam, east from Babylon, on the banks of the River Choaspes, a branch of the Tigris. This was probably done, says Prideaux (i. 180), in the first year of his sole reign. The pride of the Babylonians being particularly

provoked by this act, in the fifth year of Darius Hystaspes, B. C. 517, they rose in rebellion, which brought upon themselves again the whole strength of the Persian empire. The city was once more taken by stratagem. Zopyrus, one of the chief commanders of Darius, having cut off his own nose and ears, and mangled his body all over with stripes, fled in this condition to the besieged, apparently burning with desire to be revenged on Darius for his great cruelty in thus mutilating him. In this way he won the confidence of the Babylonians till they at length made him chief commander of their forces; whereupon he betrayed the city into the hands of his master. And that they might ever after be deterred from rebellion, Darius impaled three thousand of those who had been most active in the revolt, took away the brazen gates of the city, and beat down the walls from two hundred cubits to fifty cubits. This was the commencement of its destruction. By this act, it was left exposed to the ravages of every hostile band. Xerxes, on his return from Greece, plundered the temple of Belus of its immense wealth, and then laid the lofty structure in ruins. Alexander the

Great endeavored to rebuild it; but after employing ten thousand men two months to clear away the rubbish, he died from excessive drunkenness and debauchery, and the work was suspended. In the year 294 B. C., Seleucus Nicator built the city of New Babylon in its neighborhood, and took much of the material and many of the inhabitants, of the old city, to build up and people the new. Now almost exhausted of inhabitants, neglect and decay were telling fearfully upon the ancient city. The violence of Parthian princes hastened its ruin. About the end of the fourth century, it was used by the Persian kings as an inclosure for wild beasts. At the end of the twelfth century, according to a celebrated traveler, the few remaining ruins of Nebuchadnezzar's palace were so full of serpents and venomous reptiles that they could not, without great danger, be closely inspected. And to-day, scarcely enough even of the ruins is left to mark the spot where once stood the largest, richest, and proudest city the world has ever seen. Thus the ruin of great Babylon shows us how accurately God will fulfill his word, and makes the doubts of skepticism appear like wilful blindness.

“And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee.” The use of the word kingdom here, shows that kingdoms, and not particular kings, are represented by the different parts of this image; and hence when it was said to Nebuchadnezzar, “Thou art this head of gold,” although the personal pronoun was used, the kingdom, not the person of the king, was meant.

The succeeding kingdom, Medo-Persia, is the one which answers to the breast and arms of silver of the great image. It was to be inferior to the preceding kingdom. In what respect inferior? Not in power; for it was its conqueror. Not in extent; for Cyrus subdued all the East from the AEgean Sea to the River Indus, and thus erected the most extensive empire that up to that time had ever existed. But it was inferior in wealth, luxury, and magnificence.

Viewed from a Scriptural standpoint, the principal event under the Babylonish empire was the captivity of the children of Israel; so the

principal event under the Medo-Persian kingdom was the restoration of Israel to their own land. At the taking of Babylon, B. C. 538, Cyrus, as an act of courtesy, assigned the first place in the kingdom to his uncle, Darius. But, two years afterward, B. C. 536, Darius died; and in the same year also died Cambyses, king of Persia, Cyrus's father. By these events, Cyrus was left sole monarch of the whole empire. In this year, which closed Israel's seventy years of captivity, Cyrus issued his famous decree for the return of the Jews and the rebuilding of their temple. This was the first instalment of the great decree for the restoration and building again of Jerusalem (Ezra 6:14), which was completed in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, B. C. 457, and marked, as will hereafter be shown, the commencement of the 2300 days of Daniel 8, the longest and most important prophetic period mentioned in the Bible. Daniel 9:25.

After a reign of seven years, Cyrus left the kingdom to his son, Cambyses, called Ahasuerus in Ezra 4:6, who reigned seven years and five months, to B. C. 522. Eight monarchs whose reigns varied

from seven months to forty-six years each, took the throne in order till the year B. C. 336, as follows: Smerdis the Magian, called Artaxerxes in Ezra 4:7, seven months, in the year B. C. 522; Darius Hystaspes, from B. C. 521 to 486; Xerxes, from B. C. 485 to 465; Artaxerxes Longimanus, from B. C. 464 to 424; Darius Nothus, from B. C. 423 to 405; Artaxerxes Memnon, from B. C. 404 to 359; Ochus, from B. C. 358 to 338; Arses, from B. C. 337 to 336. The year 335 is set down as the first of Darius Codomannus, the last of the line of the old Persian kings. This man, according to Prideaux, was of noble stature, of goodly person, of the greatest personal valor, and of a mild and generous disposition. Had he lived at any other age, a long and splendid career would undoubtedly have been his. But it was his ill-fortune to have to contend with one who was an agent in the fulfillment of prophecy; and no qualifications, natural or acquired, could render him successful in the unequal contest. Scarce was he warm upon the throne, says the lastnamed historian, ere he found his formidable enemy, Alexander, at the head of the Greek soldiers, preparing to dismount him from

it.

The cause and particulars of the contest between the Greeks and Persians we leave to histories specially devoted to such matters. Suffice it here to say that the deciding point was reached on the field of Arbela, B. C. 331, in which the Grecians, though only one to twenty in number as compared with the Persians, were entirely victorious; and Alexander thenceforth became absolute lord of the Persian empire to the utmost extent that it was ever possessed by any of its own kings.

“And another third kingdom of brass shall bear rule over all the earth,” said the prophet. So few and brief are the inspired words which involved in their fulfillment a change of the world’s rulers. In the ever-changing political kaleidoscope, Grecia now comes into the field of vision, to be, for a time, the all-absorbing object of attention, as the third of what are called the great universal empires of the earth.

After the fatal battle which decided the fate of the empire, Darius still endeavored to rally the shattered remnants of his army, and make a stand for his kingdom and his rights. But he could not gather, out of all the host of his recently so numerous and well-appointed army, a force with which he deemed it prudent to hazard another engagement with the victorious Grecians. Alexander pursued him on the wings of the wind. Time after time did Darius barely elude the grasp of his swiftly following foe. At length two traitors, Bessus and Nabarzanes, seized the unfortunate prince, shut him up in a close cart, and fled with him as their prisoner toward Bactria. It was their purpose, if Alexander pursued them, to purchase their own safety by delivering up their king, Hereupon Alexander, learning of Darius's dangerous position in the hands of the traitors, immediately put himself with the lightest part of his army upon a forced pursuit. After several days' hard march, he came up with the traitors. They urged Darius to mount on horseback for a more speedy flight. Upon his refusing to do this, they gave him several mortal wounds, and left him

dying in his cart, while they mounted their steeds and rode away.

When Alexander came up, he beheld only the lifeless form of the Persian king. As he gazed upon the corpse, he might have learned a profitable lesson of the instability of human fortune. Here was a man who, but a few months before, possessing many noble and generous qualities, was seated upon the throne of universal empire. Disaster, overthrow, and desertion had come suddenly upon him. His kingdom had been conquered, his treasure seized, and his family reduced to captivity. And now, brutally slain by the hand of traitors, he lay a bloody corpse in a rude cart. The sight of the melancholy spectacle drew tears even from the eyes of Alexander, familiar though he was with all the horrible vicissitudes and bloody scenes of war. Throwing his cloak over the body, he commanded it to be conveyed to the captive ladies of Susa, himself furnishing the necessary means for a royal funeral. For this generous act let us give him credit; for he stands sadly in need of all that is his due.

When Darius fell, Alexander saw the field cleared of his last formidable foe. Thenceforward he could spend his time in his own manner, now in the enjoyment of rest and pleasure, and again in the prosecution of some minor conquest. He entered upon a pompous campaign into India, because, according to Grecian fable, Bacchus and Hercules, two sons of Jupiter, whose son he also claimed to be, had done the same. With contemptible arrogance, he claimed for himself divine honors. He gave up conquered cities, freely and unprovoked, to the absolute mercy of his bloodthirsty and licentious soldiery. He himself often murdered his own friends and favorites in his drunken frenzies. He sought out the vilest persons for the gratification of his lust. At the instigation of a dissolute and drunken woman, he with a company of his courtiers, all in a state of frenzied intoxication, sallied out, torch in hand, and fired the city and palace of Persepolis, one of the then finest palaces in the world. He encouraged such excessive drinking among his followers that on one occasion twenty of them together died as the result

of their carousal. At length, having sat through one long drinking spree, he was immediately invited to another, when, after drinking to each of the twenty guests present, he twice drank full, says history, incredible as it may seem, the Herculean cup containing six of our quarts. He thereupon fell down, seized with a violent fever, of which he died eleven days later, in May or June, B. C. 323, while yet he stood only at the threshold of mature life, in the thirty-second year of his age.

The progress of the Grecian empire we need not stop to trace here, since its distinguishing features will claim more particular notice under other prophecies. Daniel thus continues in his interpretation of the great image:--

Verse 40. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron; forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise.

Thus far in the application of this prophecy

there is a general agreement among expositors. That Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia are represented respectively by the head of gold, the breast and arms of silver, and the sides of brass, is acknowledged by all. But with just as little ground for a diversity of views, there is strangely a difference of opinion as to what kingdom is symbolized by the fourth division of the great image,--the legs of iron. On this point we have only to inquire, What kingdom did succeed Grecia in the empire of the world? for the legs of iron denote the fourth kingdom in the series. The testimony of history is full and explicit on this point. One kingdom did this, and one only, and that was Rome. It conquered Grecia; it subdued all things; like iron, it broke in pieces and bruised. Gibbon, following the symbolic imagery of Daniel, thus describes this empire:--

“The arms of the Republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean, and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to

represent the nations or their kings, were successively broken by the iron monarchy of Rome.”

At the opening of the Christian era, this empire took in the whole south of Europe, France, England, the greater part of the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the south of Germany, Hungary, Turkey, and Greece, not to speak of its possessions in Asia and Africa. Well, therefore, may Gibbon say of it:--

“The empire of the Romans filled the world. And when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. To resist was fatal; and it was impossible to fly.”

It will be noticed that at first the kingdom is described unqualifiedly as strong as iron. And this was the period of its strength, during which it has been likened to a mighty Colossus, bestriding the nations, conquering everything, and giving laws to the world. But this was not to continue.

Verse 41. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. 42. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken.

The element of weakness symbolized by the clay, pertained to the feet as well as to the toes. Rome, before its division into ten kingdoms, lost that iron tenacity which it possessed to a superlative degree during the first centuries of its career. Luxury, with its accompanying effeminacy and degeneracy, the destroyer of nations as well as of individuals, began to corrode and weaken its iron sinews, and thus prepared the way for its subsequent disruption into ten kingdoms.

The iron legs of the image terminate, to maintain the consistency of the figure, in feet and toes. To the toes, of which there were of course just

ten, our attention is called by the explicit mention of them in the prophecy; and the kingdom represented by that portion of the image to which the toes belonged, was finally divided into ten parts. The question therefore naturally arises, Do the ten toes of the image represent the ten final divisions of the Roman empire? To those who prefer what seems to be a natural and straightforward interpretation of the word of God, it is a matter of no little astonishment that any question should here be raised. To take the ten toes to represent the ten kingdoms into which Rome was divided seems like such an easy, consistent, and matter-of-course procedure, that it requires a labored effort to interpret it other wise. Yet such an effort is made by some--by Romanists universally, and by such Protestants as still cling to Romish errors.

A volume by H. Cowles, D. D., may perhaps best be taken as a representative exposition on this side of the question. The writer gives every evidence of extensive erudition and great ability. It is the more to be regretted, therefore, that these

powers are devoted to the propagation of error, and to misleading the anxious inquirer who wishes to know his whereabouts on the great highway of time.

We can but briefly notice his positions. They are, (1) That the third kingdom was Grecia during the lifetime of Alexander only; (2) That the fourth kingdom was Alexander's successors; (3) That the latest point to which the fourth kingdom could extend, is the manifestation of the Messiah; for (4) There the God of heaven set up his kingdom; there the stone smote the image upon its feet, and commenced the process of grinding it up.

Nor can we reply at any great length to these positions.

1. We might as well confine the Babylonian empire to the single reign of Nebuchadnezzar, or that of Persia to the reign of Cyrus, as to confine the third kingdom, Grecia, to the reign of Alexander.

2. Alexander's successors did not constitute another kingdom, but a continuation of the same, the Grecian division of the image; for in this line of prophecy the succession of kingdoms is by conquest. When Persia had conquered Babylon, we had the second empire; and when Grecia had conquered Persia, we had the third. But Alexander's successors (his four leading generals) did not conquer his empire, and erect another in its place; they simply divided among themselves the empire which Alexander had conquered, and left ready to their hand.

“Chronologically,” says Professor C., “the fourth empire must immediately succeed Alexander, and lie entirely between him and the birth of Christ.” Chronologically, we reply, it must do no such thing; for the birth of Christ was not the introduction of the fifth kingdom, as will in due time appear. Here he overlooks almost the entire duration of the third division of the image, confounding it with the fourth, and giving no room for the divided state of the Grecian empire as symbolized by the four heads of the leopard of

chapter 7, and the four horns of the goat of chapter 8.

“Territorially,” continues Professor C., “it [the fourth kingdom] should be sought in Western Asia, not in Europe; in general, on the same territory where the first, second, and third kingdoms stood.” Why not in Europe, we ask? Each of the first three kingdoms possessed territory which was peculiarly its own. Why not the fourth? Analogy requires that it should. And was not the third kingdom a European kingdom? that is, did it not rise on European territory, and take its name from the land of its birth? Why not, then, go a degree farther west for the place where the fourth great kingdom should be founded? And how did Grecia ever occupy the territory of the first and second kingdoms?--Only by conquest. And Rome did the same. Hence, so far as the territorial requirements of the professor’s theory are concerned, Rome could be the fourth kingdom as truthfully as Grecia could be the third.

“Politically,” he adds, “it should be the

immediate successor of Alexander's empire,... changing the dynasty, but not the nations." Analogy is against him here. Each of the first three kingdoms was distinguished by its own peculiar nationality. The Persian was not the same as the Babylonian, nor the Grecian the same as either of the two that preceded it. Now analogy requires that the fourth kingdom, instead of being composed of a fragment of this Grecian empire, should possess a nationality of its own, distinct from the other three. And this we find in the Roman kingdom, and in it alone. But,

3. The grand fallacy which underlies this whole system of misinterpretation, is the too commonly taught theory that the kingdom of God was set up at the first advent of Christ. It can easily be seen how fatal to this theory is the admission that the fourth empire is Rome. For it was to be after the division of that fourth empire, that the God of heaven was to set up his kingdom. But the division of the Roman empire into ten parts was not accomplished previous to A. D. 476; consequently the kingdom of God could not have been set up at

the first advent of Christ, nearly five hundred years before that date. Rome must not, therefore, from their standpoint, though it answers admirably to the prophecy in every particular, be allowed to be the kingdom in question. The position that the kingdom of God was set up in the days when Christ was upon earth, must, these interpreters seem to think, be maintained at all hazards.

Such is the ground on which some expositors appear, at least, to reason. And it is for the purpose of maintaining this theory that our author dwindles down the third great empire of the world to the insignificant period of about eight years! For this, he endeavors to prove that the fourth universal empire was bearing full sway during a period when the providence of God was simply filling up the outlines of the third! For this, he presumes to fix the points of time between which we must look for the fourth, though the prophecy does not deal in dates at all, and then whatever kingdom he finds within his specified time, that he sets down as the fourth kingdom, and endeavors to bend the prophecy to fit his interpretation, utterly regardless

of how much better material he might find outside of his little inclosure, to answer to a fulfillment of the prophetic record. Is such a course logical? Is the time the point to be first established?--No; the kingdoms are the great features of the prophecy, and we are to look for them; and when we find them, we must accept them, whatever may be their chronology or location. Let them govern the time and place, not the time and place govern them.

But that view which is the cause of all this misapplication and confusion, is sheer assumption. Christ did not smite the image at his first advent. Look at it! When the stone smites the image upon its feet, the image is dashed in pieces. Violence is used. The effect is immediate. The image becomes as chaff. And then what? Is it absorbed by the stone, and gradually incorporated with it?--Nothing of the kind. It is blown off, removed away, as incompatible and unavailable material; and no place is found for it. The territory is entirely cleared; and then the stone becomes a mountain, and fills the whole earth. Now what idea shall we attach to this work of smiting and breaking in

pieces? Is it a gentle, peaceful, and quiet work? or is it a manifestation of vengeance and violence? How did the kingdoms of the prophecy succeed the one to the other?--It was through the violence and din of war, the shock of armies and the roar of battle. "Confused noise and garments rolled in blood," told of the force and violence with which one nation had been brought into subjection to another. Yet all this is not called "smiting" or "breaking in pieces."

When Persia conquered Babylon, and Greece Persia, neither of the conquered empires is said to have been broken in pieces, though crushed beneath the overwhelming power of a hostile nation. But when we reach the introduction of the fifth kingdom, the image is smitten with violence; it is dashed to pieces, and so scattered and obliterated that no place is found for it. And now what shall we understand by this?--We must understand that here a scene transpires in which is manifested so much more violence and force and power than accompany the overthrow of one nation by another through the strife of war, that the latter

is not worthy even of mention in connection with it. The subjugation of one nation by another by war, is a scene of peace and quietude in comparison with that which transpires when the image is dashed in pieces by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands.

Yet what is the smiting of the image made to mean by the theory under notice?--Oh, the peaceful introduction of the gospel of Christ! the quiet spreading abroad of the light of truth! the gathering out of a few from the nations of the earth, to be made ready through obedience to the truth, for his second coming, and reign! the calm and unpretending formation of a Christian church,--a church that has been domineered over, persecuted, and oppressed by the arrogant and triumphant powers of earth from that day to this! And this is the smiting of the image! this is the breaking of it into pieces, and violently removing the shattered fragments from the face of the earth! Was ever absurdity more absurd?

From this digression we return to the inquiry,

Do the toes represent the ten divisions of the Roman empire? We answer, Yes; because,--

1. The image of chapter 2 is exactly parallel with the vision of the four beasts of chapter 7. The fourth beast of chapter 7 represents the same as the iron legs of the image. The ten horns of the beast, of course, correspond very naturally to the ten toes of the image; and these horns are plainly declared to be ten kings which should arise; and they are just as much independent kingdoms as are the beasts themselves; for the beasts are spoken of in precisely the same manner; namely, as “four kings which should arise.” (Verse 17) They do not denote a line of successive kings, but kings or kingdoms which exist contemporaneously; for three of them were plucked up by the little horn. The ten horns, beyond controversy, represent the ten kingdoms into which Rome was divided.

2. We have seen that in Daniel’s interpretation of the image he uses the words king and kingdom interchangeably, the former denoting the same as the latter. In verse 44 he says that “in the days of

these kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom.” This shows that at the time the kingdom of God is set up, there will be a plurality of kings existing contemporaneously. It cannot refer to the four preceding kingdoms; for it would be absurd to use such language in reference to a line of successive kings, since it would be in the days of the last king only, not in the days of any of the preceding, that the kingdom of God would be set up.

Here, then, is a division presented; and what have we in the symbol to indicate it?--Nothing but the toes of the image. Unless they do it, we are left utterly in the dark as to the nature and extent of the division which the prophecy shows did exist. To suppose this, would be to cast a serious imputation upon the prophecy itself. We are therefore held to the conclusion that the ten toes of the image denote the ten parts into which the Roman empire was divided.[1]

As an objection to the view that the ten toes of the image denote the ten kingdoms, we are

sometimes reminded that Rome, before its division into ten kingdoms, was divided into two parts, the Western and Eastern empires, corresponding to the two legs of the image; and as the ten kingdoms all arose out of the western division, if they are denoted by the toes, we would have, it is claimed, ten toes on one foot of the image, and none on the other; which would be unnatural and inconsistent.

But this objection devours itself; for certainly if the two legs denote division, the toes must denote division also. It would be inconsistent to say that the legs symbolize division, but the toes do not. But if the toes do indicate division at all, it can be nothing but the division of Rome into ten parts.

The fallacy, however, which forms the basis of this objection, is the view that the two legs of the image do signify the separation of the Roman empire into its eastern and western divisions. To this view there are several objections.

1. The two legs of iron symbolize Rome, not merely during its closing years, but from the very

beginning of its existence as a nation; and if these legs denote division, the kingdom should have been divided from the very commencement of its history. This claim is sustained by the other symbols. Thus the division (that is, the two elements) of the Persian kingdom, denoted by the two horns of the ram (Daniel 8:20), also by the elevation of the bear upon one side (Daniel 7:5,) and perhaps by the two arms of the image of this chapter, existed from the first. The division of the Grecian kingdom, denoted by the four horns of the goat and the four heads of the leopard, dates back to within eight years of the time when it was introduced into prophecy. So Rome should have been divided from the first, if the legs denote division, instead of remaining a unit for nearly six hundred years, and separating into its eastern and western divisions only a few years prior to its final disruption into ten kingdoms.

2. No such division into two great parts is denoted by the other symbols under which Rome is represented in the book of Daniel; namely, the great and terrible beast of Daniel 7, and the little

horn of chapter 8. Hence it is reasonable to conclude that the two legs of the image were not designed to represent such a division.

But it may be asked, Why not suppose the two legs to denote division as well as the toes? Would it not be just as inconsistent to say that the toes denote division, and the legs do not, as to say that the legs denote division, and the toes do not? We answer that the prophecy itself must govern our conclusions in this matter; and whereas it says nothing of division in connection with the legs, it does introduce the subject of division as we come down to the feet and toes. It says, “And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters’ clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided.” No division could take place, or at least none is said to have taken place, till the weakening element of the clay was introduced; and we do not find this till we come to the feet and toes. But we are not to understand that the clay denotes one division and the iron the other; for after the long-existing unity of the kingdom was broken, no one of the fragments was as strong as the original iron, but all

were in a state of weakness denoted by the mixture of iron and clay. The conclusion is inevitable, therefore, that the prophet has here stated the cause for the effect. The introduction of the weakness of the clay element, as we come to the feet, resulted in the division of the kingdom into ten parts, as represented by the ten toes; and this result, or division, is more than intimated in the sudden mention of a plurality of contemporaneous kings. Therefore, while we find no evidence that the legs denote division, but serious objections against such a view, we do find, we think, good reason for supposing that the toes denote division, as here claimed.

3. Each of the four monarchies had its own particular territory, which was the kingdom proper, and where we are to look for the chief events in its history shadowed forth by the symbol. We are not, therefore, to look for the divisions of the Roman empire in the territory formerly occupied by Babylon, or Persia, or Grecia, but in the territory proper of the Roman kingdom, which was what was finally known as the Western empire. Rome

conquered the world; but the kingdom of Rome proper lay west of Grecia. That is what was represented by the legs of iron. There, then, we look for the ten kingdoms; and there we find them. We are not obliged to mutilate or deform the symbol to make it a fit and accurate representation of historical events.

Verse 43. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.

With Rome fell the last of the universal empires belonging to this world in its present state. Heretofore the elements of society had been such that it was possible for one nation, rising superior to its neighbors in prowess, bravery, and the science of war, to attach them one after another to its chariot wheels till all were consolidated into one vast empire, and one man seated upon the dominant throne could send forth his will as law to all the nations of the earth. When Rome fell, such

possibilities forever passed away. Crushed beneath the weight of its own vast proportions, it crumbled to pieces, never to be united again. The iron was mixed with the clay. Its elements lost the power of cohesion, and no man or combination of men can again consolidate them. This point is so well set forth by another that we take pleasure in quoting his words:--

“From this, its divided state, the first strength of the empire departed; but not as that of the others had done. No other kingdom was to succeed it, as it had the three which went before it. It was to continue in this tenfold division, until the kingdom of stone smote it upon its feet, broke them in pieces, and scattered them as the wind does the chaff of the summer threshingfloor! Yet, through all this time, a portion of its strength was to remain. And so the prophet says, ‘And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken.’ Verse 42. How in any other way could you so strikingly represent the facts? For more than fourteen hundred years, this tenfold division has

existed. Time and again men have dreamed of rearing on these dominions one mighty kingdom. Charlemagne tried it. Charles V tried it. Louis XVI tried it. Napoleon tried it. But none succeeded. A single verse of prophecy was stronger than all their hosts. Their own power was wasted, frittered away, destroyed. But the ten kingdoms did not become one. ‘Partly strong, and partly broken,’ was the prophetic description. And such, too, has been the historic fact concerning them. With the book of history open before you, I ask you, Is not this an exact representation of the remnants of this once mighty empire? It ruled with unlimited power. It was the throned mistress of the world. Its scepter was broken; its throne pulled down; its power taken away. Ten kingdoms were formed out of it; and ‘broken’ as then it was, it still continues; i. e., ‘partly broken;’ for its dimensions still continue as when the kingdom of iron stood upright upon its feet. And then it is ‘partly strong;’ i. e., it retains, even in its broken state, enough of its iron strength to resist all attempts to mold its parts together. ‘This shall not be,’ says the word of God. ‘This has not been,’ replies the book of history.

“‘But then,’ men may say, ‘another plan remains. If force cannot avail, diplomacy and reasons of state may; we will try them.’ And so the prophecy foreshadows this when it says, ‘They shall mingle themselves with the seed of men;’ i. e., marriages shall be formed, in hope thus to consolidate their power, and, in the end, to unite these divided kingdoms into one.

“And shall this device succeed?--No. The prophet answers: ‘They shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.’ And the history of Europe is but a running commentary on the exact fulfillment of these words. From the time of Canute to the present age, it has been the policy of reigning monarchs, the beaten path which they have trodden in order to reach a mightier scepter and a wider sway. And the most signal instance of it which history has recorded in our own day, is in the case of Napoleon. He ruled in one of the kingdoms.... He sought to gain by alliance what he could not gain by force; i. e., to build up one mighty, consolidated empire. And did

he succeed?--Nay. The very power with which he was allied, proved his destruction, in the troops of Blucher, on the field of Waterloo! The iron would not mingle with clay. The ten kingdoms continue still.

“And yet, if as the result of these alliances or of other causes, that number is sometimes disturbed, it need not surprise us. It is, indeed, just what the prophecy seems to call for. The iron was ‘mixed with the clay.’ For a season, in the image, you might not distinguish between them. But they would not remain so. ‘They shall not cleave one to another.’ The nature of the substances forbids them to do so in the one case; the word of prophecy in the other. Yet there was to be an attempt to mingle--nay, more, there was an approach to mingling in both cases. But it was to be abortive. And how marked the emphasis with which history affirms this declaration of the word of God!”--Wm. Newton, Lectures on the First Two Visions of the Book of Daniel, pp. 34-36.

Yet with all these facts before them, asserting

the irresistible power of God's providence through the overturnings and changes of centuries, the efforts of warriors, and the diplomacy and intrigues of courts and kings, some modern expositors have manifested such a marvelous misapprehension of this prophecy as to predict a future universal kingdom, and point to a European ruler, even now of waning years and declining prestige, as the "destined monarch of the world." Vain is the breath they spend in promulgating such a theory, and delusive the hopes or fears they may succeed in raising over such an expectation.[2]

Verse 44. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever. 45. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter;

and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

We here reach the climax of this stupendous prophecy; and when Time in his onward flight shall bring us to the sublime scene here predicted, we shall have reached the end of human history. The kingdom of God! Grand provision for a new and glorious dispensation, in which his people shall find a happy terminus of this world's sad, degenerate, and changing career. Transporting change for all the righteous, from gloom to glory, from strife to peace, from a sinful to a holy world, from death to life, from tyranny and oppression to the happy freedom and blessed privileges of a heavenly kingdom! Glorious transition, from weakness to strength, from the changing and decaying to the immutable and eternal!

But when is this kingdom to be established? May we hope for an answer to an inquiry of such momentous concern to our race? These are the very questions on which the word of God does not leave us in ignorance; and herein is seen the surpassing

value of this heavenly boon. We do not say that the exact time is revealed (we emphasize the fact that it is not) either in this or any other prophecy; but so near an approximation is given that the generation which is to see the establishment of this kingdom may mark its approach unerringly, and make that preparation which will entitle them to share in all its glories.

As already explained, we are brought down by verses 41-43 this side of the division of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms; which division was accomplished, as already noticed, between 351 and 483. The kings, or kingdoms, in the days of which the God of heaven is to set up his kingdom, are evidently those kingdoms which arose out of the Roman empire. Then the kingdom of God here brought to view could not have been set up, as some claim it was, in connection with the first advent of Christ, four hundred and fifty years before. But whether we apply this division to the ten kingdoms or not, it is certain that some kind of division was to take place in the Roman empire before the kingdom of God should be set up; for

the prophecy expressly declares, “The kingdom shall be divided.” And this is equally fatal to the popular view; for after the unification of the first elements of the Roman power down to the days of Christ, there was no division of the kingdom; nor during his days, nor for many years after, did any such thing take place. The civil wars were not divisions of the empire; they were only the efforts of individuals worshiping at the shrine of ambition, to obtain supreme control of the empire. The occasional petty revolts of distant provinces, suppressed as with the power, and almost with the speed, of thunderbolt, did not constitute a division of the kingdom. And these are all that can be pointed to as interfering with the unity of the kingdom, for more than three hundred years this side the days of Christ. This one consideration is sufficient to disprove forever the view that the kingdom of God, which constitutes the fifth kingdom of this series, as brought to view in Daniel 2, was set up at the commencement of the Christian era. But a thought more may be in place.

1. This fifth kingdom, then, could not have

been set up at Christ's first advent, because it is not to exist contemporaneously with earthly governments, but to succeed them. As the second kingdom succeeded the first, the third the second, and the fourth the third, by violence and overthrow, so the fifth succeeds the fourth. It does not exist at the same time with it. The fourth kingdom is first destroyed, the fragments are removed, the territory is cleared, and then the fifth is established as a succeeding kingdom in the order of time. But the church has existed contemporaneously with earthly governments ever since earthly governments were formed. There was a church in Abel's day, in Enoch's, in Noah's, in Abraham's, and so on to the present. No; the church is not the stone that smote the image upon the feet. It existed too early in point of time, and the work in which it is engaged is not that of smiting and overthrowing earthly governments.

2. The fifth kingdom is introduced by the stone smiting the image. What part of the image does the stone smite?

The feet and toes. But these were not developed until four centuries and a half after the crucifixion of Christ. The image was, at the time of the crucifixion, only developed to the thighs, so to speak; and if the kingdom of God was there set up, if there the stone smote the image, it smote it upon the thighs, not upon the feet, where the prophecy places the smiting.

3. The stone that smites the image is cut out of the mountain without hands. The margin reads, "Which was not in hand." This shows that the smiting is not done by an agent acting for another, not by the church, for instance, in the hands of Christ; but it is a work which the Lord does by his own divine power, without any human agency.

4. Again, the kingdom of God is placed before the church as a matter of hope. The Lord did not teach his disciples a prayer which in two or three years was to become obsolete. The petition may as appropriately ascend from the lips of the patient, waiting flock in these last days, as from the lips of his first disciples, "Thy kingdom come."

5. We have plain Scripture declarations to establish the following propositions: (1) The kingdom was still future at the time of our Lord's last Passover. (Matthew 26:29) (2) Christ did not set it up before his ascension. (Acts 1:6) (3) Flesh and blood cannot inherit it. (1 Corinthians 15:50) (4) It is a matter of promise to the apostles, and to all those that love God. (James 2:5) (5) It is promised in the future to the little flock. (Luke 12:32) (6) Through much tribulation the saints are to enter therein. (Acts 14:22) (7) It is to be set up when Christ shall judge the living and the dead. (2 Timothy 4:1) (8) This is to be when he shall come in his glory with all his holy angels. (Matthew 25:31-34)

As militating against the foregoing view, it may be asked if the expression, "Kingdom of heaven," is not, in the New Testament, applied to the church. In some instances it may be; but in others as evidently it cannot be. In the decisive texts referred to above, which show that it was still a matter of promise even after the church was fully

established, that mortality cannot inherit it, and that it is to be set up only in connection with the coming of our Lord to judgment, the reference cannot be to any state or organization here upon earth. The object we have before us is to ascertain what constitutes the kingdom of Daniel 2:44; and we have seen that the prophecy utterly forbids our applying it there to the church, inasmuch as by the terms of the prophecy itself we are prohibited from looking for that kingdom till over four hundred years after the crucifixion of Christ and the establishment of the gospel church. Therefore if in some expressions in the New Testament the word “kingdom” can be found applying to the work of God’s grace, or the spread of the gospel, it cannot in such instances be the kingdom brought to view in Daniel. That can only be the future literal kingdom of Christ’s glory so often brought to view in both the Old Testament and the New.

It may be objected again, that when the stone smites the image, the iron, the brass, the silver, and the gold are broken to pieces together; hence the stone must have smitten the image when all these

parts were in existence. In reply we ask, What is meant by their being broken to pieces together? Does the expression mean that the same persons who constituted the kingdom of gold would be alive when the image was dashed to pieces?--No; else the image covers but the duration of a single generation. Does it mean that that would be a ruling kingdom?--No; for there is a succession of kingdoms down to the fourth. On the supposition, then, that the fifth kingdom was set up at the first advent, in what sense were the brass, silver, and gold in existence then any more than at the present day? Does it refer to the time of the second resurrection, when all these wicked nations will be raised to life?--No; for the destruction of earthly governments in this present state, which is here symbolized by the smiting of the image, certainly takes place at the end of this dispensation; and in the second resurrection national distinctions will be no more known.

No objection really exists in the point under consideration; for all the kingdoms symbolized by the image, are, in a certain sense, still in existence.

Chaldea and Assyria are still the first divisions of the image; Media and Persia, the second; Macedonia, Greece, Thrace, Asia Minor, and Egypt, the third. Political life and dominion, it is true, have passed from one to the other, till, so far as the image is concerned, it is all now concentrated in the divisions of the fourth kingdom; but the others, in location and substance, though without dominion, are still there; and together all will be dashed to pieces when the fifth kingdom is introduced.

It may still further be asked, by way of objection, Have not the ten kingdoms, in the days of which the kingdom of God was to be set up, all passed away? and as the kingdom of God is not yet set up, has not the prophecy, according to the view here advocated, proved a failure? We answer, Those kingdoms have not yet passed away. We are yet in the days of those kings. The following illustration from Dr. Nelson's "Cause and Cure of Infidelity," pp. 374, 375, will set this matter in a clear light:--

“Suppose some feeble people should be suffering from the almost constant invasions of numerous and ferocious enemies. Suppose some powerful and benevolent prince sends them word that he will, for a number of years, say thirty, maintain, for their safety along the frontier, ten garrisons, each to contain one hundred well-armed men. Suppose the forts are built and remain a few years, when two of them are burned to the ground and rebuilt without delay; has there been any violation of the sovereign’s word?--No; there was no material interruption in the continuance of the walls of strength; and, furthermore, the most important part of the safeguard was still there. Again, suppose the monarch sends and has two posts of strength demolished, but, adjoining the spot where these stood, and immediately, he has other two buildings erected, more capacious and more desirable; does the promise still stand good? We answer in the affirmative, and we believe no one would differ with us. Finally, suppose, in addition to the ten garrisons, it could be shown that for several months during the thirty years, one more had been maintained there; that for one or

two years out of the thirty, there had been there eleven instead of ten fortifications; shall we call it a defeat or a failure of the original undertaking? Or shall any seeming interruptions, such as have been stated, destroy the propriety of our calling these the ten garrisons of the frontier? The answer is, No, without dispute.

“So it is, and has been, respecting the ten kingdoms of Europe once under the Roman scepter. They have been there for twelve hundred and sixty years. If several have had their names changed, according to the caprice of him who conquered, this change of name did not destroy existence. If others have had their territorial limits changed, the nation was still there. If others have fallen while successors were forming in their room, the ten horns were still there. If, during a few years out of a thousand, there were more than ten, if some temporary power reared its head, seeming to claim a place with the rest, and soon disappeared, it has not caused the beast to have less than ten horns.”

Scott remarks:--

“It is certain that the Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms; and though they might be sometimes more and sometimes fewer, yet they were still known by the name of the ten kingdoms of the Western empire.”

Thus the subject is cleared of all difficulty. Time has fully developed this great image in all its parts. Most strictly does it represent the important political events it was designed to symbolize. It stands complete upon its feet. Thus it has been standing for over fourteen hundred years. It waits to be smitten upon the feet by the stone cut out of the mountain without hand, that is, the kingdom of Christ. This is to be accomplished when the Lord shall be revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. (See Psalms 2:8, 9) In the days of these kings the God of heaven is to set up a kingdom. We have been in the days of these kings for over fourteen centuries, and we are still in their days. So far as this prophecy is

concerned, the very next event is the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom. Other prophecies and innumerable signs show unmistakably its immediate proximity.

The coming kingdom! This ought to be the all-absorbing topic with the present generation. Reader, are you ready for the issue? He who enters this kingdom enters it not merely for such a lifetime as men live in this present state, not to see it degenerate, not to see it overthrown by a succeeding and more powerful kingdom; but he enters it to participate in all its privileges and blessings, and to share its glories forever; for this kingdom is not to "be left to other people." Again we ask you, Are you ready? The terms of heirship are most liberal: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Are you on terms of friendship with Christ, the coming King? Do you love his character? Are you trying to walk humbly in his footsteps, and obey his teachings? If not, read your fate in the cases of those in the parable, of whom it was said, "But those mine enemies, which would

not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.” There is to be no rival kingdom where you can find an asylum if you remain an enemy to this; for this is to occupy all the territory ever possessed by any and all of the kingdoms of this world, past or present. It is to fill the whole earth. Happy they to whom the rightful Sovereign, the all-conquering King, at last can say, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.”

Verse 46. Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshiped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him. 47. The king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldest reveal this secret. 48. Then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts, and made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon. 49. Then

Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego over the affairs of the province of Babylon; but Daniel sat in the gate of the king.

We have dwelt quite at length on the interpretation of the dream, which Daniel made known to the Chaldean monarch. From this we must now return to the palace of Nebuchadnezzar, and to Daniel, as he stands in the presence of the king, having made known to him the dream and the interpretation thereof, while the courtiers and the baffled soothsayers and astrologers wait around in silent awe and wonder.

It might be expected that an ambitious monarch, raised to the highest earthly throne, and in the full flush of uninterrupted success, would scarcely brook to be told that his kingdom, which he no doubt fondly hoped would endure through all time, was to be overthrown by another people. Yet Daniel plainly and boldly made known this fact to the king; and the king, so far from being offended, fell upon his face before the prophet of God, and

offered him worship. Daniel doubtless immediately countermanded the orders which the king issued to pay him divine honors. That Daniel had some communication with the king which is not here recorded, is evident from verse 47: “The king answered unto Daniel,” etc. And it may be still further inferred that Daniel labored to turn the king’s feelings of reverence from himself to the God of heaven, inasmuch as the king replies, “Of a truth it is that your God is a God of gods and a Lord of kings.”

Then the king made Daniel a great man. There are two things which in this life are specially supposed to make a man great, and both these Daniel received from the king: (1) Riches. A man is considered great if he is a man of wealth; and we read that the king gave him many and great gifts. (2) Power. If in conjunction with riches a man has power, certainly in popular estimation he is considered a great man; and power was bestowed upon Daniel in abundant measure. He was made ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of

Babylon.

Thus speedily and abundantly did Daniel begin to be rewarded for his fidelity to his own conscience and the requirements of God. So great was Balaam's desire for the presents of a certain heathen king, that he endeavored to obtain them in spite of the Lord's expressed will to the contrary, and thus signally failed. Daniel did not act with a view to obtaining these presents; yet by maintaining his integrity with the Lord they were given abundantly into his hands. His advancement, both with respect to wealth and power, was a matter of no small moment with him as it enabled him to be of service to his fellow-countrymen less favored than himself in their long captivity.

Daniel did not become bewildered nor intoxicated by his signal victory and his wonderful advancement. He first remembers the three who were companions with him in anxiety respecting the king's matter; and as they had helped him with their prayers, he determined that they should share with him in his honors. At his request they were

placed over the affairs of Babylon, while Daniel himself sat in the gate of the king. The gate was the place where councils were held, and matters of chief moment were deliberated upon. The record is a simple declaration that Daniel became chief counselor to the king.

Notes:

1. This division was accomplished between the years A. D. 351 and A. D. 483. The era of this dissolution thus covered almost a hundred and fifty years, from about the middle of the fourth century to near the close of the fifth. No historians of whom we are aware, place the beginning of this work of the dismemberment of the Roman empire earlier than A. D. 351, and none assign its close to a later date than A. D. 483. Concerning the intermediate dates, that is, the precise time from which each of the ten kingdoms that arose on the ruins of the Roman empire is to be dated, there is some difference of views among historians. Nor does this seem strange, when we consider that that was an era of great confusion, that the map of the

Roman empire during that time underwent many sudden and violent changes, and that the paths of hostile nations charging upon its territory, crossed and recrossed each other in a labyrinth of confusion. But all historians agree in this, that out of the territory of Western Rome, ten separate kingdoms were ultimately established, and we may safely assign them to the time between the extreme dates above named; namely, A. D. 351 and 483.

The ten nations which were most instrumental in breaking up the Roman empire, and which at some time in their history held respectively portions of Roman territory as separate and independent kingdoms, may be enumerated (without respect to the time of their establishment) as follows: The Huns, Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Franks, Vandals, Suevi, Burgundians, Heruli, Anglo-Saxons, and Lombards. The connection between these and some of the modern nations of Europe, is still traceable in the names, as England, Burgundy, Lombardy, France, etc. Such authorities as Calmet, Faber, Lloyd, Hales, Scott, Barnes, etc., concur in the foregoing enumeration. (See Barnes's

concluding notes on Daniel 7.)

2. Shortly after this language was penned, Napoleon III, this “destined monarch of the world”! was dethroned, and died in ignominious retirement, and his son and heir has since fallen by the hands of savages in Africa.

Chapter 3

The Fiery Ordeal

Verse 1. Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits; he set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon.

There is a conjecture extant that this image had some reference to the dream of the king as described in the previous chapter, it having been erected only twenty-three years subsequently, according to the marginal chronology. In that dream the head was of gold, representing Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom. That was succeeded by metals of inferior quality, denoting a succession of kingdoms. Nebuchadnezzar was doubtless quite gratified that his kingdom should be represented by the gold; but that it should ever be succeeded by another kingdom was not so pleasing. Hence, instead of having simply the head of his image of gold, he made it all of gold, to denote that the gold

of the head should extend through the entire image; or, in other words, that his kingdom should not give way to another kingdom, but be perpetual.

It is probable that the height here mentioned, ninety feet at the lowest estimate, was not the height of the image proper, but included the pedestal also. Nor is it probable that any more than the image proper, if even that, was of solid gold. It could have been overlaid with thin plates, nicely joined, at [79] a much less expense, without detracting at all from its external appearance.

Verse 2. Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up. 3. Then the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, were gathered together unto the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar

the king had set up; and they stood before the image that Nebuchadnezzar had set up. 4. Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, 5. That at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; 6. And whoso falleth not down and worshipeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. 7. Therefore, at that time, when all the people heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of music, all the people, the nations, and the languages, fell down and worshiped the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

The dedication of this image was made a great occasion. The chief men of all the kingdom were gathered together; so much pains and expense will men undergo in sustaining idolatrous and heathen systems of worship. So it is and ever has been. Alas, that those who have the true religion should

be so far outdone in these respects by the upholders of the false and counterfeit! The worship was accompanied with music; and whoso should fail to participate therein was threatened with a fiery furnace. Such are ever the strongest motives to impel men in any direction,--pleasure on the one hand, pain on the other.

Verse 6 contains the first mention to be found in the Bible of the division of time into hours. It was probably the invention of the Chaldeans.

Verse 8. Wherefore at that time certain Chaldeans came near, and accused the Jews. 9. They spake and said to the king Nebuchadnezzar, O king, live forever. 10. Thou, O king, hast made a decree, that every man that shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, shall fall down and worship the golden image; 11. And whoso falleth not down and worshipeth, that he should be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. 12. There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the

province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee; they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.

These Chaldeans who accused the Jews were probably the sect of philosophers who went by that name, and who were still smarting under the chagrin of their ignominious failure in respect to their interpretation of the king's dream of chapter 2. They were eager to seize upon any pretext to accuse the Jews before the king, and either disgrace or destroy them. They worked upon the king's prejudice by strong intimations of their ingratitude: Thou hast set them over the affairs of Babylon, and yet they have disregarded thee. Where Daniel was upon this occasion, is not known. He was probably absent on some business of the empire, the importance of which demanded his presence. But why should Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, since they knew they could not worship the image, be present on the occasion? Was it not because they were willing to comply with the king's

requirements as far as they could without compromising their religious principles? The king required them to be present. With this requirement they could comply, and they did. He required them to worship the image. This their religion forbade, and this they therefore refused to do.

Verse 13. Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury commanded to bring Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Then they brought these men before the king. 14. Nebuchadnezzar spake and said unto them, Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up? 15. Now if ye be ready that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made; well: but if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace; and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? 16. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar

zar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. 17. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. 18. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.

The forbearance of the king is shown in his granting Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego another trial after their first failure to comply with his requirements. Doubtless the matter was thoroughly understood. They could not plead ignorance. They knew just what the king wanted, and their failure to do it was an intentional and deliberate refusal to obey him. With most kings this would have been enough to seal their fate. But no, says Nebuchadnezzar, I will overlook this offense, if upon a second trial they comply with the law. But they informed the king that he need not trouble himself to repeat the farce. “We are not careful,” said they, “to answer thee in this matter.” That is, you need not grant us the favor of another

trial; our mind is made up. We can answer just as well now as at any future time; and our answer is, We will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. Our God can deliver if he will; but if not, it is just the same. We know his will, and to that we shall render unconditional obedience. Their answer was both honest and decisive.

Verse 19. Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego; therefore he spake, and commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heated. 20. And he commanded the most mighty men that were in his army to bind Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and to cast them into the burning fiery furnace. 21. Then these men were bound in their coats, their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. 22. Therefore because the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace exceeding hot, the flame of the fire slew

those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. 23. And these three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. 24. Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up in haste, and spake, and said unto his counselors, Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. 25. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.

Nebuchadnezzar was not entirely free from the faults and follies into which an absolute monarch so easily runs. Intoxicated with unlimited power, he could not brook disobedience or contradiction. Let his expressed authority be resisted, on however good grounds, and he exhibits the weakness common to our fallen humanity under like circumstances, and flies into a passion. Ruler of the world, he was not equal to that still harder task of ruling his own spirit. And even the form of his

visage was changed. Instead of the calm, dignified, self-possessed ruler that he should have appeared, he betrayed himself in look and act as the slave of ungovernable passion.

The furnace was heated one seven times hotter than usual, in other words, to its utmost capacity. The king overreached himself in this; for even if the fire had been suffered to have its ordinary effect upon the ones he cast into the furnace, it would only have destroyed them the sooner. Nothing would have been gained by that means on the part of the king. But seeing they were delivered from it, much was gained on the part of the cause of God and his truth; for the more intense the heat, the greater and more impressive the miracle of being delivered from it. Every circumstance was calculated to show the direct power of God. They were bound in all their garment's, but came out with not even the smell of fire upon them. The most mighty men in the army were chosen to cast them in. These the fire slew ere they came in contact with it; while on the Hebrews it had no effect, though they were in the very midst of its

flames. It was evident that the fire was under the control of some supernatural intelligence; for while it had effect upon the cords with which they were bound, destroying them, so that they were free to walk about in the midst of the fire, it did not even singe their garments. They did not, as soon as free, spring out of the fire, but continued therein; for, first, the king had put them in, and it was his place to call them out; and secondly, the form of the fourth was with them, and in his presence they could be content and joyful, as well in the furnace of fire as in the delights and luxuries of the palace. Let us in all our trials, afflictions, persecutions, and straitened places, but have the “form of the fourth” with us, and it is enough.

The king said, “And the form of the fourth is like the Son of God.” This language is by some supposed to refer to Christ; but it is not likely that the king had any idea of the Saviour. A better rendering, according to good authorities, would be “like a son of the gods;” that is, he had the appearance of a supernatural, or divine being. Nebuchadnezzar subsequently called him an angel.

What a scathing rebuke upon the king for his folly and madness was the deliverance of these worthies from the fiery furnace! A higher power than any on earth had vindicated those who stood firm against idolatry, and poured contempt on the worship and requirements of the king. None of the gods of the heathen ever had wrought such deliverance as that, nor were they able to do so.

Verse 26. Then Nebuchadnezzar came near to the mouth of the burning fiery furnace, and spake, and said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, ye servants of the most high God, come forth, and come hither. Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, came forth of the midst of the fire. 27. And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counselors, being gathered together, saw these men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them. 28. Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and

delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any God, except their own God. 29. Therefore I make a decree, That every people, nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill; because there is no other God that can deliver after this sort. 30. Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the province of Babylon.

When bidden, these three men came forth from the furnace. Then the princes, governors, and king's counselors, through whose advice, or at least concurrence, they had been cast into the furnace (for the king said to them, verse 24, "Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire?"), were gathered together to look upon these men, and have optical and tangible proof of their wonderful preservation. The worship of the great image was lost sight of. The whole interest of this vast concourse of people was now concentrated upon

these three remarkable men. All men's thoughts and minds were full of this wonderful occurrence. And how the knowledge of it would be spread abroad throughout the empire, as they should return to their respective provinces! What a notable instance in which God caused the wrath of man to praise him!

Then the king blessed the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and made a decree that none should speak against him. This the Chaldeans had undoubtedly done. In those days, each nation had its god or gods; for there were "gods many and lords many." And the victory of one nation over another was supposed to occur because the gods of the conquered nation were not able to deliver them from the conquerors. The Jews had been wholly subjugated by the Babylonians, on which account the latter had no doubt spoken disparagingly or contemptuously of the God of the Jews. This the king now prohibits; for he is plainly given to understand that his success against the Jews was owing to their sins, not to any lack of power on the part of their God. In what a conspicuous and

exalted light this placed the God of the Hebrews in comparison with the gods of the nations! It was an acknowledgment that he held men amenable to some high standard of moral character, and that he did not regard with indifference their actions in reference to it; since he would visit with punishment those who transgressed it, and would consequently bestow his blessing on those who complied with it. Had these Jews been time-servers, the name of the true God had not thus been exalted in Babylon. What honor does the Lord put upon them that are steadfast toward him!

The king promoted them; that is, he restored to them the offices which they held before the charges of disobedience and treason were brought against them. At the end of verse 30 the Septuagint adds: "And he advanced them to be governors over all the Jews that were in his kingdom." It is not probable that he insisted on any further worship of his image.

Chapter 4

Nebuchadnezzar's Decree

Verse 1. Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. 2. I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me. 3. How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders! his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation.

This chapter opens, says Dr. Clarke, with “a regular decree, and one of the most ancient on record.” It was from the pen of Nebuchadnezzar, and was promulgated in the usual form. He wishes to make known, not to a few only, but to all people, nations, and languages, the wonderful dealings of God with him. People are ever ready to tell what God has done for them in the way of benefits and blessings. We ought to be no less ready to tell what God has done for us in the way of humiliation and

chastisements; and Nebuchadnezzar sets us a good example in this respect, as we shall see from the subsequent portions of this chapter. He frankly confesses the vanity and pride of his heart, and the means that God took to abase him. With a genuine spirit of repentance and humiliation, he thinks it good, of his own free will, to show these things, that the sovereignty of God may be extolled, and his name adored. In reference to the kingdom, he no longer claims immutability for his own, but makes a full surrender to God, in acknowledging his kingdom alone to be everlasting, and his dominion from generation to generation.

Verse 4. I Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in mine house and flourishing in my palace: 5. I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the visions of my head troubled me. 6. Therefore made I a decree to bring in all the wise men of Babylon before me, that they might make known unto me the interpretation of the dream. 7. Then came in the magicians, the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers; and I told the dream before

them; but they did not make known unto me the interpretation thereof. 8. But at the last Daniel came in before me, whose name was Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god, and in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and before him I told the dream, saying, 9. O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the visions of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof. 10. Thus were the visions of mine head in my bed: I saw, and behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great. 11. The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth; 12. The leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all: the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it. 13. I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a watcher and an holy one came down from heaven; 14. He cried aloud, and said thus,

Hew down the tree, and cut off his branches, shake off his leaves, and scatter his fruit: let the beasts get away from under it, and the fowls from his branches: 15. Nevertheless, leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth; 16. Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him; and let seven times pass over him. 17. This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones; to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men. 18. This dream I king Nebuchadnezzar have seen. Now thou, O Belteshazzar, declare the interpretation thereof, forasmuch as all the wise men of my kingdom are not able to make known unto me the interpretation: but thou art able; for the spirit of the holy gods is in thee.

In the events here narrated, several striking points may be noticed.

1. Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in his house. He had accomplished successfully all his enterprises. He had subdued Syria, Phoenicia, Judea, Egypt, and Arabia. It was probably these great conquests that puffed him up, and betrayed him into such vanity and self-confidence. And this very time, when he felt most at rest and secure, when it was most unlikely that he would allow a thought to disturb his self-complacent tranquillity,--this very time God takes to trouble him with fears and forebodings.

2. The means by which God did this. What could strike with fear the heart of such a monarch as Nebuchadnezzar? He had been a warrior from his youth. With the perils of battle, the terrors of slaughter and carnage, he had often stood face to face, and his countenance had not blanched, nor his nerves trembled. And what should make him afraid now? No foe threatened, no hostile cloud was visible. As the most unlikely time was taken for

him to be touched with fear, so the most unlikely means was selected by which to accomplish it--a dream. His own thoughts, and the visions of his own head, were taken to teach him what nothing else could,--a salutary lesson of dependence and humility. He who had terrified others, but whom no others could terrify, was made a terror to himself.

3. A still greater humiliation than that narrated in the second chapter was brought upon the magicians. There, they boasted that if they only had the dream, they could make known the interpretation. Here, Nebuchadnezzar distinctly remembers the dream, but meets the mortification of having his magicians ignominiously fail him again. They could not make known the interpretation, and resort is again had to the prophet of God.

4. The remarkable illustration of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. This is symbolized by a tree in the midst of the earth. Babylon, where Nebuchadnezzar reigned, was about in the center of the then known world. The tree reached unto

heaven, and the leaves thereof were fair. Its external glory and splendor were great; but this was not all of it, as is the case with too many kingdoms. It had internal excellences. Its fruit was much, and it had meat for all. The beasts of the field had shadow under it, the fowls of heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it. What could represent more plainly and forcibly the fact that Nebuchadnezzar ruled his kingdom in such a way as to afford the fullest protection, support, and prosperity to all his subjects? Really to accomplish this is the perfection of earthly governments, and the highest glory of any kingdom.

5. The mercy that God mingles with his judgments. When order was given that this tree should be cut down, it was commanded that the stump of the roots should be left in the earth, and protected with a band of iron and brass, that it might not be wholly given to decay, but that the source of future growth and greatness might be left. The day is coming when the wicked shall be cut down, and no such residue of hope be left them. No

mercy will be mingled with their punishment. They shall be destroyed both root and branch.

6. An important key to prophetic interpretation. Verse 16 “Let seven times pass over him,” said the decree. This is plain, literal narration; hence the time is here to be understood literally. How long a period is denoted? This may be determined by ascertaining how long Nebuchadnezzar, in fulfillment of this prediction, was driven out to have his dwelling with the beasts of the field; and this, Josephus informs us, was seven years. A “time,” then, denotes one year. When used in symbolic prophecy, it would, of course, denote symbolic or prophetic time. A “time” would then denote a prophetic year, or, each day standing for a year, three hundred and sixty literal years. There will be occasion to refer to this fact under chapter 7:25.

7. The interest that the holy ones, or the angels, take in human affairs. They are represented as demanding this dealing with Nebuchadnezzar. They see, as mortals never can see, how unseemly

a thing is pride in the human heart. And they approve of, and sympathize with, the decrees and providences of God by which he works for the correction of these evils. Man must know that he is not the architect of his own fortune, but that there is One who ruleth in the kingdom of men, on whom his dependence should be humbly placed. A man may be a successful monarch, but he should not pride himself upon that; for unless the Lord had set him up, he would never have reached this position of honor.

8. Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges the supremacy of the true God over the heathen oracles. He appeals to Daniel to solve the mystery. "Thou art able," he says; "for the spirit of the holy gods is in thee." The Septuagint has the singular, the Spirit of the holy God.

Verse 19. Then Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, was astonished for one hour, and his thoughts troubled him. The king spake, and said, Belteshazzar, let not the dream, or the interpretation thereof, trouble thee.

Belteshazzar answered and said, My lord, the dream be to them that hate thee, and the interpretation thereof to thine enemies. 20. The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, whose hight reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth; 21. Whose leaves were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all; under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose branches the fowls of the heaven had their habitation: 22. It is thou, O king, that art grown and become strong; for thy greatness is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth. 23. And whereas the king saw a watcher and an holy one coming down from heaven, and saying, Hew the tree down, and destroy it; yet leave the stump of the roots thereof in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts of the field, till seven times pass over him; 24. This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the Most High, which is come upon my lord the king; 25. That they shall drive thee

from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. 26. And whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots; thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule. 27. Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity.

The hesitation of Daniel, who sat astonished for one hour, did not arise from any difficulty he had in interpreting the dream, but from its being so delicate a matter to make it known to the king. Daniel had received favor from the king,--nothing but favor, so far as we know,--and it came hard for him to be the bearer of so terrible a threatening of judgment against him as was involved in this

dream. He was troubled to determine in what way he could best make it known. It seems the king anticipated something of this kind, and hence assured the prophet by telling him not to let the dream or the interpretation trouble him; as if he had said, Do not hesitate to make it known, whatever bearing it may have upon me. Thus assured, Daniel speaks; and where can we find a parallel to the force and delicacy of his language: “The dream be to them that hate thee, and the interpretation thereof to thine enemies.” A calamity is set forth in this dream, which we would might come upon your enemies rather than upon you.

Nebuchadnezzar had given a minute statement of his dream; and as soon as Daniel informed him that the dream applied to himself, it was evident that he had pronounced his own sentence. The interpretation which follows is so plain that it need not detain us. The threatened judgments were conditional. They were to teach the king that the Heavens do rule, the word heavens here being put for God, the ruler of the heavens. Hence Daniel takes occasion to give the king counsel in view of

the threatened judgment. But he does not denounce him with harshness and censoriousness. Kindness and persuasion are the weapons he chooses to wield: “Let my counsel be acceptable unto thee.” So the apostle beseeches men to suffer the word of exhortation. Hebrews 13:22. If the king would break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor, it might result in a lengthening of his tranquillity, or, as the margin reads, “An healing of thine error.” That is, he might even have averted the judgment the Lord designed to bring upon him.

Verse 28. All this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar. 29. At the end of twelve months he walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon. 30. The king spake, and said, Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty? 31. While the word was in the king’s mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O king Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken: The kingdom is departed from thee. 32. And they shall drive thee from

men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field; they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee, until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. 33. The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar; and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws.

Nebuchadnezzar failed to profit by the warning he had received; yet God bore with him twelve months before the blow fell. All the time he was cherishing pride in his heart, and at length it reached a climax beyond which God could not suffer it to pass. The king walked in the palace, and as he looked forth upon the wonders of that wonder of the world, great Babylon, the beauty of kingdoms, he forgot the source of all his strength and greatness, and exclaimed, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built?" The time had come for his humiliation. A voice from heaven again

announces the threatened judgment, and divine Providence proceeds immediately to execute it. His reason departed. No longer the pomp and glory of his great city charmed him, when God with a touch of his finger took away his capability to appreciate and enjoy it. He forsook the dwellings of men, and sought a home and companionship among the beasts of the forest.

Verse 34. And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honored him that liveth forever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom is from generation to generation: 35. And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou? 36. At the same time my reason returned unto me; and for the glory of my kingdom, mine honor and brightness returned unto me; and my

counselors and my lords sought unto me; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent majesty was added unto me. 37. Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase.

At the end of seven years, God removed his afflicting hand, and the reason and understanding of the king returned to him again. His first act then was to bless the Most High. On this Matthew Henry has the following appropriate remark: “Those may justly be reckoned void of understanding that do not bless and praise God; nor do men ever rightly use their reason till they begin to be religions, nor live as men till they live to the glory of God. As reason is the substratum or subject of religion (so that creatures which have no reason are not capable of religion), so religion is the crown and glory of reason; and we have our reason in vain, and shall one day wish we had never had it, if we do not glorify God with it.”

His honor and brightness returned to him again, his counselors sought unto him, and he was once more established in the kingdom. The promise was (verse 26) that his kingdom should be sure unto him. During his insanity, his son, Evil-merodach, is said to have reigned as regent in his stead. Daniel's interpretation of the dream was doubtless well understood throughout the palace, and was probably more or less the subject of conversation. Hence the return of Nebuchadnezzar to his kingdom must have been anticipated, and looked for with interest. Why he was permitted to make his home in the open field in so forlorn a condition, instead of being comfortably cared for by the attendants of the palace, we are not informed. It is supposed that he dexterously escaped from the palace, and eluded all search.

The affliction had its designed effect. The lesson of humility was learned. He did not forget it with returning prosperity. He was ready to acknowledge that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomsoever he will; and he sent forth through all his realm a royal

proclamation, containing an acknowledgment of his pride, and a manifesto of praise and adoration to the King of heaven.

This is the last Scripture record we have of Nebuchadnezzar. This decree is dated in the authorized version, says Dr. Clarke, 563 B. C., one year before Nebuchadnezzar's death; though some place the date of this decree seventeen years before his death. Be this as it may, it is probable that he did not again relapse into idolatry, but died in the faith of the God of Israel.

Thus closed the life of this remarkable man. With all the temptations incident to his exalted position as king, may we not suppose that God saw in him honesty of heart, integrity, and purity of purpose, which he could use to the glory of his name? Hence his wonderful dealings with him, all of which seem to have been designed to wean him from his false religion, and attach him to the service of the true God. We have, first, his dream of the great image, containing such a valuable lesson for the people of all coming generations.

Secondly, his experience with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in reference to his golden image, wherein he was again led to an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the true God. And lastly, we have the wonderful incidents recorded in this chapter, showing the still unceasing efforts of the Lord to bring him to a full acknowledgment of himself. And may we not hope that the most illustrious king of the first prophetic kingdom, the head of gold, may at last have part in that kingdom before which all earthly kingdoms shall become as chaff, and the glory of which shall never dim?

Chapter 5

Belshazzar's Feast

Verse 1. Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.

The chief feature of interest pertaining to this chapter is the fact that it describes the closing scenes of the Babylonish empire, the transition from the gold to the silver of the great image of chapter 2, and from the lion to the bear of Daniel's vision in chapter 7. This feast is supposed by some to have been a stated annual festival, in honor of one of their deities. On this account, Cyrus, who was then besieging Babylon, learned of its approach, and knew when to lay his plans for the overthrow of the city. Our translation reads that Belshazzar, having invited a thousand of his lords, drank before the thousand. Some translate it, "drank against the thousand," showing that whatever other propensities he may have had, he was, at least, an enormous drinker.

Verse 2. Belshazzar, whiles he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein. 3. Then they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God which was in Jerusalem; and the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank in them. 4. They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

That this festival had some reference to former victories over the Jews may be inferred from the fact that the king, when he began to be heated with his wine, called for the sacred vessels which had been taken from Jerusalem. It would be most likely that, lost to a sense of all sacred things, he would use them to celebrate the victory by which they were obtained. No other king, probably, had carried his impiety to such a height as this. And

while they drank wine from vessels dedicated to the true God, they praised their gods of gold, silver, brass, iron, wood, and stone. Perhaps, as noticed on chapter 3:29, they celebrated the superior power of their gods over the God of the Jews, from whose vessels they now drank to their heathen deities.

Verse 5. In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. 6. Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another. 7. The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers. And the king spake, and said to the wise men of Babylon, Whosoever shall read this writing, and show me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom. 8. Then came in all the king's wise men: but they could not read the writing, nor make known to

the king the interpretation thereof. 9. Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonished.

No flashes of supernatural light, nor deafening peals of thunder, announced the interference of God in their impious revelries. A hand silently appeared, tracing mystic characters upon the wall. It wrote over against the candlestick. In the light of their own lamp they saw it. Terror seized upon the king; for his conscience accused him. Although he could not read the writing, he knew it was no message of peace and blessing that was traced in glittering characters upon his palace wall. And the description the prophet gives of the effect of the king's fear cannot be excelled in any particular. The king's countenance was changed, his heart failed him, pain seized upon him, and so violent was his trembling that his knees smote one against another. He forgot his boasting and revelry; he forgot his dignity; and he cried aloud for his astrologers and soothsayers to solve the meaning of the terrible apparition.

Verse 10. Now the queen by reason of the words of the king and his lords came into the banquet house: and the queen spake and said, O king, live forever; let not thy thoughts trouble thee, nor let thy countenance be changed. 11. There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods; and in the days of thy father light and understanding and wisdom, like the wisdom of the gods, was found in him; whom the king Nebuchadnezzar thy father, the king, I say, thy father, made master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers; 12. Forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting of dreams, and showing of hard sentences, and dissolving of doubts, were found in the same Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar: now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation. 13. Then was Daniel brought in before the king. And the king spake and said unto Daniel, Art thou that Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out

of Jewry? 14. I have even heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee. 15. And now the wise men, the astrologers, have been brought in before me, that they should read this writing, and make known unto me the interpretation thereof: but they could not show the interpretation of the thing. 16. And I have heard of thee, that thou canst make interpretations, and dissolve doubts: now if thou canst read the writing, and make known to me the interpretation thereof, thou shalt be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about thy neck, and shalt be the third ruler in the kingdom.

It appears from the circumstance here narrated, that the fact that Daniel was a prophet of God, had by some means been lost sight of at the court and palace. This was doubtless owing to his having been absent at Shushan in the province of Elam, as narrated in chapter 8:1, 2, 27, whither he had been sent to attend to the business of the kingdom there. The country being swept by the Persian army

would compel his return to Babylon at this time. The queen who came in and made known to the king that there was such a person to whom appeal could be made for knowledge in supernatural things, is supposed to have been the queen mother, the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, in whose memory the wonderful part Daniel had acted in her father's reign would still be fresh and vivid. Nebuchadnezzar is here called Belshazzar's father, according to the then common custom of calling any paternal ancestor, father, and any male descendant, son. Nebuchadnezzar was in reality his grandfather. The king inquired of Daniel when he came in, if he was of the children of the captivity of Judah. Thus it seems to have been ordered, that while they were holding impious revelry in honor of their false gods, a servant of the true God, and one whom they were holding in captivity, was called in to pronounce the merited judgment upon their wicked course.

Verse 17. Then Daniel answered and said before the king, Let thy gifts be to thyself, and give thy rewards to another; yet I will read the

writing unto the king, and make known to him the interpretation. 18. O thou king, the most high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honor; 19. And for the majesty that he gave him, all people, nations, and languages, trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew; and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he set up; and whom he would he put down. 20. But when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him: 21. And he was driven from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses: they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven; till he knew that the most high God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will. 22. And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this; 23. But hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and

thy lords, thy wives, and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know: and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified: 24. Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written.

Daniel first of all disclaims the idea of being influenced by such motives as governed the soothsayers and astrologers. He says, Let thy rewards be to another. He wishes it distinctly understood that he does not enter upon the work of interpreting this matter on account of the offer of gifts and rewards. He then rehearses the experience of the king's grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar, as set forth in the preceding chapter. He told the king that though he knew all this, yet he had not humbled his heart, but had lifted up himself against the God of heaven, and even carried his impiety so far as to profane his sacred vessels, praising the senseless gods of men's making, and failing to glorify the God in whose hands his breath was. For this

reason, he tells him, it is, that the hand has been sent forth from that God whom he had daringly and insultingly challenged, to trace those characters of fearful, though hidden import. He then proceeds to explain the writing.

Verse 25. And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. 26. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. 27. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. 28. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians. 29. Then commanded Belshazzar, and they clothed Daniel with scarlet, and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning him, that he should be the third ruler in the kingdom.

It is not known in what language this inscription was written. If it had been in Chaldaic, the king's wise men would have been able to read it. Dr. Clarke conjectures that it was written in the Samaritan, the true Hebrew, a language with which

Daniel was familiar, as it was the character used by the Jews previous to the Babylonish captivity. It seems much more likely that it was a character strange to all the parties, and that it was specially made known to Daniel by the Spirit of the Lord.

In this inscription each word stands for a short sentence. Mene, numbered; Tekel, weighed; Upharsin, from the root peres, divided. God, whom thou hast defied, has thy kingdom in his own hands, and has numbered its days and finished its course, just at the time thou thoughtest it at the height of its prosperity. Thou, who hast lifted up thy heart in pride, as the great one of the earth, art weighed, and found lighter than vanity. Thy kingdom, which thou didst dream was to stand forever, is divided between the foes already waiting at thy gates. Notwithstanding this terrible denunciation, Belshazzar did not forget his promise, but had Daniel at once invested with the scarlet robe and chain of gold, and proclaimed him third ruler in the kingdom. This Daniel accepted, probably with a view to be better prepared to look after the interests of his people during the transition

to the succeeding kingdom.

Verse 30. In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. 31. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.

The scene here so briefly mentioned is described in remarks on chapter 2, verse 39. While Belshazzar was indulging in his presumptuous revelry, while the angel's hand was tracing the doom of the empire on the walls of the palace, while Daniel was making known the fearful import of the heavenly writing, the Persian soldiery, through the emptied channel of the Euphrates, had made their way into the heart of the city, and were speeding forward with drawn swords to the palace of the king. Scarcely can it be said that they surprised him, for God had just forewarned him of his doom. But they found him and slew him; and with him the empire of Babylon ceased to be.

As a fitting conclusion to this chapter, we give the following beautiful poetic description of

Belshazzar's feast, from the pen of Edwin Arnold, author of *The Light of Asia*. It was written in 1852, and obtained the Newdegate prize for an English poem on the Feast of Belshazzar, at University College, Oxford:--

Not by one portal, or one path alone,
God's holy messages to men are known;
Waiting the glances of his awful eyes,
Silver-winged seraphs do him embassies;
And stars, interpreting his high behest,
Guide the lone feet and glad the falling breast;
The rolling thunder and the raging sea
Speak the stern purpose of the Deity,
And storms beneath and rainbow hues above
Herald his anger or proclaim his love;
The still small voices of the summer day,
The red sirocco, and the breath of May,
The lingering harmony in ocean shells,
The fairy music of the meadow bells,
Earth and void air, water and wasting flame,
Have words to whisper, tongues to tell, his
name.

Once, with no cloak of careful mystery,
Himself was herald of his own decree;
The hand that edicts on the marble drew,
Graved the stern sentence of their scorner too.
Listen and learn! Tyrants have heard the tale,
And turned from hearing, terror-struck and
pale;
Spiritless captives, sinking with the chain,
Have read this page, and taken heart again.

From sunlight unto starlight, trumpets told
Her king's command in Babylon the old;
From sunlight unto starlight, west and east,
A thousand satraps girt them for the feast,
And reined their chargers to the palace hall
Where king Belshazzar held high festival:
A pleasant palace under pleasant skies,
With cloistered courts and gilded galleries,
And gay kiosk and painted balustrade
For winter terraces and summer shade;
By court and terrace, minaret and dome,
Euphrates, rushing from his mountain home,
Rested his rage, and curbed his crested pride
To belt that palace with his bluest tide;

Broad-fronted bulls with chiseled feathers
barred,
In silent vigil keeping watch and ward,
Giants of granite, wrought by cunning hand,
Guard in the gate and frown upon the land.
Not summer's glow nor yellow autumn's glare
Pierced the broad tamarisks that blossomed
there;
The moonbeams, darting through their leafy
screen,
Lost half their silver in the softened green,
And fell with lessened luster, broken light,
Tracing quaint arabesque of dark and white,
Or dimly tinting on the graven stones
The pictured annals of Chaldean thrones.
There, from the rising to the setting day,
Birds of bright feathers sang the light away,
And fountain waters on the palace floor
Made even answer to the river's roar,
Rising in silver from the crystal well,
And breaking into spangles as they fell,
Though now ye heard them not--for far along
Rang the broad chorus of the banquet song,
And sounds as gentle, echoes soft as these,

Died out of hearing from the revelries.

High on a throne of ivory and gold,
From crown to footstool clad in purple fold,
Lord of the East from sea to distant sea,
The king Belshazzar feasteth royally--
And not that dreamer in the desert cave
Peopled his paradise with pomp as brave;
Vessels of silver, cups of crusted gold,
Blush with a brighter red than all they hold;
Pendulous lamps, like planets of the night,
Flung on the diadems a fragrant light,
Or, slowly swinging in the midnight sky,
Gilded the ripples as they glided by.
And sweet and sweeter rose the cittern's ring,
Soft as the beating of a seraph's wing;
And swift and swifter in the measured dance
The tresses gather and the sandals glance:
And bright and brighter at the festal board
The flagons bubble, and the wines are poured.
No lack of goodly company was there,
No lack of laughing eyes to light the cheer;
From Dara trooped they, from Daremma's
grove,

“The sons of battle and the moons of love;”[1]
From where Arsissa’s silver waters sleep
To Imla’s marshes and the inland deep,
From pleasant Calah, and from Cattacene--
The horseman’s captain and the harem’s queen.

It seemed no summer-cloud of passing woe
Could fling its shadow on so fair a show;
It seemed the gallant forms that feasted there
Were all too grand for woe, too great for care;--
Whence came the anxious eye, the altered tone,
The dull presentiment no heart could own,
That ever changed the smiling to a sigh
Sudden as sea-bird flashing from the sky?
It is not that they know the spoiler waits
Harnessed for battle at the brazen gates;
It is not that they hear the watchman’s call
Mark the slow minutes on the leaguered wall:
The clash of quivers and the ring of spears
Make pleasant music in a soldier’s ears,
And not a scabbard hideth sword to-night
That hath not glimmered in the front of fight.
May not the blood of every beating vein
Have quick foreknowledge of the coming pain,

Even as the prisoned silver,[2] dead and dumb,
Shrinks at cold winter's footfall ere he come?

The king hath felt it, and the heart's unrest
Heaved the broad purple of his belted breast.
Sudden he speaks: "What! doth the beaded
juice

Savor like hyssop, that ye scorn its use?
Wear ye so pitiful and sad a soul,
That tramp of foemen scares ye from the bowl?
Think ye the gods on yonder starry floor
Tremble for terror when the thunders roar?
Are we not gods? have we not fought with
God?

And shall we shiver at a robber's nod?
No; let them batter till the brazen bars
Ring merry mocking of their idle wars.
Their fall is fated for to-morrow's sun;
The lion rouses when his feast is done.
Crown me a cup, and fill the bowls we brought
From Judah's temple when the fight was
fought;
Drink, till the merry madness fill the soul,
To Salem's conqueror in Salem's bowl;

Each from the goblet of a god shall sip,
And Judah's gold tread heavy on the lip." [3]
The last loud answer dies along the line,
The last light bubble bursts upon the wine,
His eager lips are on the jeweled brink,--
Hath the cup poison that he doubts to drink?
Is there a spell upon the sparkling gold,
That so his fevered fingers quit their hold?
Whom sees he where he gazes? what is there,
Freezing his vision into fearful stare?
Follow his lifted arm and lighted eye,
And watch with them the wondrous mystery.

There cometh forth a hand, upon the stone
Graving the symbols of a speech unknown.
Fingers like mortal fingers, leaving there
The blank wall flashing characters of fear;
And still it glideth silently and slow,
And still beneath the spectral letters grow;
Now the scroll endeth; now the seal is set;
The hand is gone; the record tarries yet.
As one who waits the warrant of his death,
With pale lips parted and with bridled breath,
They watch the sign, and dare not turn to seek

Their fear reflected in their fellows' cheek,
But stand as statues where the life is none,
Half the jest uttered, half the laughter done,
Half the flask empty, half the flagon poured,
Each where the phantom found him at the
board

Struck into silence, as December's arm
Curbs the quick ripples into crystal calm.
With wand of ebony and sable stole,
Chaldea's wisest scan the spectral scroll.
Strong in the lessons of a lying art,
Each comes to gaze, but gazes to depart;
And still for mystic sign and muttered spell
The graven letters guard their secret well;
Gleam they for warning, glare they to
condemn,
God speaketh, but he speaketh not for them.

Oh! ever, when the happy laugh is dumb,
All the joy gone, and all the anguish come;
When strong adversity and subtle pain
Wring the sad soul and rack the throbbing
brain;
When friends once faithful, hearts once all our

own,
Leave us to weep, to bleed and die alone;
When fears and cares the lonely thought
employ,
And clouds of sorrow hide the sun of joy;
When weary life, breathing reluctant breath,
Hath no hope sweeter than the hope of death,--
Then the best counsel and the last relief,
To cheer the spirit or to cheat the grief,
The only calm, the only comfort heard,
Comes in the music of a woman's word,
Like beacon-bell on some wild island shore,
Silverly ringing in the tempest's roar;
Whose sound, borne shipward through the
midnight gloom,
Tells of the path, and turns her from her doom.

So in the silence of that awful hour,
When baffled magic mourned its parted power,
When kings were pale, and satraps shook for
fear,
A woman speaketh, and the wisest hear.
She, the high daughter of a thousand thrones,
Telling with trembling lip and timid tones

Of him, the captive, in the feast forgot,
Who readeth visions; him whose wondrous lot
Sends him to lighten doubt and lessen gloom,
And gaze undazzled on the days to come;
Daniel, the Hebrew, such his name and race,
Held by a monarch highest in his grace,
He may declare--oh! bid them quickly send,
So may the mystery have happy end.

Calmly and silent as the fair, full moon
Comes smiling upward in the sky of June,
Fearfully as the troubled clouds of night
Shrink from before the coming of its light,
So through the hall the prophet passed along,
So from before him fell the festal throng.
By broken wassail-cup, and wine o'erthrown,
Pressed he still onward for the monarch's
 throne;

His spirit failed him not, his quiet eye
Lost not its light for earthly majesty;
His lip was steady and his accent clear--
"The king hath needed me, and I am here."

"Art thou the prophet? Read me yonder scroll,

Whose undeciphered horror daunts my soul.
There shall be guerdon for the grateful task,
Fitted for me to give, for thee to ask,--
A chain to deck thee, and a robe to grace,
Thine the third throne, and thou the third in
place.”

He heard, and turned him where the lighted
wall

Dimmed the red torches of the festival,
Gazed on the sign with steady gaze and set;
And he who quailed not at a kingly threat
Bent the true knee and bowed the silver hair,
For that he knew the King of kings was there;
Then nerved his soul the sentence to unfold,
While his tongue trembled at the tale it told.
And never tongue shall echo tale as strange
Till that change cometh which shall never
change.

“Keep for thyself the guerdon and the gold;
What God hath graved, God’s prophet must
unfold;

Could not thy father’s crime, thy father’s fate,
Teach thee the terror thou hast learned too late?

Hast thou not read the lesson of his life,--
Who wars with God shall strive a losing strife?
His was a kingdom mighty as thine own,
The sword his scepter and the earth his throne;
The nations trembled when his awful eye
Gave to them leave to live or doom to die:
The lord of life, the keeper of the grave,
His frown could wither, and his smile could
save.

Yet, when his heart was hard, his spirit high,
God drove him from his kingly majesty,
Far from the brotherhood of fellow-men,
To seek for dwelling in the desert den;
Where the wild asses feed and oxen roam,
He sought his pasture and he made his home;

And bitter-biting frost and dews of night
Schooled him in sorrow till he knew the right,--
That God is ruler of the rulers still,
And setteth up the sovereign that he will.
Oh! hadst thou treasured in repentant breast
His pride and fall, his penitence and rest,
And bowed submissive to Jehovah's will,
Then had thy scepter been a scepter still.

But thou hast mocked the Majesty of heaven;
And shamed the vessels to his service given.
And thou hast fashioned idols of thine own,--
Idols of gold, of silver, and of stone;
To them hast bowed the knee, and breathed the
 breath,
And they must help thee in the hour of death.
Woe for the sign unseen, the sin forgot!
God was among ye, and ye knew it not!
Hear what he sayeth now: ‘Thy race is run,
Thy years are numbered, and thy days are done;
Thy soul hath mounted in the scale of fate,
The Lord hath weighed thee, and thou lackest
 weight;
Now in thy palace porch the spoilers stand,
To seize thy scepter, to divide thy land.’”

He ended, and his passing foot was heard,
But none made answer, not a lip was stirred;
Mute the free tongue, and bent the fearless
 brow;
The mystic letters had their meaning now.
Soon came there other sound,--the clash of
 steel,

The heavy ringing of the iron heel,
The curse in dying, and the cry for life,--
The bloody voices of the battle strife.

That night they slew him on his father's throne,
The deed unnoticed and the hand unknown:
Crownless and scepterless Belshazzar lay,
A robe of purple round a form of clay.

Notes:

1. Hafiz, the Persian Anacreon.
2. The quicksilver in the tube of the thermometer.
3. "He never drinks. But Timon's silver treads upon his lips."--Shakespeare, "Titus Andronicus."

Chapter 6

Daniel in the Lion's Den

Verse 1. It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred and twenty princes, which should be over the whole kingdom; 2. And over these three presidents; of whom Daniel was first; that the princes might give accounts unto them, and the king should have no damage. 3. Then this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes, because an excellent spirit was in him; and the king thought to set him over the whole realm. 4. Then the presidents and princes sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom; but they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him. 5. Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God.

Babylon was taken by the Persians, and Darius

the Median placed upon the throne, B. C. 538. Two years later, B. C. 536, Darius dying, Cyrus took the throne. Somewhere, therefore, between these two dates the event here narrated occurred.

Daniel was a chief actor in the kingdom of Babylon in the hight of its glory; and from that time on, to the time when the Medes and Persians took the throne of universal empire, he was at least a resident of that city, and acquainted with all the affairs of the kingdom; yet he gives us no consecutive account of events that occurred during his long connection with these kingdoms. He only touches upon an event here and there such as is calculated to inspire faith and hope and courage in the hearts of the people of God in every age, and lead them to be steadfast in their adherence to the right.

The event narrated in this chapter is alluded to by the apostle Paul in Hebrews 11, where he speaks of some who through faith have “stopped the mouths of lions.” Darius set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty princes, there being, as is

supposed, at that time a hundred and twenty provinces in the empire, each one having its prince, or governor. By the victories of Cambyses and Darius Hystaspes, it was afterward enlarged to a hundred and twenty-seven provinces. Esther 1:1. Over these one hundred and twenty princes were set three, and of these Daniel was chief. Preference was given to Daniel because of his excellent spirit. Daniel, who, for being a great man in the empire of Babylon, might have been esteemed an enemy by Darius, and so have been banished or otherwise put out of the way; or, being a captive from a nation then in ruins, might have been despised and set at naught, was not treated in either of these ways; but to the credit of Darius be it said, Daniel was preferred over all the others, because the discerning king saw in him an excellent spirit. And the king thought to set him over the whole realm. Then was the envy of the other rulers raised against him, and they set about to destroy him. But Daniel's conduct was perfect so far as related to the kingdom. He was faithful and true. They could find no ground for complaint against him on that score. Then they said they could find no occasion to accuse him,

except as concerning the law of his God. So let it be with us. A person can have no better recommendation.

Verse 6. Then these presidents and princes assembled together to the king, and said thus unto him, King Darius, live forever. 7. All the presidents of the kingdom, the governors, and the princes, the counselors, and the captains, have consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions. 8. Now, O king, establish the decree, and sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. 9. Wherefore king Darius signed the writing and the decree. 10. Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.

Mark the course these persons took to accomplish their nefarious purposes. They came together to the king,--came tumultuously, says the margin. They came as though some urgent matter had suddenly come up, and they had come unanimously to present it before him. They claimed that all were agreed. This was false; for Daniel, the chief of them all, was not, of course, consulted in the matter. The decree they fixed upon was one which would flatter the king's vanity, and thus the more readily gain his assent. It would be a position before unheard of, for a man to be the only dispenser of favors and granter of petitions for thirty days. Hence the king, not fathoming their evil designs, signed the decree, and it took its place on the statute-book as one of the unalterable laws of the Medes and Persians.

Mark the subtlety of these men--the length to which people will go to accomplish the ruin of the good. If they had made the decree read that no petition should be asked of the God of the Hebrews, which was the real design of the matter,

the king would at once have divined their object, and the decree would not have been signed. So they gave it a general application, and were willing to ignore and heap insult upon their whole system of religion, and all the multitude of their gods, for the sake of ruining the object of their hatred.

Daniel foresaw the conspiracy going on against him, but took no means to thwart it. He simply committed himself to God, and left the issue to his providence. He did not leave the empire on pretended business, or perform his devotions with more than ordinary secrecy; but when he knew the writing was signed, just as aforetime, with his face turned toward his beloved Jerusalem, he kneeled down in his chamber three times a day, and poured out his prayers and supplications to God.

Verse 11. Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God. 12. Then they came near, and spake before the king concerning the king's decree: Hast thou not signed a decree, that every man that shall ask a petition of any God

or man within thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said, The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. 13. Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day. 14. Then the king, when he heard these words, was sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him; and he labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him. 15. Then these men assembled unto the king, and said unto the king, Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed. 16. Then the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions. Now the king spake and said unto Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee. 17. And a stone was brought, and laid upon the mouth of the den; and the king sealed it with his own signet, and

with the signet of his lords, that the purpose might not be changed concerning Daniel.

It only remained for these men, having set the trap, to watch their victim that they might ensnare him therein. So they again came tumultuously together, this time at the residence of Daniel, as though some important business had called them suddenly together to consult the chief of the presidents; and lo, they found him, just as they intended and hoped, praying to his God. So far all had worked well. They were not long in going to the king with the matter, and, to render it more sure, got an acknowledgment from the king that such a decree was in force. Then they were ready to inform against Daniel; and mark their mean resort to excite the prejudices of the king: “That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah.” Yes; that poor captive, who is entirely dependent on you for all that he enjoys, so far from being grateful and appreciating your favors, regards not you, nor pays any attention to your decree. Then the king saw the trap that had been prepared for him as well as for Daniel, and he

labored till the going down of the sun to deliver him, probably by personal efforts with the conspirators to cause them to relent, or by arguments and endeavors to procure the repeal of the law. But they were inexorable. The law was sustained; and Daniel, the venerable, the grave, the upright and faultless servant of the kingdom, was thrown, as if he had been one of the vilest of malefactors, into the den of lions to be devoured by them.

Verse 18. Then the king went to his palace, and passed the night fasting; neither were instruments of music brought before him; and his sleep went from him. 19. Then the king arose very early in the morning, and went in haste unto the den of lions. 20. And when he came to the den, he cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel; and the king spake and said to Daniel, O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions? 21. Then said Daniel unto the king, O king, live forever. 22. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths,

that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt. 23. Then was the king exceeding glad for him, and commanded that they should take Daniel up out of the den. So Daniel was taken up out of the den, and no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he believed in his God. 24. And the king commanded, and they brought those men which had accused Daniel, and they cast them into the den of lions, them, their children, and their wives; and the lions had the mastery of them, and brake all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den.

The course of the king after Daniel had been cast into the den of lions attests his genuine interest in his behalf, and the severe condemnation he felt for his own course in the matter. At earliest dawn he repaired to the den where his prime minister had passed the night in company with hungry and ravenous beasts. Daniel's response to his first salutation was no word of reproach for the king's course in yielding to his persecutors, but a term of

respect and honor, “O king, live forever.” He afterward, however, reminds the king, in a manner which he must have keenly felt, but to which he could take no exception, that before him he had done no hurt. And on account of his innocency, God, whom he served continually, not at intervals, nor by fits and starts, had sent his angel, and shut the lions’ mouths.

Here, then, stood Daniel, preserved by a power higher than any power of earth. His cause was vindicated, his innocency declared. No hurt was found on him, because he believed in his God. Faith did it. A miracle had been wrought. Why, then, were Daniel’s accusers brought and cast in? It is conjectured that they attributed the preservation of Daniel, not to any miracle in his behalf, but to the fact that the lions chanced at that time not to be hungry. Then, said the king, they will no more attack you than him, so we will test the matter by putting you in. The lions were hungry enough when they could get hold of the guilty; and these men were torn to pieces ere they reached the bottom of the den. Thus was Daniel doubly

vindicated; and thus strikingly were the words of Solomon fulfilled: “The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead.” Proverbs 11:8.

Verse 25. Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth: Peace be multiplied unto you. 26. I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel; for he is the living God, and steadfast forever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. 27. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions. 28. So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.

The result of Daniel’s deliverance was that another proclamation went out through the empire in favor of the true God, the God of Israel. All men were to fear and tremble before him. What Daniel’s

enemies designed to prove his ruin, resulted only in his advancement. In this case, and in the case of the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace, the seal of God is set in favor of two great lines of duty: (1) As in the case of the three in the fiery furnace, not to yield to any known sin; and (2) As in the present case, not to omit any known duty. And from these instances, the people of God in all ages are to derive encouragement.

The decree of the king sets forth the character of the true God in fine terms. (1) He is the living God; all others are dead. (2) He is steadfast forever; all others change. (3) He has a kingdom; for he made and governs all. (4) His kingdom shall not be destroyed; all others come to an end. (5) His dominion is without end; no human power can prevail against it. (6) He delivereth those who are in bondage. (7) He rescueth his servants from their enemies when they call upon him for help. (8) He worketh wonders in the heavens and signs upon the earth. (9) And to complete all, he hath delivered Daniel, giving before our own eyes the fullest proof of his power and goodness in rescuing his

servant from the power of the lions. How excellent an eulogium is this on the great God and his faithful servant!

Thus closes the historical part of the book of Daniel. We now come to the prophetic portion, which, like a shining beacon light, has thrown its rays over all the course of time from that point to the present, and is still lighting up the pathway of the church onward to the eternal kingdom.

Chapter 7

The Four Beasts

Verse 1. In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed; then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.

This is the same Belshazzar mentioned in chapter 5. Chronologically, therefore, this chapter follows chapter 5; but chronological order has been disregarded in order that the historical part of the book might stand by itself, and the prophetic part, on which we now enter, might not be interrupted by writings of that nature.

Verse 2. Daniel spake and said, I saw in' my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. 3. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.

All Scripture language is to be taken literally,

unless there exists some good reason for supposing it to be figurative; and all that is figurative is to be interpreted by that which is literal. That the language here used is symbolic, is evident from verse 17, which reads, “These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.” And to show that kingdoms are intended, and not merely individual kings, the angel continued, “But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.” And further, in the explanation in verse 23, the angel said, “The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth.” These beast are therefore symbols of four great kingdoms; and the circumstances under which they arose, and the means by which their elevation was accomplished, as represented in the prophecy, are symbolic also. The symbols introduced are, the four winds, the sea, four great beasts, ten horns, and another horn which had eyes and a mouth, and rose up in war against God and his people. We have now to inquire what they denote.

Winds, in symbolic language, denote strife, political commotion, and war. Jeremiah 25:31, 32,

33: “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth.” Here the prophet speaks of a controversy which the Lord is to have with all nations, when the wicked shall be given to the sword, and the slain of the Lord shall be from one end of the earth to the other; and the strife and commotion which produces all this destruction is called a great whirlwind.

That winds denote strife and war is further evident from a consideration of the vision itself; for as the result of the striving of the winds, kingdoms arise and fall; and these events are accomplished through political strife.

The Bible definition of sea, or waters, when used as a symbol, is, peoples, and nations, and tongues. In proof of this, see Revelation 17:15, where it is expressly so declared.

The definition of the symbol of the four beasts is given to Daniel ere the close of the vision. Verse 17: “These great beasts, which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.” The field of the vision is thus definitely opened before us.

Verse 4. The first was like a lion, and had eagle’s wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man’s heart was given to it.

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.

At first the lion had eagle's wings, denoting the rapidity with which Babylon extended its conquests under Nebuchadnezzar. At this point in the vision a change had taken place; its wings had been plucked. It no longer flew like an eagle upon its prey. The boldness and spirit of the lion were

gone. A man's heart, weak, timorous, and faint, had taken its place. Such was emphatically the case with the nation during the closing years of its history, when it had become enfeebled and effeminate through wealth and luxury.

Verse 5. And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it; and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.

As in the great image of chapter 2, so in this series of symbols, a marked deterioration will be noticed as we descend from one kingdom to another. The silver of the breast and arms was inferior to the gold of the head. The bear was inferior to the lion. Medo-Persia fell short of Babylon in wealth and magnificence, and the brilliancy of its career. And now we come to additional particulars respecting this power. The bear raised itself up on one side. This kingdom was composed of two nationalities, the Medes and the Persians. The same fact is represented by the two

horns of the ram of chapter 8. Of these horns it is said that the higher came up last; and of the bear that it raised itself up on one side; and this was fulfilled by the Persian division of the kingdom, which came up last, but attained the higher eminence, becoming the controlling influence in the nation. (See on chapter 8:3.) The three ribs perhaps signify the three provinces of Babylon, Lydia, and Egypt, which were especially ground down and oppressed by this power. Their saying unto it, "Arise, devour much flesh," would naturally refer to the stimulus given to the Medes and Persians, by the overthrow of these provinces, to plan and undertake more extensive conquests. The character of the power is well represented by a bear. The Medes and Persians were cruel and rapacious, robbers and spoilers of the people. As already noticed in the exposition of chapter 2, this kingdom dated from the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus, B. C. 538, and continued to the battle of Arbela, B. C. 331, a period of 207 years.

Verse 6. After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it

four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it.

The third kingdom, Grecia, is represented by this symbol. If wings upon the lion signified rapidity of conquest, they would signify the same here. The leopard itself is a swift-footed beast, but this was not sufficient to represent the career of the nation which it symbolized in this respect; it must have wings in addition. Two wings, the number the lion had, were not sufficient, it must have four; this would denote unparalleled celerity of movement, which we find to be historically true of the Grecian kingdom. The conquests of Grecia under Alexander have no parallel in historic annals for suddenness and rapidity.

Rollin, *Ancient History*, b. 15, sec. 2, gives the following brief synopsis of Alexander's marches:--

“From Macedonia to the Ganges, which river Alexander nearly approached, is computed at least eleven hundred leagues. Add to this the various turnings in Alexander's marches; first, from the

extremity of Cilicia, where the battle of Issus was fought, to the temple of Jupiter Ammon in Libya; and his returning from thence to Tyre, a journey of three hundred leagues at least, and as much space at least for the windings of his route in different places; we shall find that Alexander, in less than eight years, marched his army upward of seventeen hundred leagues [or more than fifty-one hundred miles], without including his return to Babylon.”

“The beast had also four heads.” The Grecian empire maintained its unity but little longer than the lifetime of Alexander. Within fifteen years after his brilliant career ended in a fever induced by a drunken debauch, the empire was divided among his four leading generals. Cassander had Macedon and Greece in the west; Lysimachus had Thrace and the parts of Asia on the Hellespont and Bosphorus in the north; Ptolemy received Egypt, Lydia, Arabia, Palestine, and Coele-Syria in the south; and Seleucus had Syria and all the rest of Alexander’s dominions in the east. These divisions were denoted by the four heads of the leopard. B. C. 308.

Thus accurately were the words of the prophet fulfilled. As Alexander left no available successor, why did not the huge empire break up into countless petty fragments? Why into just four parts, and no more?--Because the prophecy had said that there should be four. The leopard had four heads, the rough goat four horns, the kingdom was to have four divisions; and thus it was. (See more fully on chapter 8.)

Verse 7. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly: and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.

Inspiration finds no beast in nature which it can make even the basis of a symbol to represent the power here illustrated. No addition of hoofs, heads, horns, wings, scales, teeth, or nails to any beast found in nature, would answer. This power was

diverse from all the others, and the symbol wholly nondescript.

The foundation for a volume is laid in verse 7, just quoted; but we are compelled to treat it the more briefly here, because anything like a full history is entirely beyond the space that can be allowed in this brief exposition. This beast, of course, corresponds to the fourth division of the great image--the legs of iron. Under chapter 2:40 are given some reasons for supposing this power to be Rome. The same reasons are applicable to the present prophecy. How accurately Rome answered to the iron division of the image! How accurately it answers to the beast before us! In the dread and terror which it inspired, and in its exceeding strength, the world has never seen its equal. It devoured as with iron teeth, and brake in pieces; and it ground the nations into the very dust beneath its brazen feet. It had ten horns, which are explained in verse 24 to be ten kings, or kingdoms, which should arise out of this empire. As already noticed in chapter 2, Rome was divided into ten kingdoms, enumerated as follows: The Huns, the

Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Franks, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Burgundians, the Heruli, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Lombards. These divisions have ever since been spoken of as the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire. A. D. 351-483. See on chapter 2:41, 42; also Appendix III.

Verse 8. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.

Daniel considered the horns. Indications of a strange movement appeared among them. A little horn (at first little, but afterward more stout than its fellows) thrust itself up among them. It was not content quietly to find a place of its own, and fill it; it must thrust aside some of the others, and usurp their places. Three kingdoms were plucked up before it. This little horn, as we shall have occasion to notice more fully hereafter, was the papacy. The three horns plucked up before it were the Heruli,

the Ostrogoths, and the Vandals. And the reason why they were plucked up was because they were opposed to the arrogant claims of the papal hierarchy, and hence to the supremacy in the church of the bishop of Rome.

And “in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things,”--the eyes, a fit emblem of the shrewdness, penetration, cunning, and foresight of the papal hierarchy; and the mouth speaking great things, a fit symbol of the arrogant claims of the bishops of Rome.

Verse 9. I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. 10. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened.

A sublimer description of a sublimer scene is not to be found in the English language. But not only on account of the grand and lofty imagery introduced should it arrest our attention; the nature of the scene itself is such as to demand most serious consideration. The Judgment is brought to view; and whenever the Judgment is mentioned, it ought to take an irresistible hold upon every mind; for all have an interest in its eternal issues.

By an unfortunate translation in verse 9, a wrong idea is almost sure to be conveyed. The words cast down are from a word which in the original signifies just the opposite, namely, to set up. The word [r'mah] Gesenius defines as follows: "Chald. 1. To cast, to throw, Daniel 3:20, 21, 24; 6:17. 2. To set, to place, e. g., thrones, Daniel 7:9. Comp. Revelation 4:2,e.t. and No. 2." The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, by Davidson, also gives to this word the definition "to set, to place," and refers to Daniel 7:9 as an example of its use in this sense. Why this word was used to express the idea here intended may perhaps be learned from the following note

found in the Cottage Bible: “Ver. 9. The thrones were cast down. Wintle, ‘Were placed.’ So Boothroyd. But both come to the same meaning. The Asiatics have neither chairs nor stools, but, to receive persons of rank, ‘cast down,’ or ‘place,’ cushions round the room for seats, which seems to be here alluded to. See Matthew 19:28; Revelation 20:4.” Dr. Clarke says that the word “might be translated erected; so the Vulgate, positi sunt [were placed], and so all the versions.” The Septuagint has .t...sa. (etethesan), which is defined to mean “to set, put, place; to set up; to erect.” The thrones are not the thrones of earthly kingdoms, which are to be thrown down at the last day, but thrones of judgment, which are to be “placed,” or set up, in the court of God on high just before the end.

The “Ancient of days,” God the Father, takes the throne of judgment. Mark the description of his person. Those who believe in the impersonality of God are obliged to admit that he is here described as a personal being; but they console themselves by saying that it is the only description of the kind in the Bible. We do not admit this latter assertion; but

granting that it were true, is not one description of this kind as fatal to their theory as though it were repeated a score of times? The thousand thousands who minister unto him, and the ten thousand times ten thousand who stand before him, are not sinners arraigned before the judgment-seat, but heavenly beings who wait before him, attendant on his will. An understanding of these verses involves an understanding of the subject of the sanctuary; and to works on this question we refer the reader. The closing up of the ministration of Christ, our great High Priest, in the heavenly sanctuary, is the work of judgment here introduced. It is an investigative judgment. The books are opened, and the cases of all come up for examination before that great tribunal, that it may be determined beforehand who are to receive eternal life when the Lord shall come to confer it upon his people. John, as recorded in Revelation 5, had a view of this same place, and saw the same number of heavenly attendants engaged with Christ in the work of investigative judgment. Looking into the sanctuary (as we learn from Revelation 4 that he was doing), in chapter 5:11 he says, "And I beheld, and I heard the voice

of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.”

It will appear from the testimony of chapter 8:14, that this solemn work is even now transpiring in the sanctuary above.

Verse 11. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. 12. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.

There are persons who believe in a thousand years' triumph of the gospel and reign of righteousness over all the world before the Lord comes; and there are others who believe in probation after the Lord comes, and a mixed millennium, the immortal righteous still proclaiming the gospel to mortal sinners, and

turning them into the way of salvation. But both of these systems of error are completely demolished by the verses before us.

1. The fourth terrible beast continues without change of character, and the little horn continues to utter its blasphemies, and hold its millions of votaries in the bonds of a blind superstition, till the beast is given to the burning flame; and this is not its conversion, but its destruction. (See 2 Thessalonians 2:8.)

2. The life of the fourth beast is not prolonged after its dominion is gone, as were the lives of the preceding beasts. Their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season. The territory and subjects of the Babylonian kingdom still existed, though made subject to the Persians. So of the Persian kingdom in respect to Grecia, and of Grecia in respect to Rome. But what succeeds the fourth kingdom?--No government or state in which mortals have any part. Its career ends in the lake of fire, and it has no existence beyond. The lion was merged into the bear; the bear into the

leopard; the leopard into the fourth beast; and the fourth beast into what?--Not into another beast; but it is cast into the lake of fire, under which destruction it rests till men shall suffer the second death. Then let no one talk of probation or a mixed millennium after the Lord comes.

The adverb then, in the sentence, "I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake," etc., seems to refer to some particular time. The work of the investigative judgment is introduced in the previous verses; and this verse would seem to imply that while this work is going forward, and just before this power is destroyed and given to the burning flame, the little horn utters its great words against the Most High. Have we not heard them, and that, too, within a few years? Look at the decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870. What can be more blasphemous than to attribute infallibility to a mortal man? Yet in that year the world beheld the spectacle of an Ecumenical Council assembled for the purpose of deliberately decreeing that the occupant of the papal throne, the man of sin, possesses this prerogative of God, and

cannot err. Can anything be more presumptuous and blasphemous? Is not this the voice of the great words which the horn spake? and is not this power ripe for the burning flame, and near its end?

Verse 13. I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. 14. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

The scene here described is not the second advent of Christ to this earth, unless the Ancient of days is on this earth; for it is a coming to the Ancient of days. There, in the presence of the Ancient of days, a kingdom, dominion, and glory are given him. The Son of man receives his kingdom before his return to this earth. (See Luke 19:10-12 and onward.) This is a scene, therefore,

which transpires in the heavenly temple, and is closely connected with that brought to view in verses 9 and 10. He receives the kingdom at the close of his priestly work in the sanctuary. The people, nations, and languages, that shall serve him, are the nations of the saved (Revelation 21:24), not the wicked nations of the earth; for these are dashed in pieces at the second advent. Some out of all the nations, tribes, and kindreds of the earth will find themselves at last in the kingdom of God, to serve him there with joy and gladness forever and ever.

Verse 15. I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. 16. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. 17. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. 18. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.

No less anxious should we be than was Daniel to understand the truth of all this. And whenever we inquire with equal sincerity of heart, we shall find the Lord no less ready now than in the days of the prophet to lead to a correct knowledge of these important truths. The beasts, and the kingdoms which they represent, have already been explained. We have followed the prophet down through the course of events, even to the complete destruction of the fourth and last beast, the final subversion of all earthly governments. What next? Verse 18 tells us: “The saints shall take the kingdom.” The saints! those of all others held in low esteem in this world, despised, reproached, persecuted, cast out; those who were considered the least likely of all men ever to realize their hopes; these shall take the kingdom, and possess it forever. The usurpation and misrule of the wicked shall come to an end. The forfeited inheritance shall be redeemed. Peace shall be restored to its distracted borders, and righteousness shall reign over all the fair expanse of the renovated earth.

Verse 19. Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; 20. And of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.

Of the first three beasts of this series, Daniel had so clear an understanding that he had no trouble in reference to them. But he was astonished at this fourth beast, so unnatural and dreadful; for the further we come down the stream of time, the further it is necessary to depart from nature in forming symbols to represent accurately the degenerating governments of this earth. The lion is a production of nature; but it must have the unnatural addition of two wings' to represent the kingdom of Babylon. The bear we also find in nature; but as a symbol of Medo-Persia an

unnatural ferocity must be denoted by the insertion of three ribs into its mouth. So the leopard is a beast of nature; but fitly to represent Grecia there is a departure from nature in respect to wings, and the number of heads. But nature furnishes no symbol which can fitly illustrate the fourth kingdom. A beast the likeness of which never was seen, is taken; a beast dreadful and terrible, with nails of brass, and teeth of iron, so cruel, rapacious, and fierce, that from mere love of oppression it devoured, and brake in pieces, and trampled its victims beneath its feet.

Wonderful was all this to the prophet; but something still more wonderful appeared. A little horn came up, and, true to the nature of the beast from which it sprang, thrust aside three of its fellows; and lo! the horn had eyes, not the uncultivated eyes of a brute, but the keen, shrewd, intelligent eyes of a man; and, stranger yet, it had a mouth, and with that mouth it uttered proud sayings, and put forth preposterous and arrogant claims. No wonder the prophet made special inquiry respecting this monster, so unearthly in its

instincts, and so fiendish in its works and ways. In the following verses some specifications are given respecting the little horn, which enable the student of prophecy to make an application of this symbol without danger of mistake.

Verse 21. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; 22. Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

The wonderful wrath of this little horn against the saints particularly attracted the attention of Daniel. The rise of the ten horns, or the division of Rome into ten kingdoms, between the years A. D. 351 and 483, has already been noticed. (See on chapter 2:41.) As these horns denote kingdoms, the little horn must denote a kingdom also, but not of the same nature, because it was diverse from the others. They were political kingdoms. And now we have but to inquire if any kingdom has arisen among the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire

since A. D. 483, and yet diverse from them all; and if so, what one. The answer is, Yes; the spiritual kingdom of the papacy. This answers to the symbol in every particular, as is easily proved; and nothing else will do it. See the specifications more particularly mentioned on verse 23.

Daniel beheld this horn making war upon the saints. Has such a war been waged by the papacy? Fifty million martyrs, with a voice like the sound of many waters, answer, Yes. Witness the cruel persecutions of the Waldenses, the Albigenses, and Protestants in general, by the papal power. It is stated on good authority that the persecutions, massacres, and religious wars excited by the church and bishop of Rome, have occasioned the shedding of far more blood of the saints of the Most High, than all the enmity, hostility, and persecutions of professed heathens from the foundation of the world.

In verse 22 three consecutive events seem to be brought to view. Daniel, looking onward from the time when the little horn was in the height of its

power, to the full end of the long contest between the saints and Satan with all his agents, notes three prominent events that stand as mile-posts along the way. (1) The coming of the Ancient of days; that is, the position which Jehovah takes in the opening of the judgment scene described in verses 9, 10. (2) The judgment that is given to the saints; that is, the time when the saints sit with Christ in judgment a thousand years, following the first resurrection (Revelation 20:1-4), apportioning to the wicked the punishment due to their sins. Then the martyrs will sit in judgment upon the great anti-Christian, persecuting power, which, in the days of their trial, hunted them like the beasts of the desert, and poured out their blood like water. (3) The time that the saints possess the kingdom; that is, the time of their entrance upon the possession of the new earth. Then the last vestige of the curse, of sin, and of sinners, root and branch, will have been wiped away, and the territory so long misruled by the wicked powers of earth, the enemies of God's people, will be taken by the righteous, to be held by them forever and ever. 1 Corinthians 6:2, 3; Matthew 25:34.

Verse 23. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. 24. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. 25. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. 26. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

We have here further particulars respecting the fourth beast and the little horn.

Perhaps enough has already been said respecting the fourth beast (Rome) and the ten horns, or ten kingdoms, which arose therefrom.

The little horn now more particularly demands attention. As stated on verse 8, we find the fulfillment of the prophecy concerning this horn in the rise and work of the papacy. It is a matter of both interest and importance, therefore, to inquire into the causes which resulted in the development of this anti-Christian power.

The first pastors or bishops of Rome enjoyed a respect proportionate to the rank of the city in which they resided; and for the first few centuries of the Christian era, Rome was the largest, richest, and most powerful city in the world. It was the seat of empire, the capital of the nations. “All the inhabitants of the earth belong to her,” said Julian; and Claudian declared her to be “the fountain of laws.” “If Rome is the queen of cities, why should not her pastor be the king of bishops?” was the reasoning these Roman pastors adopted. “Why should not the Roman Church be the mother of Christendom? Why should not all nations be her children, and her authority their sovereign law? It was easy,” says D’Aubigné, from whom we quote these words (History of the Reformation, Vol. I,

chap. 1), “for the ambitious heart of man to reason thus. Ambitious Rome did so.”

The bishops in the different parts of the Roman empire felt a pleasure in yielding to the bishop of Rome some portion of that honor which Rome, as the queen city, received from the nations of the earth. There was originally no dependence implied in the honor thus paid. “But,” continues D’Aubigné, “usurped power increases like an avalanche. Admonitions, at first simply fraternal, soon became absolute commands in the mouth of the pontiff. The Western bishops favored this encroachment of the Roman pastors, either from jealousy of the Eastern bishops, or because they preferred submitting to the supremacy of a pope rather than to the dominion of a temporal power.”

Such were the influences clustering around the bishop of Rome, and thus was everything tending toward his speedy elevation to the supreme spiritual throne of Christendom. But the fourth century was destined to witness an obstacle thrown across the path of this ambitious dream. Arius,

parish priest of the ancient and influential church of Alexandria, sprung his doctrine upon the world, occasioning so fierce a controversy in the Christian church that a general council was called at Nicaea, by the emperor Constantine, A. D. 325, to consider and adjust it. Arius maintained “that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father both in nature and dignity.” This opinion was condemned by the council, which decreed that Christ was of one and the same substance with the Father. Hereupon Arius was banished to Illyria, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the creed composed on that occasion. (Mosheim, cent. 4, part 2, chap. 4.; Stanley, History of the Eastern Church, p. 239.)

The controversy itself, however, was not to be disposed of in this summary manner, but continued for ages to agitate the Christian world, the Arians

everywhere becoming the bitter enemies of the pope and of the Roman Catholic Church. From these facts it is evident that the spread of Arianism would check the influence of the Catholics; and the possession of Rome and Italy by a people of the Arian persuasion, would be fatal to the supremacy of a Catholic bishop. But the prophecy had declared that this horn would rise to supreme power, and that in reaching this position it would subdue three kings.

Some difference of opinion has existed in regard to the particular powers which were overthrown in the interest of the papacy, in reference to which the following remark by Albert Barnes seems very pertinent: "In the confusion that existed on the breaking up of the Roman empire, and the imperfect accounts of the transactions which occurred in the rise of the papal power, it would not be wonderful if it should be difficult to find events distinctly recorded that would be in all respects an accurate and absolute fulfillment of the vision. Yet it is possible to make out the fulfillment of this with a good degree of certainty in the

history of the papacy.”--Notes on Daniel 7.

Mr. Mede supposes the three kingdoms plucked up to have been the Greeks, the Lombards, and the Franks; and Sir Isaac Newton supposes they were the Exarchate of Ravenna, the Lombards, and the Senate and Dukedom of Rome. Bishop Newton (*Dissertation on the Prophecies*, pp. 217, 218) states some serious objections to both these schemes. The Franks could not have been one of these kingdoms; for they were never plucked up before the papacy. The Lombards could not have been one; for they were never made subject to the popes. Says Barnes, “I do not find, indeed, that the kingdom of the Lombards was, as is commonly stated, among the number of the temporal sovereignties that became subject to the authority of the popes.” And the Senate and Dukedom of Rome could not have been one; for they, as such, never constituted one of the ten kingdoms, three of which were to be plucked up before the little horn.

But we apprehend that the chief difficulty in the application made by these eminent

commentators, lay in the fact that they supposed that the prophecy respecting the exaltation of the papacy had not been fulfilled, and could not have been, till the pope became a temporal prince; and hence they sought to find an accomplishment of the prophecy in the events which led to the pope's temporal sovereignty. Whereas, evidently, the prophecy of verses 24, 25 refers, not to his civil power, but to his power to domineer over the minds and consciences of men; and the pope reached this position, as will hereafter appear, in A. D. 538; and the plucking up of the three horns took place before this, and to make way for this very exaltation to spiritual dominion. The insuperable difficulty in the way of all attempts to apply the prophecy to the Lombards and the other powers named above is, that they may come altogether too late in point of time; for the prophecy deals with the arrogant efforts of the Roman pontiff to gain power, not with his endeavors to oppress and humble the nations after he had secured the supremacy.

The position is here confidently taken that the

three powers, or horns, plucked up before the papacy, were the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths; and this position rests upon the following statements of historians.

Odoacer, the leader of the Heruli, was the first of the barbarians who reigned over the Romans. He took the throne of Italy, according to Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. III, pp. 510, 515), in 476. Of his religious belief Gibbon (p. 516) says. "Like the rest of the barbarians, he had been instructed in the Arian heresy; but he revered the monastic and episcopal characters, and the silence of the Catholics attests the toleration which they enjoyed."

Again he says (p. 547): "The Ostrogoths, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the Vandals, who had listened to the eloquence of the Latin clergy, preferred the more intelligible lessons of their domestic teachers; and Arianism was adopted as the national faith of the warlike converts who were seated on the ruins of the Western empire. This irreconcilable difference of religion was a

perpetual source of jealousy and hatred; and the reproach of barbarian was embittered by the more odious epithet of heretic. The heroes of the North, who had submitted, with some reluctance, to believe that all their ancestors were in hell, were astonished and exasperated to learn that they themselves had only changed the mode of their eternal condemnation.”

The reader is requested to consider carefully a few more historical statements which throw some light on the situation at this time. Stanley (History of the Eastern Church, p. 151) says: “The whole of the vast Gothic population which descended on the Roman empire, so far as it was Christian at all, held to the faith of the Alexandrian heretic. Our first Teutonic version of the Scriptures was by an Arian missionary, Ulfilas. The first conqueror of Rome, Alaric, and the first conqueror of Africa, Genseric, were Arians. Theodoric, the great king of Italy, and hero of the ‘Nibelungen Lied,’ was an Arian. The vacant place in his massive tomb at Ravenna is a witness of the vengeance which the Orthodox took on his memory, when, in their

triumph, they tore down the porphyry vase in which his Arian subjects had enshrined his ashes.”

Ranke, in his *History of the Popes* (London, edition of 1871), Vol. I, p. 9, says: “But she [the church] fell, as was inevitable, into many embarrassments, and found herself in an entirely altered condition. A pagan people took possession of Britain; Arian kings seized the greater part of the remaining West; while the Lombards, long attached to Arianism, and, as neighbors, most dangerous and hostile, established a powerful sovereignty before the very gates of Rome. The Roman bishops, meanwhile, beset on all sides, exerted themselves with all the prudence and pertinacity which have remained their peculiar attributes, to regain the mastery, at least in their patriarchal diocese.”

Machiavelli, in his *History of Florence*, p. 14, says: “Nearly all the wars which the northern barbarians carried on in Italy, it may be here remarked, were occasioned by the pontiffs; and the hordes with which the country was inundated, were

generally called in by them.”

These extracts give us a general view of the state of affairs at this time, and show us that though the hands of the Roman pontiffs might not be visibly manifest in the movements upon the political board, they constituted the power working assiduously behind the scenes to secure their own purposes. The relation which these Arian kings sustained to the pope, from which we can see the necessity of their being overthrown to make way for papal supremacy, is shown in the following testimony from Mosheim, given in his History of the Church, cent. 6, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 2:--

“On the other hand, it is certain, from a variety of the most authentic records, that both the emperors and the nations in general were far from being disposed to bear with patience the yoke of servitude which the popes were imposing upon the Christian church. The Gothic princes set bounds to the power of those arrogant prelates in Italy, permitted none to be raised to the pontificate without their approbation, and reserved to

themselves the right of judging of the legality of every new election.”

An instance in proof of this statement occurs in the history of Odoacer, the first Arian king above mentioned, as related by Bower in his History of the Popes, Vol. I, p. 271. When, on the death of Pope Simplicius, A. D. 483, the clergy and people had assembled for the election of a new pope, suddenly Basilius, praefectus praetorio, and lieutenant of King Odoacer, appeared in the assembly, expressed his surprise that any such work as appointing a successor to the deceased pope should be undertaken without him, in the name of the king declared all that had been done null and void, and ordered the election to be begun anew. Certainly the horn which exercised such a restrictive power over the papal pontiff must be taken away before the pope could reach the predicted supremacy.

Meanwhile Zeno, the emperor of the East, and friend of the pope, was anxious to drive Odoacer out of Italy (Machiavelli, p. 6), a movement which

he soon had the satisfaction of seeing accomplished without trouble to himself, in the following manner. Theodoric had come to the throne of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Moesia and Pannonia. Being on friendly terms with Zeno, he wrote him, stating that it was impossible for him to restrain his Goths within the impoverished province of Pannonia, and asking his permission to lead them to some more favorable region, which they might conquer and possess. Zeno gave him permission to march against Odoacer, and take possession of Italy. Accordingly, after a three years' war, the Herulian kingdom in Italy was overthrown, Odoacer was treacherously slain, and Theodoric established his Ostrogoths in the Italian peninsula. As already stated he was an Arian, and the law of Odoacer subjecting the election of the pope to the approval of the king, was still retained.

The following incident will show how completely the papacy was in subjection to his power. The Catholics in the East, having commenced a persecution against the Arians in 523, Theodoric summoned Pope John into his

presence, and thus addressed him: “If the emperor [Justin, the predecessor of Justinian] does not think fit to revoke the edict which he has lately issued against those of my persuasion [that is, the Arians], it is my firm resolution to issue the like edict against those of his [that is, the Catholics]; and to see it everywhere executed with the same rigor. Those who do not profess the faith of Nicaea are heretics to him, and those who do are heretics to me. Whatever can excuse or justify his severity to the former, will excuse and justify mine to the latter. But the emperor,” continued the king, “has none about him who dare freely and openly speak what they think, or to whom he would hearken if they did. But the great veneration which he professes for your See, leaves no room to doubt but he would hearken to you. I will therefore have you to repair forthwith to Constantinople, and there to remonstrate, both in my name and your own, against the violent measures in which that court has so rashly engaged. It is in your power to divert the emperor from them; and till you have, nay, till the Catholics [this name Theodoric applies to the Arians] are restored to the free exercise of their

religion, and to all the churches from which they have been driven, you must not think of returning to Italy.”--Bower’s History of the Popes, Vol. I, p. 325.

The pope who was thus peremptorily ordered not to set his foot again upon Italian soil until he had carried out the will of the king, certainly could not hope for much advancement toward any kind of supremacy till that power was taken out of the way. Baronius, according to Bower, will have it that the pope sacrificed himself on this occasion, and advised the emperor not by any means to comply with the demand the king had sent him. But Mr. Bower thinks this inconsistent, since he could not, he says, “sacrifice himself without sacrificing, at the same time, the far greater part of the innocent Catholics in the West, who were either subject to King Theodoric, or to other Arian princes in alliance with him.” It is certain that the pope and the other ambassadors were treated with severity on their return, which Bower explains on this wise: “Others arraign them all of high treason; and truly the chief men of Rome were suspected at

this very time of carrying on a treasonable correspondence with the court of Constantinople, and machinating the ruin of the Gothic empire in Italy.”--Id., p. 326.

The feelings of the papal party toward Theodoric may be accurately estimated, according to a quotation already given, by the vengeance which they took on his memory, when they tore from his massive tomb in Ravenna the porphyry vase in which his Arian subjects had enshrined his ashes. But these feelings are put into language by Baronius, who inveighs “against Theodoric as a cruel barbarian, as a barbarous tyrant, as an impious Arian.” But “having exaggerated with all his eloquence, and bewailed the deplorable condition of the Roman Church reduced by that heretic to a state of slavery, he comforts himself in the end, and dries up his tears, with the pious thought that the author of such a calamity died soon after, and was eternally damned!”--Baronius’s Annals, A. D. 526, p. 116; Bower, Vol. III, p. 328.

While the Catholics were thus feeling the

restraining power of an Arian king in Italy, they were suffering a violent persecution from the Arian Vandals in Africa. (Gibbon, chap. 37, sec. 2.) Elliott, in his *Horae Apocalypticae*, Vol. III, p. 152, note 3, says: “The Vandal kings were not only Arians, but persecutors of the Catholics; in Sardinia and Corsica, under the Roman Episcopate, we may presume, as well as in Africa.”

Such was the position of affairs, when, in 533, Justinian entered upon his Vandal and Gothic wars. Wishing to secure the influence of the pope and the Catholic party, he issued that memorable decree which was to constitute the pope the head of all the churches, and from the carrying out of which, in 538, the period of papal supremacy is to be dated. And whoever will read the history of the African campaign, 533-4, and the Italian campaign, 534-8, will notice that the Catholics everywhere hailed as deliverers the army of Belisarius, the general of Justinian.

The testimony of D’Aubigné (*Reformation*, book 1, chap. 1), also throws light upon the

undercurrents which gave shape to outward movements in these eventful times. He says: “Princes whom these stormy times often shook upon their thrones, offered their protection if Rome would in its turn support them. They conceded to her the spiritual authority, provided she would make a return in secular power. They were lavish of the souls of men, in the hope that she would aid them against their enemies. The power of the hierarchy, which was ascending, and the imperial power, which was declining, leaned thus one upon the other, and by this alliance accelerated their twofold destiny. Rome could not lose by it. An edict of Theodosius II and of Valentinian III proclaimed the Roman bishop ‘rector of the whole church.’ Justinian published a similar decree.”

But no decree of this nature could be carried into effect until the Arian horns which stood in its way, were plucked up. The Vandals fell before the victorious arms of Belisarius in 534; and the Goths, retiring, left him in undisputed possession of Rome in 538. (Gibbon’s Rome, chap 41.)

Procopius relates that the African war was undertaken by Justinian for the relief of the Christians (Catholics) in that quarter; and that when he expressed his intention in this respect, the prefect of the palace came very near dissuading him from his purpose; but a dream appeared to him in which he was bidden “not to shrink from the execution of his design; for by assisting the Christians he would overthrow the power of the Vandals.”--Evagrius’s Ecclesiastical History, Book chap. 16. Listen again to Mosheim: “It is true that the Greeks who had received the decrees of the Council of Nicaea [that is, the Catholics], persecuted and oppressed the Arians wherever their influence and authority could reach; but the Nicenians, in their turn, were not less rigorously treated by their adversaries [the Arians], particularly in Africa and Italy, where they felt, in a very severe manner, the weight of the Arian power, and the bitterness of hostile resentment. The triumphs of Arianism were, however, transitory, and its prosperous days were entirely eclipsed when the Vandals were driven out of Africa, and the Goths out of Italy, by the arms of Justinian.”--

Mosheim's Church History, cent. 6, part 2, chap. 5, sec. 3.

Elliott, in his *Horae Apocalypticae*, makes two enumerations of the ten kingdoms which rose out of the Roman empire, varying the second list from the first according to the changes which had taken place at the later period to which the second list applies. His first list differs from that mentioned in remarks on chap. 2:42, only in that he put the *Allemanni* in place of the Huns, and the Bavarians in place of the Lombards, a variation which can be easily accounted for. But out of this list he names the three that were plucked up before the papacy, in these words: "I might cite three that were eradicated from before the pope out of the list first given; namely, the Heruli under Odoacer, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths."--Vol. III, p. 152, note 1.

Although he prefers the second list, in which he puts the Lombards instead of the Heruli, the foregoing is good testimony that if we make the enumeration of the ten kingdoms while the Heruli

were a ruling power, they were one of the horns which were plucked up.

From the historical testimony above cited, we think it clearly established that the three horns plucked up were the powers named; viz., the Heruli in A. D. 493, the Vandals in 534, and the Ostrogoths in 538.

1. “He shall speak great words against the Most High.” Has the papacy done this? Look at a few of the pope’s self-accepted titles: “Vicegerent of the Son of God,” “Our Lord God, the Pope,” “Another God upon earth,” “King of the world,” “King of kings and Lord of lords.” Said Pope Nicholas to Emperor Michael, “The pope, who is called God by Constantine, can never be bound or released by man; for God cannot be judged by man.” Is there need of bolder blasphemy than this? Listen also to the adulation the popes have received from their followers without rebuke. A Venetian prelate in the fourth session of the Lateran, addressed the pope as follows: “Thou art our Shepherd, our Physician, in short, a second God upon earth.” Another bishop

called him “the lion of the tribe of Judah, the promised Saviour.” Lord Anthony Pucci, in the fifth Lateran, said to the pope, “The sight of thy divine majesty does not a little terrify me; for I am not ignorant that all power both in heaven and in earth is given unto you; that the prophetic saying is fulfilled in you, ‘All the kings of the earth shall worship him, and nations shall serve him.’” (See Oswald’s Kingdom Which Shall Not be Destroyed, pp. 97-99.) Again, Dr. Clarke, in verse 25, says: “‘He shall speak as if he were God.’ So St. Jerome quotes from Symmachus. To none can this apply so well or so fully as to the popes of Rome. They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. And they go beyond God in pretending to loose whole nations from their oath of allegiance to their kings, when such kings do not please them. And they go against God when they give indulgences for sin. This is the worst of all blasphemies.”

2. “And shall wear out the saints of the Most High.” Has the papacy done this? For the mere information of any student of church history, no answer need here be given. All know that for long years the papal church has pursued its relentless work against the true followers of God. Chapter after chapter might be given, would our limited space permit. Wars, crusades, massacres, inquisitions, and persecutions of all kinds,--these were their weapons of extinction.

Scott’s Church History says: “No computation can reach the numbers who have been put to death, in different ways, on account of their maintaining the profession of the gospel, and opposing the corruptions of the Church of Rome. A million of poor Waldenses perished in France; nine hundred thousand orthodox Christians were slain in less than thirty years after the institution of the order of the Jesuits. The Duke of Alva boasted of having put to death in the Netherlands thirty-six thousand by the hand of the common executioner during the space of a few years. The Inquisition destroyed, by

various tortures, one hundred and fifty thousand within thirty years. These are a few specimens, and but a few, of those which history has recorded. But the total amount will never be known till the earth shall disclose her blood, and no more cover her slain.”

Commenting on the prophecy that the little horn should “wear out the saints of the Most High,” Barnes, in his Notes on Daniel 7:25, says: “Can any one doubt that this is true of the papacy? The Inquisition, the persecutions of the Waldenses, the ravages of the Duke of Alva, the fires of Smithfield, the tortures at Goa,--indeed, the whole history of the papacy may be appealed to in proof that this is applicable to that power. If anything could have worn out the saints of the Most High,--could have cut them off from the earth so that evangelical religion would have become extinct,--it would have been the persecutions of the papal power. In the year 1208 a crusade was proclaimed by Pope Innocent III against the Waldenses and Albigenses, in which a million men perished. From the beginning of the order of Jesuits in the year

1540 to 1580, nine hundred thousand were destroyed. One hundred and fifty thousand perished by the Inquisition in thirty years. In the Low Countries fifty thousand persons were hanged, beheaded, burned, and buried alive, for the crime of heresy, within the space of thirty-eight years from the edict of Charles V against the Protestants to the peace of Chateau Cambresis in 1559. Eighteen thousand suffered by the hand of the executioner in the space of five years and a half, during the administration of the Duke of Alva. Indeed, the slightest acquaintance with the history of the papacy will convince any one that what is here said of ‘making war with the saints’ (verse 21), and ‘wearing out the saints of the Most High’ (verse 25), is strictly applicable to that power, and will accurately describe its history.” (See Buck’s Theological Dictionary, art., Persecutions; Oswald’s Kingdom, etc., pp. 107-133; Dowling’s History of Romanism; Fox’s Book of Martyrs; Charlotte Elizabeth’s Martyrology; The Wars of the Huguenots; The Great Red Dragon, by Anthony Gavin, formerly one of the Roman Catholic priests of Saragossa, Spain; Histories of

the Reformation, etc.)

To parry the force of this damaging testimony from all history, papists deny that the church has ever persecuted any one; it has been the secular power; the church has only passed decision upon the question of heresy, and then turned the offenders over to the civil power, to be dealt with according to the pleasure of the secular court. The impious hypocrisy of this claim is transparent enough to make it an absolute insult to common sense. In those days of persecution, what was the secular power?--Simply a tool in the hand of the church, and under its control, to do its bloody bidding. And when the church delivered its prisoners to the executioners to be destroyed, with fiendish mockery it made use of the following formula: "And we do leave thee to the secular arm, and to the power of the secular court; but at the same time do most earnestly beseech that court so to moderate its sentence as not to touch thy blood, nor to put thy life in any sort of danger." And then, as intended, the unfortunate victims of popish hate were immediately executed. (Geddes's Tracts on

Popery; View of the Court of Inquisition in Portugal, p. 446; Limborch, Vol. II, p. 289.)

But the false claims of papists in this respect have been flatly denied and disproved by one of their own standard writers, Cardinal Bellarmine, who was born in Tuscany in 1542, and who, after his death in 1621, came very near being placed in the calendar of saints on account of his great services in behalf of popery. This man, on one occasion, under the spur of controversy, betrayed himself into an admission of the real facts in the case. Luther having said that the church (meaning the true church) never burned heretics, Bellarmine, understanding it of the Romish Church, made answer: “This argument proves not the sentiment, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther; for as almost an infinite number were either burned or otherwise put to death, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant; or if he knew it, he was convicted of impudence and falsehood; for that heretics were often burned by the church, may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.”

To show the relation of the secular power to the church, as held by Romanists, we quote the answer of the same writer to the argument that the only weapon committed to the church is “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.” To this he replied: “As the church has ecclesiastical and secular princes, who are her two arms, so she has two swords, the spiritual and material; and therefore when her right hand is unable to convert a heretic with the sword of the Spirit, she invokes the aid of the left hand, and coerces heretics with the material sword.” In answer to the argument that the apostles never invoked the secular arm against heretics, he says, “The apostles did it not, because there was no Christian prince whom they could call on for aid. But afterward, in Constantine’s time, ... the church called in the aid of the secular arm.” — Dowling’s History of Romanism, pp. 547, 548.

In corroboration of these facts, fifty million martyrs--this is the lowest computation made by any historian--will rise up in the judgment as witnesses against her bloody work.

Pagan Rome persecuted relentlessly the Christian church, and it is estimated that three million Christians perished in the first three centuries, yet it is said that the primitive Christians prayed for the continuance of imperial Rome; for they knew that when this form of government should cease, another far worse persecuting power would arise, which would literally, as this prophecy declares, “wear out the saints of the Most High.” Pagan Rome could slay the infants, but spare the mothers; but papal Rome slew both mothers and infants together. No age, no sex, no condition in life, was exempt from her relentless rage. “When Herod died,” says a forcible writer, “he went down to the grave with infamy; and earth had one murderer, one persecutor, less, and hell one victim more. O Rome! what will not be thy hell, and that of thy votaries, when thy judgment shall have come!”

3. And shall “think to change times and laws.” What laws? and whose? Not the laws of other earthly governments; for it was nothing marvelous or strange for one power to change the laws of

another, whenever it could bring such power under its dominion. Not human laws of any kind; for the little horn had power to change these so far as its jurisdiction extended; but the times and laws in question were such as this power should only think to change, but not be able to change. They are the laws of the same Being to whom the saints belong who are worn out by this power; namely, the laws of the Most High. And has the papacy attempted this?--Yes, even this. It has, in its catechisms, expunged the second commandment of the decalogue to make way for its adoration of images. It has divided the tenth commandment to make up the number ten. And, more audacious than all! it has taken hold of the fourth commandment, torn from its place the Sabbath of Jehovah, the only memorial of the great God ever given to man, and erected in its place a rival institution to serve another purpose.[1]

4. “And they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.” The pronoun they embraces the saints, the times, and the laws, just mentioned. How long a time were

they to be given into the hands of this power? A time, as we have seen from chapter 4:23, is one year; two times, the least that could be denoted by the plural, two years, and the dividing of time, or half a time (Sept.) half a year. Gesenius also gives “Chald., a half. Daniel 7:25.” We thus have three years and a half for the continuance of this power. The Hebrew, or rather the Chaldaic, word for time in the text before us, is iddân, which Gesenius defines thus: “Time. Spec, in prophetic language for a year. Daniel 7:25, for a year, also two years, and half a year; i. e., for three years and a half; comp. Jos. B. J. 1. 1. 1.” We must now consider that we are in the midst of symbolic prophecy; hence in this measurement the time is not literal, but symbolic also. The inquiry then arises, How long a period is denoted by the three years and a half of prophetic time? The rule given us in the Bible is, that when a day is used as a symbol, it stands for a year. Ezekiel 4:6; Numbers 14:34. Under the Hebrew word for day, (yom), Gesenius has this remark: “3. Sometimes [yamim] marks a definite space of time; viz., a year; as also Syr. and Chald. [iddân] denotes both time and year;

and as in English several words signifying time, weight, measure, are likewise used to denote certain specific times, weights, and measures.” The ordinary Jewish year, which must be used as the basis of reckoning, contained three hundred and sixty days. Three years and a half contained twelve hundred and sixty days. As each day stands for a year, we have twelve hundred and sixty years for the continuation of the supremacy of this horn. Did the papacy possess dominion that length of time? The answer again is, Yes. The edict of the emperor Justinian, dated A. D. 533, made the bishop of Rome the head of all the churches. But this edict could not go into effect until the Arian Ostrogoths, the last of the three horns that were plucked up to make room for the papacy, were driven from Rome; and this was not accomplished, as already shown, till A. D. 538. The edict would have been of no effect had this latter event not been accomplished; hence from this latter year we are to reckon, as this was the earliest point where the saints were in reality in the hand of this power. From this point did the papacy hold supremacy for twelve hundred and sixty years?--Exactly. For 538

+ 1260 = 1798; and in the year 1798, Berthier, with a French army, entered Rome, proclaimed a republic, took the pope prisoner, and for a time abolished the papacy. It has never since enjoyed the privileges and immunities which it possessed before. Thus again this power fulfils to the very letter the specifications of the prophecy, which proves beyond question that the application is correct.

After describing the terrible career of the little horn, and stating that the saints should be given into his hand for 1260 years, bringing us down to 1798, verse 26 declares: “But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.” In verse 10 of the same chapter we have substantially the same expression relative to the judgment: “The judgment was set.” It would seem consistent to suppose that the same judgment is referred to in both instances. But the sublime scene described in verse 10, is the opening of the investigative Judgment in the sanctuary in heaven, as will appear in remarks on Daniel 8:14 and 9:25-27. The

opening of this judgment scene is located by the prophecy at the close of the great prophetic period of 2300 years, which terminated in 1844. (See under chapter 9:25-27.) Four years after this, in 1848, the great revolution which shook so many thrones in Europe, drove the pope also from his dominions. His restoration shortly after was through the force of foreign bayonets, by which alone he was upheld till his final loss of temporal power in 1870. The overthrow of the papacy in 1798, marked the conclusion of the prophetic period of 1260 years, and constituted the “deadly wound” prophesied in Revelation 13:3, to come upon this power; but this deadly wound was to be “healed.” In 1800 another pope was elected; his palace and temporal dominion were restored, and every prerogative except, as Mr. Croly says, that of a systematic persecutor, was again under his control; and thus the wound was healed. But since 1870, he has enjoyed no prestige as a temporal prince, among the nations of the earth.

Verse 27. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the

whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. 28. Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart.

After beholding the dark and desolate picture of papal oppression upon the church, the prophet is permitted once more to turn his eyes upon the glorious period of the saints' rest, when they shall have the kingdom, free from all oppressive powers, in everlasting possession. How could the children of God keep heart in this present evil world, amid the misrule and oppression of the governments of earth, and the abominations that are done in the land, if they could not look forward to the kingdom of God and the return of their Lord, with full assurance that the promises concerning them both shall certainly be fulfilled, and that speedily?[2]

Note:

1. See Catholic catechisms, and the work entitled, *Who Changed the Sabbath?* and works on the Sabbath and Law, published at the office of the Review and Herald, Battle Creek, Mich.
2. Some startling events relative to the papacy, filling up the prophecies uttered in this chapter concerning that power, have taken place within a few years of the present time. Commencing in 1798, where the first great blow fell upon the papacy, what have been the chief characteristics of its history? Answer: The rapid defection of its natural supporters, and greater assumptions on its own part. In 1844, the judgment of verse 10 began to sit; namely, the investigative Judgment, in the heavenly sanctuary, preparatory to the coming of Christ. Dec. 8, 1854, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was decreed by the pope. July 21, 1870, in the great Ecumenical Council assembled at Rome, it was deliberately

decreed, by a vote of 538 against 2, that the pope was infallible. In the same year, France, by whose bayonets the pope was kept upon his throne, was crushed by Prussia, and the last prop was taken from under the papacy. Then Victor Emmanuel, seeing 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, Sept. 20, 1870. The pope's temporal power was thus wholly taken away, nevermore, said Victor Emmanuel, to be restored; and since that time, the popes, shutting themselves up in the Vatican, have styled themselves "prisoners." Because of the great words which the horn uttered, Daniel saw the beast destroyed, and given to the burning flame. This destruction is to take place at the second coming of Christ and by means of that event; for the man of sin is to be consumed by the spirit of Christ's mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming. 2 Thessalonians 2:8. What words could be more arrogant, presumptuous,

blasphemous, or insulting to high Heaven, than the deliberate adoption of the dogma of infallibility, thus clothing a mortal man with a prerogative of the Deity? And this was accomplished by papal intrigue and influence, July 21, 1870. Following in swift succession, the last vestige of temporal power was wrenched from his grasp. It was because of these words, and as if in almost immediate connection with them, that the prophet saw this power given to the burning flame. His dominion was to be consumed unto the end, implying that when his power as a civil ruler should be wholly destroyed, the end would not be far off. And the prophet immediately adds: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." All, in this line of prophecy, has now been fully accomplished except the closing scene. Next comes the last, crowning act in the drama, when the beast will be given to the burning flame, and the saints of the Most High take the kingdom. We must be,

now, upon the very threshold of this glorious event.

Chapter 8

Vision of the Ram, He-Goat, and Little Horn

We now come once more,” says Dr. Clarke, “to the Hebrew, the Chaldee part of the book being finished. As the Chaldeans had a particular interest both in the history and the prophecies from chapter 2:4 to the end of chapter 7, the whole is written in Chaldee; but as the prophecies which remain concern times posterior to the Chaldean monarchy, and principally relate to the church and people of God generally, they are written in the Hebrew language, this being the tongue in which God chose to reveal all his counsels given under the Old Testament relative to the New.”

Verse 1. In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.

One prominent characteristic of the sacred writings, and one which should forever shield them from the charge of being works of fiction, is the frankness and freedom with which the writers state all the circumstances connected with that which they record. This verse states the time when the vision recorded in this chapter was given to Daniel. The first year of Belshazzar was B. C. 540. His third year, in which this vision was given, would consequently be 538. If Daniel, as is supposed, was about twenty years of age when he was carried to Babylon in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 606, he was at this time about eighty-eight years of age. The vision he speaks of as the one “which appeared unto him at the first,” is doubtless the vision of the seventh chapter, which he had in the first year of Belshazzar.

Verse 2. And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai.

As verse 1 states the time when, this verse

gives the place where, the vision was given. Shushan, as we learn from Prideaux, was the metropolis of the province of Elam. This was then in the hands of the Babylonians, and there the king of Babylon had a royal palace. Daniel, as minister of state, and employed about the king's business, was accordingly in that place. Abradates, viceroy or prince of Shushan, revolted to Cyrus, and the province was joined to the Medes and Persians; so that, according to the prophecy of Isaiah (21:2), Elam went up with the Medes to besiege Babylon. Under the Medes and Persians it regained its liberties, of which it had been deprived by the Babylonians, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah 49:39.

Verse 3. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns; and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. 4. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand;

but he did according to his will, and became great.

In verse 20 an interpretation of this symbol is given us in plain language: “The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are the kings of Media and Persia.” We have only, therefore, to consider how well the symbol answers to the power in question. The two horns represented the two nationalities of which the empire consisted. The higher came up last. This represented the Persian element, which, from being at first simply an ally of the Medes, came to be the leading division of the empire. The different directions in which the ram was seen pushing, denote the directions in which the Medes and Persians carried their conquests. No earthly powers could stand before them while they were marching up to the exalted position to which the providence of God had summoned them. And so successfully were their conquests prosecuted that in the days of Ahasuerus (Esther 1:1), the Medo-Persian kingdom extended from India to Ethiopia, the extremities of the then known world, over a hundred and twenty-seven

provinces. The prophecy almost seems to fall short of the facts as stated in history, when it simply says that this power “did according to his will, and became great.”

Verse 5. And as I was considering, behold, an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. 6. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. 7. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand.

“As I was considering,” says the prophet; and in this he sets an example for every lover of the truth, and all who have any regard for things higher than the objects of time and sense. When Moses

saw the burning bush, he said, “I will now turn aside, and see this great sight.” But how few are willing at the present time to turn aside from their pursuit of business or pleasure to consider the important themes to which both the mercy and providence of God are striving to call their attention.

The symbol here introduced is also explained by the angel to Daniel. Verse 21: “And the rough goat is the king [or kingdom] of Grecia.” Concerning the fitness of this symbol to the Grecian or Macedonian people, Bishop Newton observes that the Macedonians, “about two hundred years before the time of Daniel, were called AËgeadae, the goats’ people;” the origin of which name he explains, according to heathen authors, as follows: “Caranus, their first king, going with a great multitude of Greeks to seek new habitations in Macedonia, was advised by an oracle to take the goats for his guides to empire; and afterward, seeing a herd of goats flying from a violent storm, he followed them to Edessa, and there fixed the seat of his empire, and made the

goats his ensigns, or standards, and called the city AEGae, or the goats' town, and the people, AEGeadae, or the goats' people." "The city of AEGeae, or AEGae, was the usual burying-place of the Macedonian kings. It is also very remarkable that Alexander's son by Roxana was named Alexander AEGus, or the son of the goat; and some of Alexander's successors are represented in their coins with goats' horns." [1]

The goat came from the west. Grecia lay west of Persia.

"On the face of the whole earth." He covered all the ground as he passed; that is, he swept everything before him; he left nothing behind.

He "touched not the ground." Such was the marvelous celerity of his movements that he did not seem to touch the ground, but to fly from point to point with the swiftness of the wind; the same feature is brought to view by the four wings of the leopard in the vision of chapter 7.

The notable horn between his eyes. This is explained in verse 21 to be the first king of the Macedonian empire. This king was Alexander the Great.

Verses 6 and 7 give a concise account of the overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander. The contests between the Greeks and Persians are said to have been exceedingly furious; and some of the scenes as recorded in history are vividly brought to mind by the figure used in the prophecy,--a ram standing before the river, and the goat running unto him in the fury of his power. Alexander first vanquished the generals of Darius at the River Granicus in Phrygia; he next attacked and totally routed Darius at the passes of Issus in Cilicia, and afterward on the plains of Arbela in Syria. This last battle occurred B. C. 331, and marked the conclusion of the Persian empire; for by this event Alexander became complete master of the whole country. Bishop Newton quotes verse 6: "And he [the goat] came to the ram which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power;" and adds: "One can hardly read

these words, without having some image of Darius's army standing and guarding the River Granicus, and of Alexander on the other side, with his forces plunging in, swimming across the stream, and rushing on the enemy with all the fire and fury that can be imagined.”[2]

Ptolemy begins the reign of Alexander B. C. 332; but it was not till the battle of Arbela, the year following, that he became, according to Prideaux[3], “absolute lord of that empire to the utmost extent in which it was ever possessed by the Persian kings.” On the eve of this engagement, Darius sent ten of his chief relatives to sue for peace; and upon their presenting their conditions to Alexander, he replied, “Tell your sovereign... that the world will not permit two suns nor two sovereigns!”

The language of verse 7 sets forth the completeness of the subjection of Medo-Persia to Alexander. The two horns were broken, and the ram was cast to the ground and stamped upon. Persia was subdued, the country ravaged, its armies

cut to pieces and scattered, its cities plundered, and the royal city of Persepolis, the capital of the Persian empire, and even in its ruins one of the wonders of the world to the present day, was sacked and burned. Thus the ram had no power to stand before the goat, and there was none that could deliver him out of his hand.

Verse 8. Therefore the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven.

The conqueror is greater than the conquered. The ram, Medo-Persia, became great; the goat, Grecia, became very great. And when he was strong, the great horn was broken. Human foresight and speculation would have said, When he becomes weak, his kingdom racked by rebellion, or paralyzed by luxury, then the horn will be broken, and the kingdom shattered. But Daniel saw it broken in the very prime of its strength and the height of its power, when every beholder would have exclaimed, Surely, the kingdom is

established, and nothing can overthrow it. Thus it is often with the wicked. The horn of their strength is broken when they think they stand most firm.

Alexander fell in the prime of life.[4] After his death there arose much confusion among his followers respecting the succession. It was finally agreed, after a seven days' contest, that his natural brother, Philip Aridaeus, should be declared king. By him, and Alexander's infant sons, Alexander AEGus and Hercules, the name and show of the Macedonian empire were for a time sustained; but all these persons were soon murdered; and the family of Alexander being then extinct, the chief commanders of the army, who had gone into different parts of the empire as governors of the provinces, assumed the title of kings. They thereupon fell to leaguings and warring with one another to such a degree that within the short space of fifteen years from Alexander's death, the number was reduced to--how many? Five?--No. Three?--No. Two?--No. But four--just the number specified in the prophecy; for four notable horns were to come up toward the four winds of heaven

in place of the great horn that was broken. These were, (1) Cassander, who had Greece and the neighboring countries; (2) Lysimachus, who had Asia Minor; (3) Seleucus, who had Syria and Babylon, and from whom came the line of kings known as the “Seleucidae,” so famous in history; and (4) Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who had Egypt, and from whom sprang the “Lagidae.” These held dominion toward the four winds of heaven. Cassander had the western parts; Lysimachus had the northern regions; Seleucus possessed the eastern countries; and Ptolemy had the southern portion of the empire. These four horns may therefore be named Macedonia, Thrace (which then included Asia Minor, and those parts lying on the Hellespont and Bosphorus), Syria, and Egypt.

Verse 9. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. 10. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. 11. Yea, he

magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. 12. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced, and prospered.

A third power is here introduced into the prophecy. In the explanation which the angel gave to Daniel of these symbols, this one is not described in language so definite as that concerning Medo-Persia and Grecia. Hence a flood of wild conjecture is at once let loose. Had not the angel, in language which cannot be misunderstood, stated that Medo-Persia and Grecia were denoted by the ram and the he-goat, it is impossible to tell what application men would have given us of those symbols. Probably they would have applied them to anything and everything but the right objects. Leave men a moment to their own judgment in the interpretation of prophecy, and we immediately have the most sublime exhibitions of human fancy.

There are two leading applications of the symbol now under consideration, which are all that need be noticed in these brief thoughts. The first is that the “little horn” here introduced denotes the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes; the second, that it denotes the Roman power. It is an easy matter to test the claims of these two positions.

I. Does it mean Antiochus? If so, this king must fulfill the specifications of the prophecy. If he does not fulfill them, the application cannot be made to him. The little horn came out of one of the four horns of the goat. It was then a separate power, existing independently of, and distinct from, any of the horns of the goat. Was Antiochus such a power?

1. Who was Antiochus? From the time that Seleucus made himself king over the Syrian portion of Alexander’s empire, thus constituting the Syrian horn of the goat, until that country was conquered by the Romans, twenty-six kings ruled in succession over that territory. The eighth of these, in order, was Antiochus Epiphanes.

Antiochus, then, was simply one of the twenty-six kings who constituted the Syrian horn of the goat. He was, for the time being, that horn. Hence he could not be at the same time a separate and independent power, or another and remarkable horn, as the little horn was.

2. If it were proper to apply the little horn to any one of these twenty-six Syrian kings, it should certainly be applied to the most powerful and illustrious of them all; but Antiochus Epiphanes did not by any means sustain this character. Although he took the name Epiphanes, that is, The Illustrious, he was illustrious only in name; for nothing, says Prideaux, on the authority of Polybius, Livy, and Diodorus Siculus, could be more alien to his true character; for, on account of his vile and extravagant folly, some thinking him a fool and others a madman, they changed the name of Epiphanes, “The Illustrious,” into Epimanes, “The Madman.”

3. Antiochus the Great, the father of Epiphanes, being terribly defeated in a war with the Romans,

was enabled to procure peace only by the payment of a prodigious sum of money, and the surrender of a portion of his territory; and, as a pledge that he would faithfully adhere to the terms of the treaty, he was obliged to give hostages, among whom was this very Epiphanes, his son, who was carried to Rome. The Romans ever after maintained this ascendancy.

4. The little horn waxed exceeding great; but this Antiochus did not wax exceeding great; on the contrary, he did not enlarge his dominion, except by some temporary conquests in Egypt, which he immediately relinquished when the Romans took the part of Ptolemy, and commanded him to desist from his designs in that quarter. The rage of his disappointed ambition he vented upon the unoffending Jews.

5. The little horn, in comparison with the powers that preceded it, was exceeding great. Persia is simply called great, though it reigned over a hundred and twenty-seven provinces. Esther 1:1. Grecia, being more extensive still, is called very

great. Now the little horn, which waxed exceeding great, must surpass them both. How absurd, then, to apply this to Antiochus, who was obliged to abandon Egypt at the dictation of the Romans, to whom he paid enormous sums of money as tribute. The Religious Encyclopedia gives us this item of his history: "Finding his resources exhausted, he resolved to go into Persia to levy tribute, and collect large sums which he had agreed to pay to the Romans." It cannot take long for any one to decide the question which was the greater power,--the one which evacuated Egypt, or the one which commanded that evacuation; the one which exacted tribute, or the one which was compelled to pay it.

6. The little horn was to stand up against the Prince of princes. The Prince of princes here means, beyond controversy, Jesus Christ. (Daniel 9:25; Acts 3:15; Revelation 1:5) But Antiochus died one hundred and sixty-four years before our Lord was born. The prophecy cannot, therefore, apply to him; for he does not fulfill the specifications in one single particular. The question may then be asked how any one has ever come to

apply it to him. We answer, Romanists take that view to avoid the application of the prophecy to themselves; and many Protestants follow them, in order to oppose the doctrine that the second advent of Christ is now at hand.

II. It has been an easy matter to show that the little horn does not denote Antiochus. It will be just as easy to show that it does denote Rome.

1. The field of vision here is substantially the same as that covered by Nebuchadnezzar's image of chapter 2, and Daniel's vision of chapter 7. And in both those prophetic delineations we have found that the power which succeeded Grecia as the fourth great power, was Rome. The only natural inference would be that the little horn, the power which in this vision succeeds Grecia as an "exceeding great" power, is also Rome.

2. The little horn comes forth from one of the horns of the goat. How, it may be asked, can this be true of Rome? It is unnecessary to remind the reader that earthly governments are not introduced

into prophecy till they become in some way connected with the people of God. Rome became connected with the Jews, the people of God at that time, by the famous Jewish League B. C. 161.[5] But seven years before this, that is, in B. C. 168, Rome had conquered Macedonia, and made that country a part of its empire. Rome is therefore introduced into prophecy just as, from the conquered Macedonian horn of the goat, it is going forth to new conquests in other directions. It therefore appeared to the prophet, or may be properly spoken of in this prophecy, as coming forth from one of the horns of the goat.

3. The little horn waxed great toward the south. This was true of Rome. Egypt was made a province of the Roman empire B. C. 30, and continued such for some centuries.

4. The little horn waxed great toward the east. This also was true of Rome. Rome conquered Syria B. C. 65, and made it a province.

5. The little horn waxed great toward the

pleasant land. So did Rome. Judea is called the pleasant land in many scriptures. The Romans made it a province of their empire, B. C. 63, and eventually destroyed the city and the temple, and scattered the Jews over the face of the whole earth.

6. The little horn waxed great even to the host of heaven. Rome did this also. The host of heaven, when used in a symbolic sense in reference to events transpiring upon the earth, must denote persons of illustrious character or exalted position. The great red dragon (Revelation 12:4) is said to have cast down a third part of the stars of heaven to the ground. The dragon is there interpreted to symbolize pagan Rome, and the stars it cast to the ground were Jewish rulers. Evidently it is the same power and the same work that is here brought to view, which again makes it necessary to apply this growing horn to Rome.

7. The little horn magnified himself even to the Prince of the host. Rome alone did this. In the interpretation (verse 25) this is called standing up against the Prince of princes How clear an allusion

to the crucifixion of our Lord under the jurisdiction of the Romans.

8. By the little horn the daily sacrifice was taken away. This little horn must be understood to symbolize Rome in its entire history, including its two phases, pagan and papal. These two phases are elsewhere spoken of as the “daily” (sacrifice is a supplied word) and the “transgression of desolation;” the daily (desolation) signifying the pagan form, and the transgression of desolation, the papal.[6] In the actions ascribed to this power, sometimes one form is spoken of, sometimes the other. “By him” (the papal form) “the daily” (the pagan form) “was taken away.” Pagan Rome was remodeled into papal Rome. And the place of his sanctuary, or worship, the city of Rome, was cast down. The seat of government was removed by Constantine in A. D. 330 to Constantinople. The same transaction is brought to view in Revelation 13:2, where it is said that the dragon, pagan Rome, gave to the beast, papal Rome, his seat, the city of Rome.

9. A host was given him (the little horn) against the daily. The barbarians that subverted the Roman empire in the changes, attritions, and transformations of those times, became converts to the Catholic faith, and the instruments of the dethronement of their former religion. Though conquering Rome politically, they were themselves vanquished religiously by the theology of Rome, and became the perpetrators of the same empire in another phase. And this was brought about by reason of “transgression;” that is, by the working of the mystery of iniquity. The papacy is the most cunningly contrived, false ecclesiastical system ever devised; and it may be called a system of iniquity because it has committed its abominations and practiced its orgies of superstition, in the garb, and under the pretense, of pure and undefiled religion.

10. The little horn cast the truth to the ground, and practiced and prospered. This describes, in few words, the work and career of the papacy. The truth is by it hideously caricatured; it is loaded with traditions; it is turned into mummary and

superstition; it is cast down and obscured. And this anti-Christian power has “practiced,”--practiced its deceptions upon the people, practiced its schemes of cunning to carry out its own ends and aggrandize its own power.

And it has “prospered.” It has made war with the saints, and prevailed against them. It has run its allotted career, and is soon to be broken without hand, to be given to the burning flame, and to perish in the consuming glories of the second appearing of our Lord.

Rome meets all the specifications of the prophecy. No other power does meet them. Hence Rome, and no other, is the power in question. And while the descriptions given in the word of God of the character of this monstrous system are fully met, the prophecies of its baleful history have been most strikingly and accurately fulfilled.

Verse 13. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision

concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? 14. And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

The time. These two verses close the vision proper of chapter 8; and they introduce the one remaining point which of all others would naturally be of the most absorbing interest to the prophet and to all the church; namely, the time the desolating powers previously brought to view were to continue. How long shall they continue their course of oppression against God's people, and of blasphemy against high Heaven? Daniel, if time had been given, might perhaps have asked this question himself, but God is ever ready to anticipate our wants, and sometimes to answer even before we ask. Hence two celestial beings appear upon the scene, holding a conversation, in the hearing of the prophet, upon this question which it is so important that the church should understand. Daniel heard one saint speaking. What

this saint spoke at this time we are not informed; but there must have been something either in the matter or the manner of this speaking which made a deep impression upon the mind of Daniel, inasmuch as he uses it in the very next sentence as a designating title, calling the angel “that certain saint which spake.” He may have spoken something of the same nature as that which the seven thunders of the Apocalypse uttered (Revelation 10:3), and which, for some good reason, John was restrained from writing. But another saint asked this one that spake an important question: How long the vision? and both the question and the answer are placed upon record, which is prima-facie evidence that this is a matter which it was designed that the church should understand. And this view is further confirmed by the fact that the angel did not ask this question for his own information, inasmuch as the answer was addressed to Daniel, as the one whom it chiefly concerned, and for whose information it was given. “And he said unto me,” said Daniel, recording the answer to the angel’s question, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be

cleansed.”

The daily sacrifice. We have proof in verse 13 that sacrifice is the wrong word to be supplied in connection with the word daily. If the daily sacrifice of the Jewish service is here meant, or, in other words, the taking away of that sacrifice, as some suppose, which sacrifice was at a certain point of time taken away, there would be no propriety in the question, How long the vision concerning it? This question evidently implies that those agents or events to which the vision relates, occupy a long series of years. Continuance of time is the central idea. And the whole time of the vision is filled by what is here called the daily and the transgression of desolation. Hence the daily cannot be the daily sacrifice of the Jews, the taking away of which, when the time came for it, occupied comparatively but an instant of time. It must denote something which occupies a series of years.

The word here rendered daily occurs in the Old Testament, according to the Hebrew Concordance, one hundred and two times, and is, in the great

majority of instances, rendered continual or continually. The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word at all. Nor is there any word in the text which signifies sacrifice; that is wholly a supplied word, the translators putting in that word which their understanding of the text seemed to demand. But they evidently entertained an erroneous view, the sacrifices of the Jews not being referred to at all. It appears therefore more in accordance with both the construction and the context, to suppose that the word daily refers to a desolating power, like the “transgression of desolation,” with which it is connected. Then we have two desolating powers, which for a long period oppress, or desolate the church. The Hebrew, justifies this construction; the last word, desolation, having a common relation to the two preceding nouns, the perpetual and the transgression, which are connected by the conjunction and. Literally, it may be rendered, “How long the vision [concerning] the continuance and the transgression of desolation?” the word desolation being related to both continuance and transgression, as though it were expressed in full, thus: “The continuance of desolation and the

transgression of desolation.” By the “continuance of desolation,” or the perpetual desolation, we must understand that paganism, through all its long history, is meant; and by “the transgression of desolation” is meant the papacy. The phrase describing this latter power is stronger than that used to describe paganism. It is the transgression (or rebellion, as the word also means) of desolation; as though under this period of the history of the church the desolating power had rebelled against all restraint previously imposed upon it.

From a religious point of view, the world has presented only these two phases of opposition against the Lord’s work in the earth. Hence although three earthly governments are introduced in the prophecy as oppressors of the church, they are here ranged under two heads; “the daily,” and the “transgression of desolation.” Medo-Persia was pagan; Grecia was pagan; Rome in its first phase was pagan; these all were embraced in the “daily.” Then comes the papal form,—the “transgression of desolation”—a marvel of craft and cunning, an

incarnation of fiendish bloodthirstiness and cruelty. No wonder the cry has gone up from suffering martyrs, from age to age, How long, O Lord, how long? And no wonder the Lord, in order that hope might not wholly die out of the hearts of his down-trodden, waiting people, has lifted before them the veil of futurity, showing them the consecutive events of the world's history, till all these persecuting powers shall meet an utter and everlasting destruction, and giving them glimpses beyond, of the unfading glories of their eternal inheritance.

The Lord's eye is upon his people. The furnace will be heated no hotter than necessary to consume the dross. It is through much tribulation we are to enter the kingdom; and the word tribulation is from tribulum, a threshing sledge. Blow after blow must be laid upon us; till all the wheat is beaten free from the chaff, and we are made fit for the heavenly garner. But not a kernel of wheat shall be lost. Says the Lord to his people, Ye are the light of the world, the salt of the earth. In his eyes there is nothing else on the earth of consequence or

importance. Hence the peculiar question here asked, How long the vision respecting the daily and the transgression of desolation? Concerning what?--the glory of earthly kingdoms? the skill of renowned warriors? the fame of mighty conquerors? the greatness of human empire?

No; but concerning the sanctuary and the host, the people and worship of the Most High. How long shall they be trodden under foot? Here is where all Heaven's interest and sympathy are enlisted. He who touches the people of God, touches not mere mortals, weak and helpless, but Omnipotence; he opens an account which must be settled at the bar of Heaven. And soon all these accounts will be adjusted, the iron heel of oppression will itself be crushed, and a people will be brought out of the furnace prepared to shine as the stars forever and ever. To be one who is an object of interest to heavenly beings, one whom the providence of God is engaged to preserve while here, and crown with immortality hereafter--what an exalted position! How much higher than that of any king, president, or potentate of earth? Reader,

are you one of the number?

Respecting the 2300 days, introduced for the first time in verse 14, there are no data in this chapter from which to determine their commencement and close, or tell what portion of the world's history they cover. It is necessary, therefore, for the present, to pass them by. Let the reader be assured, however, that we are not left in any uncertainty concerning those days. The declaration respecting them is a part of a revelation which is given for the instruction of the people of God, and is consequently to be understood. They are spoken of in the midst of a prophecy which the angel Gabriel was commanded to make Daniel understand; and it may be safely assumed that Gabriel somewhere carried out this instruction. It will accordingly be found that the mystery which hangs over these days in this chapter, is dispelled in the next.

The sanctuary. Connected with the 2300 days is another subject of equal importance, which now presents itself for consideration; namely, the

sanctuary; and with this is also connected the subject of its cleansing. An examination of these subjects, will reveal the importance of having an understanding of the commencement and termination of the 2300 days, that we may know when the great event called “the cleansing of the sanctuary” is to transpire; for all the inhabitants of the earth, as will in due time appear, have a personal interest in that solemn work.

Several objects have been claimed by different ones as the sanctuary here mentioned: (1) The earth; (2) The land of Canaan; (3) The church; (4) The sanctuary, the “true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,” which is “in the heavens,” and of which the Jewish tabernacle was a type, pattern, or figure. Hebrews 8:1, 2; 9:23, 24. These conflicting claims must be decided by the Scriptures; and fortunately the testimony is neither meager nor ambiguous.

1. Is the earth the sanctuary? The word sanctuary occurs in the Old and New Testaments one hundred and forty-four times, and from the

definitions of lexicographers, and its use in the Bible, we learn that it is used to signify a holy or sacred place, a dwelling-place for the Most High. If, therefore, the earth is the sanctuary, it must answer to this definition; but what single characteristic pertaining to this earth is found which will satisfy the definition? It is neither a holy nor a sacred place, nor is it a dwelling-place for the Most High. It has no mark of distinction, except as being a revolted planet, marred by sin, scarred and withered by the curse. Moreover, it is nowhere in all the Scriptures called the sanctuary. Only one text can be produced in favor of this view, and that only by an uncritical application. Isaiah 60:13 says: "The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious." This language undoubtedly refers to the new earth; but even that is not called the sanctuary, but only the "place" of the sanctuary, just as it is called "the place" of the Lord's feet; an expression which probably denotes the continual presence of God with his people, as it was revealed to John when it was said, "Behold,

the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.” Revelation 21:3. All that can be said of the earth, therefore, is, that when renewed, it will be the place where the sanctuary of God will be located. It can present not a shadow of a claim to being the sanctuary at the present time, or the sanctuary of the prophecy.

2. Is the land of Canaan the sanctuary? So far as we may be governed by the definition of the word, it can present no better claim than the earth to that distinction. If we inquire where in the Bible it is called the sanctuary, a few texts are brought forward which seem to be supposed by some to furnish the requisite testimony. The first of these is Exodus 15:17. Moses, in his song of triumph and praise to God after the passage of the Red Sea, exclaimed: “Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, in the Sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have established.” A writer who urges this

text, says, “I ask the reader to pause, and examine and settle the question most distinctly, before he goes further, What is the sanctuary here spoken of?” But it would be far safer for the reader not to attempt to settle the question definitely from this one isolated text before comparing it with other scriptures. Moses here speaks in anticipation. His language is a prediction of what God would do for his people. Let us see how it was accomplished. If we find, in the fulfilment, that the land in which they were planted is called the sanctuary, it will greatly strengthen the claim that is based upon this text. If, on the other hand, we find a plain distinction drawn between the land and the sanctuary, then Exodus 15:17 must be interpreted accordingly. We turn to David, who records as a matter of history what Moses uttered as a matter of prophecy. Psalms 78:53, 54. The subject of the psalmist here, is the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian servitude, and their establishment in the promised land; and he says: “And he [God] led them on safely, so that they feared not: but the sea overwhelmed their enemies. And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this

mountain, which his right hand had purchased.” The “mountain” here mentioned by David is the same as the “mountain of thine inheritance” spoken of by Moses, in which the people were to be planted; and this mountain David calls, not the sanctuary, but only the border of the sanctuary. What, then, was the sanctuary? Verse 69 of the same psalm informs us: “And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever.” The same distinction between the sanctuary and the land is pointed out in the prayer of good king Jehoshaphat. “Art not thou our God, who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend forever? And they dwelt therein, and have built thee a sanctuary therein for thy name.” (2 Chronicles 20:7, 8) Taken alone, some try to draw an inference from Exodus 15:17 that the mountain was the sanctuary; but when we take in connection with it the language of David, which is a record of the fulfillment of Moses’ prediction, and an inspired commentary upon his language, such an idea cannot be entertained; for David plainly says that the

mountain was simply the “border” of the sanctuary; and that in that border, or land, the sanctuary was “built” like high palaces, reference being made to the beautiful temple of the Jews, the center and symbol of all their worship. But whoever will read carefully Exodus 15:17, will see that not even an inference is necessary that Moses by the word sanctuary means the mountain of inheritance, much less the whole land of Palestine. In the freedom of poetic license, he employs elliptical expressions, and passes rapidly from one idea or object to another. First, the inheritance engages his attention, and he speaks of it; then the fact that the Lord was to dwell there; then the place he was to provide for his dwelling there; namely, the sanctuary which he would cause to be built. David thus associates Mount Zion and Judah together in Psalms 78:68, because Zion was located in Judah.

The three texts, Ex. 15:17; Psalms 78:54, 69, are the ones chiefly relied on to prove that the land of Canaan is the sanctuary; but, singularly enough, the two latter, in plain language, clear away the ambiguity of the first, and utterly disprove the

claim that is based thereon.

Having disposed of the main proof on this point, it would hardly seem worth while to spend time with those texts from which only inferences can be drawn. As there is, however, only one even of this class, we will refer to it, that no point may be left unnoticed. Isaiah 63:18: “The people of thy holiness have possessed it but a little while: our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary.” This language is as applicable to the temple as to the land; for when the land was overrun with the enemies of Israel, their temple was laid in ruins. This is plainly stated in verse 11 of the next chapter: “Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned up with fire.” The text therefore proves nothing for this view.

Respecting the earth or the land of Canaan as the sanctuary, we offer one thought more. If either constitutes the sanctuary, it should not only be somewhere described as such, but the same idea should be carried through to the end, and the purification of the earth or of Palestine should be

called the cleansing of the sanctuary. The earth is indeed defiled, and it is to be purified by fire; but fire, as we shall see, is not the agent which is used in the cleansing of the sanctuary; and this purification of the earth, or any part of it, is nowhere in the Bible called the cleansing of the sanctuary.

3. Is the church the sanctuary? The evident mistrust with which this idea is suggested, is a virtual surrender of the argument before it is presented. The one solitary text adduced in its support is Psalms 114:1, 2: “When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language; Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion.” Should we take this text in its most literal sense, what would it prove respecting the sanctuary? It would prove that the sanctuary was confined to one of the twelve tribes; and hence that a portion of the church only, not the whole of it, constitutes the sanctuary. But this, proving too little for the theory under consideration, proves nothing. Why Judah is called the sanctuary in the text quoted, need not be a matter of perplexity,

when we remember that God chose Jerusalem, which was in Judah, as the place of his sanctuary. “But chose,” says David, “the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which he loved. And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever.” This clearly shows the connection which existed between Judah and the sanctuary. That tribe itself was not the sanctuary; but it is once spoken of as such when Israel came forth from Egypt, because God purposed that in the midst of the territory of that tribe his sanctuary should be located. But even if it could be shown that the church is anywhere called the sanctuary, it would be of no consequence to our present purpose, which is to determine what constitutes the sanctuary of Daniel 8:13, 14; for the church is there spoken of as another object: “To give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot.” That by the term host the church is here meant, none will dispute; the sanctuary is therefore another and a different object.

4. Is the temple in heaven the sanctuary? There now remains but this one claim to be examined;

namely, that the sanctuary mentioned in the text is what Paul calls in Hebrews the “true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,” to which he expressly gives the name of “the sanctuary,” and which he locates in “the heavens;” of which sanctuary, there existed, under the former dispensation, first in the tabernacle built by Moses, and afterward in the temple at Jerusalem, a pattern, type, or figure. And let it be particularly noticed, that on the view here suggested rests our only hope of ever understanding this question; for we have seen that all other positions are untenable. No other object which has ever been supposed by any one to be the sanctuary--the earth, the land of Canaan, or the church--can for a moment support such a claim. If, therefore, we do not find it in the object before us, we may abandon the search in utter despair; we may discard so much of revelation as still unrevealed, and may cut out from the sacred page, as so much useless reading, the numerous passages which speak on this subject. All those, therefore, who, rather than that so important a subject should go by default, are willing to lay aside all preconceived opinions and cherished views, will

approach the position before us with intense anxiety and unbounded interest. They will lay hold of any evidence that may here be given us, as a man bewildered in a labyrinth of darkness would lay hold of the thread which was his only guide to lead him forth again to light.

It will be safe for us to put ourselves in imagination in the place of Daniel, and view the subject from his standpoint. What would he understand by the term sanctuary as addressed to him? If we can ascertain this, it will not be difficult to arrive at correct conclusions on this subject. His mind would inevitably turn, on the mention of that word, to the sanctuary of that dispensation; and certainly he well knew what that was. His mind did turn to Jerusalem, the city of his fathers, which was then in ruins, and to their “beautiful house,” which, as Isaiah laments, was burned with fire. And so, as was his wont, with his face turned toward the place of their once venerated temple, he prayed God to cause his face to shine upon his sanctuary, which was desolate. By the word sanctuary Daniel evidently understood their temple at Jerusalem.

But Paul bears testimony which is most explicit on this point. (Hebrews 9:1) “Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.” This is the very point which at present we are concerned to determine: What was the sanctuary of the first covenant? Paul proceeds to tell us. Hear him. Verses 2-5: “For there was a tabernacle made; the first [or first apartment], wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary [margin, the holy]. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron’s rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercyseat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.”

There is no mistaking the object to which Paul here has reference. It is the tabernacle erected by Moses according to the direction of the Lord

(which was afterward merged into the temple at Jerusalem), with a holy and a most holy place, and various vessels of service, as here set forth. A full description of this building, with its various vessels and their uses, will be found in Exodus 25 and onward. If the reader is not familiar with this subject, he is requested to turn and closely examine the description of this building. This, Paul plainly says, was the sanctuary of the first covenant. And we wish the reader carefully to mark the logical value of this declaration. By telling us what did positively for a time constitute the sanctuary, Paul sets us on the right track of inquiry. He gives us a basis on which to work. For a time, the field is cleared of all doubt and all obstacles. During the time covered by the first covenant, which reached from Sinai to Christ, we have before us a distinct and plainly defined object, minutely described by Moses, and declared by Paul to be the sanctuary during that time.

But Paul's language has greater significance even than this. It forever annihilates the claims which are put forth in behalf of the earth, the land

of Canaan, or the church, as the sanctuary; for the arguments which would prove them to be the sanctuary at any time, would prove them to be such under the old dispensation. If Canaan was at any time the sanctuary, it was such when Israel was planted in it. If the church was ever the sanctuary, it was such when Israel was led forth from Egypt. If the earth was ever the sanctuary, it was such during the period of which we speak. To this period the arguments urged in their favor apply as fully as to any other period; and if they were not the sanctuary during this time, then all the arguments are destroyed which would show that they ever were, or ever could be, the sanctuary. But were they the sanctuary during that time? This is a final question for these theories; and Paul decides it in the negative, by describing to us the tabernacle of Moses, and telling us that that--not the earth, nor Canaan, nor the church--was the sanctuary of that dispensation.

And this building answers in every respect to the definition of the term, and the use for which the sanctuary was designed.

1. It was the earthly dwelling-place of God. “Let them make me a sanctuary,” said he to Moses, “that I may dwell among them.” Exodus 25:8. In this tabernacle, which they erected according to his instructions, he manifested his presence. 2. It was a holy, or sacred place,--“the holy sanctuary.” (Leviticus 16:33) 3. In the word of God it is over and over again called the sanctuary. Of the one hundred and forty instances in which the word is used in the Old Testament, it refers in almost every case to this building.

The tabernacle was at first constructed in such a manner as to be adapted to the condition of the children of Israel at that time. They were just entering upon their forty years’ wandering in the wilderness, when this building was set up in their midst as the habitation of God, and the center of their religious worship. Journeying was a necessity, and removals were frequent. It would be necessary that the tabernacle should often be moved from place to place. It was, therefore, so fashioned of movable parts, the sides being composed of upright

boards, and the covering consisting of curtains of linen and dyed skins, that it could be readily taken down, conveniently transported, and easily erected at each successive stage of their journey. After entering the promised land, this temporary structure in time gave place to the magnificent temple of Solomon. In this more permanent form it existed, saving only the time it lay in ruins in Daniel's day, till its final destruction by the Romans in A. D. 70.

This is the only sanctuary connected with the earth, concerning which the Bible gives us any instruction, or history any record. But is there nowhere any other? This was the sanctuary of the first covenant; with that covenant it came to an end; is there no sanctuary which pertains to the second, or new covenant? There must be; otherwise the analogy is lacking between these covenants; and in this case the first covenant had a system of worship, which, though minutely described, is unintelligible, and the second covenant has a system of worship which is indefinite and obscure. And Paul virtually asserts

that the new covenant, in force since the death of Christ, the testator, has a sanctuary; for when, in contrasting the two covenants, as he does in the book of Hebrews, he says in chapter 9:1 that the first covenant “had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary,” it is the same as saying that the new covenant has likewise its services and its sanctuary. Furthermore, in verse 8 of this chapter he speaks of the worldly sanctuary as the first tabernacle. If that was the first, there must be a second; and as the first tabernacle existed so long as the first covenant was in force, when that covenant came to an end, the second tabernacle must have taken the place of the first, and must be the sanctuary of the new covenant. There can be no evading this conclusion.

Where, then, shall we look for the sanctuary of the new covenant? Paul, by the use of the word also, in Hebrews 9:1, intimates that he had before spoken of this sanctuary. We turn back to the beginning of the previous chapter, and find him summing up his foregoing arguments as follows: “How of the things which we have spoken this is

the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” Can there be any doubt that we have in this text the sanctuary of the new covenant? A plain allusion is here made to the sanctuary of the first covenant. That was pitched by man, erected by Moses; this was pitched by the Lord, not by man. That was the place where the earthly priests performed their ministry; this is the place where Christ, the High Priest of the new covenant, performs his ministry. That was on earth; this is in heaven. That was therefore very properly called by Paul a “worldly sanctuary;” this is a “heavenly one.”

This view is further sustained by the fact that the sanctuary built by Moses was not an original structure, but was built after a pattern. The great original existed somewhere else; what Moses constructed was but a type, or model. Listen to the directions the Lord gave him on this point: “According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the

instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.” Exodus 25:9. “And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount.”[7]

Now of what was the earthly sanctuary a type, or figure? Answer: Of the sanctuary of the new covenant, the “true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” The relation which the first covenant sustains to the second throughout, is that of type to antitype. Its sacrifices were types of the greater sacrifice of this dispensation; its priests were types of our Lord, in his more perfect priesthood; their ministry was performed unto the shadow and example of the ministry of our High Priest above; and the sanctuary where they ministered, was a type, or figure, of the true sanctuary in heaven, where our Lord performs his ministry.

All these facts are plainly stated by Paul in a few verses to the Hebrews 8:4, 5: “For if he [Christ] were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts

according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.” This testimony shows that the ministry of the earthly priests was a shadow of Christ’s priesthood; and the evidence Paul brings forward to prove it, is the direction which God gave to Moses to make the tabernacle, according to the pattern showed him in the mount. This clearly identifies the pattern showed to Moses in the mount with the sanctuary, or true tabernacle, in heaven, where our Lord ministers, mentioned three verses before.

In chapter 9:8, 9, Paul further says: “The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all [Greek, holy places, plural] was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present,” etc. While the first tabernacle stood, and the first covenant was in force, the ministration of the more perfect tabernacle and the work of the new covenant was not, of course, carried forward.

But when Christ came, a high priest of good things to come, when the first tabernacle had served its purpose, and the first covenant had ceased, then Christ, raised to the throne of the Majesty in the heavens as a minister of the true sanctuary, entered by his own blood (verse 12) “into the holy place [where also the Greek has the plural, the holy places], having obtained eternal redemption for us.” Of these heavenly holy places, therefore, the first tabernacle was a figure for the time then present. If any further testimony is needed, he speaks, in verse 28, of the earthly tabernacle, with its apartments and instruments, as patterns of things in the heavens; and in verse 21, he calls the holy places made with hands, that is, the earthly tabernacle erected by Moses, figures of the true; that is, the tabernacle in heaven.

This view is still further corroborated by the testimony of John. Among the things which he was permitted to behold in heaven, he saw seven lamps of fire burning before the throne (Revelation 4:5); he saw an altar of incense, and a golden censer (chapter 8:3); he saw the ark of God’s testament

(chapter 11:19); and all this in connection with a “temple” in heaven. (Revelation 11:19; 15:8) These objects every Bible reader must at once recognize as implements of the sanctuary. They owed their existence to the sanctuary, and were confined to it, to be employed in the ministration connected therewith. As without the sanctuary they had not existed, so wherever we find these, we may know that there is the sanctuary; and hence the fact that John saw these things in heaven in this dispensation, is proof that there is a sanctuary there, and that he was permitted to behold it.

However reluctant a person may have been to acknowledge that there is a sanctuary in heaven, the testimony that has been presented is certainly sufficient to prove this fact. Paul says that the tabernacle of Moses was the sanctuary of the first covenant. Moses says that God showed him in the mount a pattern, according to which he was to make this tabernacle. Paul testifies again that Moses did make it according to the pattern, and that the pattern was the true tabernacle in heaven, which the Lord pitched, and not man; and that of

this heavenly sanctuary the tabernacle erected with hands was a true figure, or representation. And finally, John, to corroborate the statement of Paul that this sanctuary is in heaven, bears testimony, as an eye-witness, that he beheld it there. What further testimony could be required? Nay, more, what further is conceivable?

So far as the question as to what constitutes the sanctuary is concerned, we now have the subject before us in one harmonious whole. The sanctuary of the Bible--mark it, all, dispute it, who can--consists, first, of the typical tabernacle established with the Hebrews at the exode from Egypt, which was the sanctuary of the first covenant; and, secondly, of the true tabernacle in heaven, of which the former was a type, or figure, which is the sanctuary of the new covenant. These are inseparably connected together as type and antitype. From the antitype we go back to the type, and from the type we are carried forward naturally and inevitably to the antitype.

We have said that Daniel would at once

understand by the word sanctuary the sanctuary of his people at Jerusalem; so would any one under that dispensation. But does the declaration of Daniel 8:14 have reference to that sanctuary? That depends upon the time to which it applies. All the declarations respecting the sanctuary which apply under the old dispensation, have respect, of course, to the sanctuary of that dispensation; and all those declarations which apply in this dispensation, must have reference to the sanctuary of this dispensation. If the 2300 days, at the termination of which the sanctuary is to be cleansed, ended in the former dispensation, the sanctuary to be cleansed was the sanctuary of that time. If they reach over into this dispensation, the sanctuary to which reference is made is the sanctuary of this dispensation,-- the new-covenant sanctuary in heaven. This is a point which can be determined only by a further argument on the 2300 days; and this will be found in remarks on Daniel 9:24, where the subject of time is resumed and explained.

What we have thus far said respecting the sanctuary, has been only incidental to the main

question in the prophecy. That question has respect to its cleansing. Unto 2300 days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. But it was necessary first to determine what constituted the sanctuary, before we could understandingly examine the question of its cleansing. For this we are now prepared.

Having learned what constitutes the sanctuary, the question of its cleansing and how it is accomplished, is soon decided. It has been noticed that whatever constitutes the sanctuary of the Bible, must have some service connected with it which is called its cleansing. There is no account in the Bible of any work so named as pertaining to this earth, the land of Canaan, or the church; which is good evidence that none of these objects constitutes the sanctuary; there is such a service connected with the object which we have shown to be the sanctuary, and which, in reference to both the earthly building and the heavenly temple, is called its cleansing.

Does the reader object to the idea of there being anything in heaven which is to be cleansed? Is this

a barrier in the way of his receiving the view here presented? Then his controversy is not with this work, but with Paul, who positively affirms this fact. But before he decides against the apostle, we ask the objector to examine carefully in reference to the nature of this cleansing, as he is here undoubtedly laboring under an utter misapprehension. The following are the plain terms in which Paul affirms the cleansing of both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary: “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” (Hebrews 9:22, 23) In the light of foregoing arguments, this may be paraphrased thus: “It was therefore necessary that the tabernacle, as erected by Moses, with its sacred vessels, which were patterns of the true sanctuary in heaven, should be purified, or cleansed, with the blood of calves and goats; but the heavenly things themselves, the sanctuary of this dispensation, the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not

man, must be cleansed with better sacrifices, even with the blood of Christ.”

We now inquire, What is the nature of this cleansing, and how is it to be accomplished? According to the language of Paul, just quoted, it is performed by means of blood. The cleansing is not, therefore, a cleansing from physical uncleanness or impurity; for blood is not the agent used in such a work. And this consideration should satisfy the objector's mind in regard to the cleansing of the heavenly things. The fact that Paul speaks of heavenly things to be cleansed, does not prove that there is any physical impurity in heaven; for that is not the kind of cleansing to which he refers. The reason Paul assigns why this cleansing is performed with blood, is because without the shedding of blood there is no remission.

Remission, then, that is, the putting away of sin, is the work to be done. The cleansing, therefore, is not physical cleansing, but a cleansing from sin. But how came sins connected with the sanctuary, either the earthly or the heavenly, that it

should need to be cleansed from them? This question is answered by the ministration connected with the type, to which we now turn.

The closing chapters of Exodus give us an account of the construction of the earthly sanctuary, and the arrangement of the service connected therewith. Leviticus opens with an account of the ministration which was there to be performed. All that it is to our purpose to notice here, is one particular branch of the service, which was performed as follows: The person who had committed sin, brought his victim to the door of the tabernacle. Upon the head of this victim he placed his hand for a moment, and, as we may reasonably infer, confessed over him his sin. By this expressive act he signified that he had sinned, and was worthy of death, but that in his stead he consecrated his victim, and transferred his guilt to it. With his own hand (and what must have been his emotions?) he then took the life of his victim on account of that guilt. The law demanded the life of the transgressor for his disobedience; the life is in the blood (Leviticus 17:11, 14); hence without the

shedding of blood, there is no remission; with the shedding of blood, remission is possible; for the demand of life by the law is thus satisfied. The blood of the victim, representative of a forfeited life, and the vehicle of its guilt, was then taken by the priest, and ministered before the Lord.

The sin of the individual was thus, by his confession, by the slaying of the victim, and by the ministry of the priest, transferred from himself to the sanctuary. Victim after victim was thus offered by the people. Day by day the work went forward; and thus the sanctuary continually became the receptacle of the sins of the congregation. But this was not the final disposition of these sins. The accumulated guilt was removed by a special service, which was called the cleansing of the sanctuary. This service, in the type, occupied one day in the year; and the tenth day of the seventh month, on which it was performed, was called the day of atonement. On this day, while all Israel refrained from work and afflicted their souls, the priest brought two goats, and presented them before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the

congregation. On these goats he cast lots; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat. The one upon which the Lord's lot fell, was then slain, and his blood was carried by the priest into the most holy place of the sanctuary, and sprinkled upon the mercy-seat. And this was the only day on which he was permitted to enter into that apartment. Coming forth, he was then to lay both his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, and, thus putting them upon his head (Leviticus 16:21), he was to send him away by the hand of a fit man into a land not inhabited, a land of separation, or forgetfulness, the goat never again to appear in the camp of Israel, and the sins of the people to be remembered against them no more. This service was for the purpose of cleansing the people from their sins, and cleansing the sanctuary and its sacred vessels. (Leviticus 16:30, 33) By this process, sin was removed,--but only in figure; for all that work was typical.

The reader to whom these views are new will

be ready here to inquire, perhaps, with some astonishment, what this strange work could possibly be designed to typify; what there is in this dispensation which it was designed to prefigure. We answer, A similar work in the ministration of Christ, as Paul clearly teaches. After stating, in Hebrews 8, that Christ is the minister of the true tabernacle, the sanctuary in heaven, he states that the priests on earth served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things. In other words, the work of the earthly priests was a shadow, an example, a correct representation, so far as it could be carried out by mortals, of the ministration of Christ above. These priests ministered in both apartments of the earthly tabernacle, Christ therefore ministers in both apartments of the heavenly temple; for that temple has two apartments, or it was not correctly represented by the earthly; and our Lord officiates in both, or the service of the priest on earth was not a correct shadow of his work. But Paul directly states that he ministers in both apartments; for he says that he has entered into the holy place (Greek, the holy places) by his own blood. (Hebrews 9:12) There is

therefore a work performed by Christ in his ministry in the heavenly temple, corresponding to that performed by the priests in both apartments of the earthly building. But the work in the second apartment, or most holy place, was a special work to close the yearly round of service, and cleanse the sanctuary. Hence Christ's ministration in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary must be a work of like nature, and constitute the close of his work as our great High Priest, and the cleansing of that sanctuary.

As through the sacrifices of a former dispensation the sins of the people were transferred in figure by the priests to the earthly sanctuary, where those priests ministered, so ever since Christ ascended to be our intercessor in the presence of his Father, the sins of all those who sincerely seek pardon through him, are transferred in fact to the heavenly sanctuary where he ministers. Whether Christ ministers for us in the heavenly holy places with his own blood literally, or only by virtue of its merits, we need not stop to inquire. Suffice it to say, that his blood has been shed, and through that

blood remission of sins is secured in fact, which was obtained only in figure through the blood of the calves and goats of the former dispensation. But those sacrifices had real virtue in this respect: they signified faith in a real sacrifice to come; and thus those who employed them have an equal interest in the work of Christ with those who in this dispensation come to him by faith, through the ordinances of the gospel.

The continual transfer of sins to the heavenly sanctuary (and if they are not thus transferred, will any one, in the light of the types, and in view of the language of Paul, explain the nature of the work of Christ in our behalf?)--this continual transfer, we say, of sins to the heavenly sanctuary, makes its cleansing necessary on the same ground that a like work was required in the earthly sanctuary.

An important distinction between the two ministrations must here be noticed. In the earthly tabernacle, a complete round of service was accomplished every year. For three hundred and fifty-nine days, in their ordinary years, the

ministration went forward in the first apartment. One day's work in the most holy completed the yearly round. The work then commenced again in the holy place, and went forward till another day of atonement completed the year's work. And so on, year by year. This continual repetition of the work was necessary on account of the short lives of mortal priests. But no such necessity exists in the case of our divine Lord, who ever liveth to make intercession for us. (See Hebrews 7:23-25.) Hence the work of the heavenly sanctuary, instead of being a yearly work, is performed once for all. Instead of being repeated year by year, one grand cycle is allotted to it, in which it is carried forward, and finished, never to be repeated

One year's round of service in the earthly sanctuary represented the entire work of the sanctuary above. In the type, the cleansing of the sanctuary was the brief closing work of the year's service. In the antitype, the cleansing of the sanctuary must be the closing work of Christ, our great High Priest, in the tabernacle on high. In the type, to cleanse the sanctuary, the high priest

entered into the most holy place to minister in the presence of God before the ark of his testament. In the antitype, when the time comes for the cleansing of the sanctuary, our High Priest, in like manner, enters into the most holy place to make a final end of his intercessory work in behalf of mankind. We confidently affirm that no other conclusion can be arrived at on this subject without doing despite to the unequivocal testimony of God's word.

Reader, do you now see the importance of this subject? Do you begin to perceive what an object of interest for all the world is the sanctuary of God? Do you see that the whole work of salvation centers there, and that when the work is done, probation is ended, and the cases of the saved and lost are eternally decided? Do you see that the cleansing of the sanctuary is a brief and special work, by which the great scheme is forever finished? Do you see that if it can be made known when this work of cleansing commences, it is a solemn announcement to the world that salvation's last hour is reached, and is fast hastening to its close? And this is what the prophecy is designed to

show. It is to make known the commencement of this momentous work. “Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.”

In advance of any argument on the nature and application of these days, the position may be safely taken that they reach to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, for the earthly was to be cleansed each year; and we make the prophet utter nonsense, if we understand him as saying that at the end of 2300 days, a period of time over six years in length, even if we take them literally, an event should take place which was to occur regularly every year. The heavenly sanctuary is the one in which the decision of all cases is to be rendered. The progress of the work there is what it especially concerns mankind to know. If people understood the bearing of these subjects on their eternal interests, with what earnestness and anxiety would they give them their most careful and prayerful study. See on chapter 9:20 and onward, an argument on the 2300 days, showing at what point they terminated, and when the solemn work

of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began.

Verse 15. And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. 16. And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.

We now enter upon an interpretation of the vision. And first of all we have mention of Daniel's solicitude, and his efforts to understand these things. He sought for the meaning. Those who have given to prophetic subjects their careful and earnest attention, are not the ones who are unconcerned in such matters. They only can tread with indifference over a mine of gold, who do not know that a bed of precious metal lies beneath their feet. Immediately there stood before the prophet as the appearance of a man. The text does not say it was a man, as some would fain have us think, who wish to prove that angels are dead men, and who resort to such texts as this for their evidence. It says, "The appearance

of a man,” from which we are evidently to understand an angel in human form. And he heard a man’s voice; that is, the voice of an angel, as of a man, speaking. The commandment given was, to make this man, Daniel, understand the vision. It was addressed to Gabriel, a name that signifies “the mighty one.” He continues his instruction to Daniel in chapter 9. Under the new dispensation he was commissioned to announce the birth of John the Baptist to his father Zacharias (Luke 1:11); and that of the Messiah to the virgin Mary, verse 26. To Zacharias, he introduced himself with these words: “I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God.” From this it appears that he was an angel of a high order and superior dignity; but the one who here addressed him was evidently higher in rank, and had power to command and control his actions. This was probably no other than the archangel Michael, or Christ, between whom and Gabriel, alone, a knowledge of the matters communicated to Daniel existed. (See chapter 10:21.)

Verse 17. So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon

my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision. 18. Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground: but he touched me, and set me upright. 19. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be.

Under similar circumstances to those here narrated, John fell down before the feet of an angel, but it was for the purpose of worship. (Revelation 19:10; 22:8) Daniel seems to have been completely overcome by the majesty of the heavenly messenger. He prostrated himself with his face to the ground, probably as though in a deep sleep, but not really so. Sorrow, it is true, caused the disciples to sleep; but fear, as in this case, would hardly have that effect. The angel gently laid his hand upon him to give him assurance (how many times have mortals been told by heavenly beings to “fear not”!), and from this helpless and prostrate condition set him upright. With a general statement that at the time appointed the end shall be, and that

he will make him know what shall be in the last end of the indignation, he enters upon an interpretation of the vision. The indignation must be understood to cover a period of time. What time? God told his people Israel that he would pour upon them his indignation for their wickedness; and thus he gave directions concerning the “profane wicked prince of Israel:” “Remove the diadem, and take off the crown. ... I will overturn, overturn, overturn it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” (Ezekiel 21:25-27, 31)

Here is the period of God’s indignation against his covenant people; the period during which the sanctuary and host are to be trodden under foot. The diadem was removed, and the crown taken off, when Israel was subjected to the kingdom of Babylon. It was overturned again by the Medes and Persians, again by the Grecians, again by the Romans, corresponding to the three times the word is repeated by the prophet. The Jews then having rejected Christ, were soon scattered abroad over the face of the earth; and spiritual Israel has taken

the place of the literal seed, but they are in subjection to earthly powers, and will be till the throne of David is again set up,--till He who is its rightful heir, the Messiah, the Prince of peace, shall come, and then it will be given him. Then the indignation will have ceased. What shall take place in the last end of this period, the angel is now to make known to Daniel.

Verse 20. The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. 21. And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. 22. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.

As the disciples said to the Lord, so may we here say of the angel who spake to Daniel, "Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb." This is an explanation of the vision in language as plain as need be given. (See on verses 3-8.) The distinguishing feature of the Persian empire, the union of the two nationalities which

composed it, is represented by the two horns of the ram. Grecia attained its greatest glory as a unit under the leadership of Alexander the Great, a general as famous as the world has ever seen. This part of her history is represented by the first phase of the goat, during which time the one notable horn symbolized Alexander the Great. Upon his death, the kingdom fell into fragments, but almost immediately consolidated into four grand divisions, represented by the second phase of the goat, when it had four horns which came up in the place of the first, which was broken. These divisions did not stand in his power. None of them possessed the strength of the original kingdom. These great waymarks in history, on which the historian bestows volumes, the inspired penman here gives us in sharp outline, with a few strokes of the pencil and a few dashes of the pen.

Verse 23. And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. 24. And his power shall be mighty, but not by

his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. 25. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand: and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

This power succeeds to the four divisions of the goat kingdom in the latter time of their kingdom, that is, toward the termination of their career. It is, of course, the same as the little horn of verse 9 and onward. Apply it to Rome, as set forth in remarks on verse 9, and all is harmonious and clear.

“A king of fierce countenance.” Moses, in predicting punishment to come upon the Jews from this same power, calls it “a nation of fierce countenance.” Deuteronomy 28:49, 50. No people made a more formidable appearance in warlike array than the Romans. “Understanding dark sentences.” Moses, in the scripture just referred to

says, “Whose tongue thou shalt not understand.” This could not be said of the Babylonians, Persians, or Greeks, in reference to the Jews; for the Chaldean and Greek languages were used to a greater or less extent in Palestine. This was not the case, however, with the Latin.

“When the transgressors are come to the full.” All along, the connection between God’s people and their oppressors is kept in view. It was on account of the transgressions of his people that they were sold into captivity. And their continuance in sin brought more and more severe punishment. At no time were the Jews more corrupt, morally, as a nation, than at the time they came under the jurisdiction of the Romans.

“Mighty, but not by his own power.” The success of the Romans was owing largely to the aid of their allies, and divisions among their enemies, of which they were ever ready to take advantage.

“He shall destroy wonderfully.” The Lord told the Jews by the prophet Ezekiel that he would

deliver them to men who were “skilful to destroy.” How full of meaning is such a description, and how applicable to the Romans! In taking Jerusalem, they slew eleven hundred thousand Jews, and made ninety-seven thousand captives. So wonderfully did they destroy this once mighty and holy people.

And what they could not accomplish by force, they secured by artifice. Their flatteries, fraud, and corruption were as fatal as their thunderbolts of war. And Rome, finally, in the person of one of its governors, stood up against the Prince of princes, by giving sentence of death against Jesus Christ. “But he shall be broken without hand,” an expression which identifies the destruction of this power with the smiting of the image of chapter 2.

Verse 26. And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true; wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days. 27. And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king’s business; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.

“The vision of the evening and the morning,” is that of the 2300 days. In view of the long period of oppression, and the calamities which were to come upon his people, Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days. He was astonished at the vision, but did not understand it. Why did not Gabriel at this time fully carry out his instructions, and cause Daniel to understand the vision? — Because Daniel had received all that he could then bear. Further instruction is therefore deferred to a future time.

Notes:

1. Dissertation on the Prophecies, p. 238.
2. Id., p. 239.
3. Vol. I, p. 378.
4. See notes on verse 39 of chapter 2.
5. 1 Maccabees 8; Josephus’s Antiquities, book 12, chap. 10, sec. 6; Prideaux, Vol. II, p. 166.
6. See on verse 13.
7. Verse 40; To the same end see Exodus 26:30; 27:8; Acts 7:44.

Chapter 9

The Seventy Weeks

Verse 1. In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; 2. In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

The vision recorded in the preceding chapter was given in the third year of Belshazzar, B. C. 538. In the same year, which was also the first of Darius, the events narrated in this chapter occurred. Consequently, less than one year is passed over between these two chapters. Although Daniel, as prime minister of the foremost kingdom on the face of the earth, was cumbered with cares and burdens, he did not let this deprive him of the privilege of studying into things of higher moment, even the purposes of God as revealed to his prophets. He

understood by books, that is, the writings of Jeremiah, that God would accomplish seventy years in the captivity of his people. This prediction is found in Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10. The knowledge of it, and the use that was made of it, shows that Jeremiah was early regarded as a divinely inspired prophet; otherwise his writings would not have been so soon collected, and so extensively copied. Though Daniel was for a time contemporary with him, he had a copy of his works which he carried with him in his captivity; and though he was so great a prophet himself, he was not above studying carefully what God might reveal to others of his servants. Commencing the seventy years B. C. 606, Daniel understood that they were now drawing to their termination; and God had even commenced the fulfillment by overthrowing the kingdom of Babylon.

Verse 3. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes.

Because God has promised, we are not released

from the responsibility of beseeching him for the fulfillment of his word. Daniel might have reasoned in this manner: God has promised to release his people at the end of the seventy years, and he will accomplish this promise; I need not therefore concern myself at all in the matter. Daniel did not thus reason; but as the time drew near for the accomplishment of the word of the Lord, he set himself to seek the Lord with all his heart. And how earnestly he engaged in the work, even with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes! This was the year, probably, in which he was cast into the lion's den; and the prayer of which we here have an account, may have been the burden of that petition, which, regardless of the unrighteous human law which had been secured to the contrary, he offered before the Lord three times a day.

Verse 4. And I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments.

We here have the opening of Daniel's wonderful prayer,--a prayer expressing such humiliation and contrition of heart that one must be without feeling who can read it unmoved. He commences by acknowledging the faithfulness of God. God never fails in any of his engagements with his followers. It was not from any lack on God's part in defending and upholding them, that the Jews were then in the furnace of captivity, but only on account of their sins.

Verse 5. We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments: 6. Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land 7. O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them,

because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. 8. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. 9. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him; 10. Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets. 11. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. 12. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. 13. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth. 14. Therefore hath

the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: for we obeyed not his voice.

To this point Daniel's prayer is employed in making a full and heart-broken confession of sin. He vindicates fully the course of the Lord, acknowledging their sins to be the cause of all their calamities, as God had threatened them by the prophet Moses. And he does not discriminate in favor of himself. No self-righteousness appears in his petition. And although he had suffered long for others' sins, enduring seventy years of captivity for the wrongs of his people, himself meanwhile living a godly life, and receiving signal honors and blessings from the Lord, he brings no accusations against any one to the exclusion of others, pleads no sympathy for himself as a victim of others' wrongs, but ranks himself in with the rest, and says, We have sinned, and unto us belongs confusion of face. And he acknowledges that they had not heeded the lessons God designed to teach them by their afflictions, by turning again unto

him.

An expression in the 14th verse is worthy of especial notice: “Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us.” Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil. But none may think that the Lord does not see, or that he has forgotten. His retributions will surely overtake the transgressor, against whom they are threatened, without deviation and without fail. He will watch upon the evil, and in his own good time will bring it to pass.

Verse 15. And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day; we have sinned, we have done wickedly. 16. O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers,

Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. 17. Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. 18. O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. 19. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

The prophet now pleads the honor of the Lord's name as a reason why he desires that his petition should be granted. He refers to the fact of their deliverance from Egypt, and the great renown that had accrued to the Lord's name for all his wonderful works manifested among them. All this would be lost, should he now abandon them to perish. Moses used the same argument in pleading for Israel. Numbers 14. Not that God is moved with

motives of ambition and vainglory; but when his people are jealous for the honor of his name, when they evince their love for him by pleading with him to work, not for their own personal benefit, but for his own glory, that his name may not be reproached and blasphemed among the heathen, this is acceptable with him. Daniel then intercedes for the city of Jerusalem, called by God's name, and his holy mountain, for which he has had such love, and beseeches him, for his mercies' sake, to let his anger be turned away. Finally, his mind centers upon the holy sanctuary, God's own dwelling-place upon this earth, and he pleads that its desolations may be repaired.

Daniel understood the seventy years of captivity to be near their termination. From his allusion to the sanctuary, it is evident that he so far misunderstood the important vision given him in chapter 8, as to suppose that the 2300 days, at the termination of which the sanctuary was to be cleansed, expired at the same time. This misapprehension was at once corrected, when the angel came to give him further instruction in

answer to his prayer, the narration of which is next given.

Verse 20. And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God: 21. Yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation.

We here have the result of Daniel's supplication. He is suddenly interrupted by a heavenly messenger. The angel Gabriel, appearing again as he had before, in the form of a man, whom Daniel had seen in the vision at the beginning, touched him. A very important question is at this point to be determined. It is to be decided whether the vision of chapter 8 has ever been explained, and can ever be understood. The question is, To what vision does Daniel refer by the expression, "the vision at the beginning"? It will be conceded

by all that it is a vision of which we have some previous record, and that in that vision we shall find some mention of Gabriel. We must go back beyond this ninth chapter; for all that we have in this chapter previous to this appearance of Gabriel, is simply a record of Daniel's prayer. Looking back, then, through previous chapters, we find mention of only three visions given to Daniel. 1. The interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar was given in a night vision. (Chapter 2:19) But there is no record of any angelic agency in the matter. 2. The vision of chapter 7. This was explained to Daniel by "one of of them that stood by," probably an angel; but we have no information as to what angel, nor is there anything in that vision which needed further explanation. 3. The vision of chapter 8. Here we find some particulars which show this to be the vision referred to. 1. Gabriel is there first brought to view by name in the book, and the only time previous to this occasion. 2. He was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision. 3. Daniel, at the conclusion, says he did not understand it, showing that Gabriel, at the conclusion of chapter 8, had not fulfilled his

mission. There is no place in all the Bible where this instruction is carried out, if it be not in chapter 9. If, therefore, the vision of chapter 8 is not the one referred to, we have no record that Gabriel ever complied with the instructions given him, or that that vision has ever been explained. 5. The instruction which the angel now gives to Daniel, as we shall see from the following verses, does exactly complete what was lacking in chapter 8. These considerations prove beyond a doubt the connection between Daniel 8 and 9; and this conclusion will be still further strengthened by a consideration of the angel's instructions.

Verse 22. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. 23. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.

The manner in which Gabriel introduces

himself on this occasion, shows that he has come to complete some unfulfilled mission. This can be nothing less than to carry out the instruction to make this man “understand the vision,” as recorded in chapter 8. “I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.” As the charge still rested upon him to make Daniel understand, and as he explained to Daniel in chapter 8 all that he could then bear, and yet he did not understand the vision, he now comes to resume his work and complete his mission. As soon as Daniel commenced his fervent supplication, the commandment came forth; that is, Gabriel received instruction to visit Daniel, and impart to him the requisite information. From the time it takes to read Daniel’s prayer down to the point at which Gabriel made his appearance upon the scene, the reader can judge of the speed with which this messenger was despatched from the court of heaven to this servant of God. No wonder that Daniel says he was caused to fly swiftly, or that Ezekiel compares the movements of these celestial beings to a flash of lightning. (Ezekiel 1:14) “Understand the matter,” he says to Daniel. What matter?--That, evidently, which he did not

before understand, as stated in the last verse of chapter 8. "Consider the vision." What vision? Not the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's image, nor the vision of chapter 7, for there was no difficulty with either of these; but the vision of chapter 8, in reference to which his mind was filled with doubt and astonishment. "I am come to show thee," also said the angel. Show thee in reference to what?-- Certainly in reference to something wherein he was entertaining wrong ideas, and something, at the same time, pertaining to his prayer, as it was this which had called forth Gabriel on his mission at this time.

But Daniel had no difficulty in understanding what the angel told him about the ram, hegoat, and little horn, the kingdoms of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Nor was he mistaken in regard to the ending of the seventy years' captivity. But the burden of his petition was respecting the repairing of the desolations of the sanctuary, which lay in ruins; and he had undoubtedly drawn the conclusion that when the end of the seventy years' captivity came, the time would come for the

fulfillment of what the angel had said respecting the cleansing of the sanctuary at the end of the 2300 days. Now he must be set right. And this explains why at this particular time, so soon after the previous vision, instruction was sent to him. Now the seventy years of captivity were drawing to their close, and Daniel was applying to a wrong issue the instruction he had before received from the angel. He was falling into a misunderstanding, and was acting upon it; hence he must not be suffered longer to remain ignorant of the true import of the former vision. "I am come to show thee;" "understand the matter;" "consider the vision." Such were the words used by the very person Daniel had seen in the former vision, and to whom he had heard the command given, "Make this man to understand the vision," and who, he knew, had never carried out that instruction. But now he appears, and says, "I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding." How could Daniel's mind be more emphatically carried back to the vision of chapter 8, and how could the connection between that visit of the angel and this be more distinctly shown, than by such words at

such a time from such a person? The considerations already presented are sufficient to show conclusively the connection between chapters 8 and 9; but this will still further appear in subsequent verses.

One expression seems worthy of notice before we leave verse 23. It is the declaration of the angel to Daniel, "For thou art greatly beloved." The angel brought this declaration direct from the courts of heaven. It expressed the state of feeling that existed there in regard to Daniel. Think of celestial beings, the highest in the universe,--the Father, the Son, the holy angels,--having such regard and esteem for a mortal man here upon earth as to authorize an angel to bear the message to him that he is greatly beloved! This is one of the highest pinnacles of glory to which mortals can attain. Abraham reached another, when it could be said of him that he was the "friend of God;" and Enoch another, when it could be said of him that he "walked with God." Can we arrive at any such attainments? God is no respecter of person; but he is a respecter of character. If in virtue and

godliness we could equal these eminent men, we could move the divine love to equal depths. We, too, could be greatly beloved,--could be friends of God, and could walk with him. And we must be in our generation what they were in theirs. There is a figure used in reference to the last church which denotes the closest union with God: "If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Revelation 3:20. To sup with the Lord denotes an intimacy equal to being greatly beloved by him, walking with him, or being his friend. How desirable a position! Alas for the evils of our nature, which cut us off from this communion! Oh for grace to overcome these! that we may enjoy this spiritual union here, and finally enter the glories of his presence at the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Verse 24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal

up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

Such are the first words the angel utters to Daniel, toward imparting to him that instruction which he came to give. Why does he thus abruptly introduce a period of time? We must again refer to the vision of chapter 8. We have seen that Daniel, at the close of that chapter, says that he did not understand the vision. Some portions of that vision were at the time very clearly explained. It could not have been these portions which he did not understand. We therefore inquire what it was which Daniel did not understand, or, in other words, what part of the vision was there left unexplained. In that vision four prominent things are brought to view: (1) The Ram; (2) The He-goat; (3) The Little Horn; (4) The period of the 2300 days. The symbols of the ram, the he-goat, and the little horn were explained. Nothing, however, was said respecting the time. This must therefore have been the point which he did not understand; and as without this the other portions of the vision were of no avail, he could well say, while the application of

this period was left in obscurity, that he did not understand the vision.

If this view of the subject is correct, we should naturally expect, when the angel completed his explanation of the vision, that he would commence with the very point which had been omitted; namely, the time. And this we find to be true in fact. After citing Daniel's attention back to the former vision in the most direct and emphatic manner, and assuring him that he had now come forth to give him understanding in the matter, he commences upon the very point there omitted, and says, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city."

But how does this language show any connection with the 2300 days, or throw any light upon that period? We answer: The language cannot be intelligibly referred to anything else; for the word here rendered determined signifies "cut off;" and there is no period from which the seventy weeks could be cut off but the 2300 days of the previous vision. How direct and natural, then, is the

connection. Daniel's attention is fixed upon the 2300 days, which he did not understand, by the angel's directing him to the former vision; and he says, "Seventy weeks are cut off." Cut off from what?--The 2300 days, most assuredly.

Proof may be called for that the word rendered determined signifies to cut off. An abundance can be given. The Hebrew word thus translated is, *nehhtak*. This word Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, defines as follows: "Properly, to cut off; tropically, to divide; and so to determine, to decree." In the Chaldeo-Rabbinic Dictionary of Stockius, the word *nehhtak* is thus defined: "Scidit, abscidit, conscidit, inscidit, excidit--to cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off." Mercerus, in his Thesaurus, furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase, *hhatikah shel basar*, "a piece of flesh," or, "a cut of flesh." He translates the word, as it occurs in Daniel 9:24, by *praecisa est*, is cut off. In the literal version of Arias Montanus it is translated "*decisa est*," is cut off; in the marginal reading, which is grammatically correct, it is rendered by the plural,

“decisae sunt,” are cut off. In the Latin version of Junius and Tremellius, nehhtak (the passive of hhathak) is rendered “decisae sunt,” are cut off. Again, in Theodotion’s Greek version of Daniel (which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, as being the most faithful), it is rendered by s..eṭ...sa. (sunetmethesan), were cut off; and in the Venetian copy by t.ṭ..ta. (tetmentai), have been cut.” The idea of cutting off is preserved in the Vulgate, where the phrase is “abbreviatae sunt,” are shortened.

“Thus Chaldaic and Rabbinical authority, and that of the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the single signification of cutting off, to this verb.”

“Hengstenberg, who enters into a critical examination of the original text, says: ‘But the very use of the word, which does not elsewhere occur, while others much more frequently used, were at hand if Daniel had wished to express the idea of determination, and of which he has elsewhere, and even in this portion availed himself, seems to argue

that the word stands from regard to its original meaning, and represents the seventy weeks in contrast with a determination of time (en platei) as a period cut off from subsequent duration, and accurately limited.””[1]

Why, then, it may be asked, did our translators render the word determined, when it so obviously means cut off? The answer is, They doubtless overlooked the connection between the eighth and ninth chapters, and considering it improper to render it cut off, when nothing was given from which the seventy weeks could be cut off, they gave the word its tropical instead of its literal meaning. But, as we have seen, the construction, the context, and the connection require the literal meaning, and render any other inadmissible.

Seventy weeks, then, or 490 days of the 2300, were cut off upon, or allotted to, Jerusalem and the Jews; and the events which were to be consummated within that period are briefly stated. The transgression was to be finished; that is, the Jewish people were to fill up the cup of their

iniquity, which they did in the rejection and crucifixion of Christ. An end of sins, or of sinofferings, was to be made. This took place when the great offering was made on Calvary. Reconciliation for iniquity was to be provided. This was made by the sacrificial death of the Son of God. Everlasting righteousness was to be brought in; the righteousness which our Lord manifested in his sinless life. The vision and the prophecy were to be sealed up, or made sure. By the events given to transpire in the seventy weeks, the prophecy is tested. By this the application of the whole vision is determined. If the events of this period are accurately fulfilled, the prophecy is of God, and will all be accomplished; and if these seventy weeks are fulfilled as weeks of years, then the 2300 days, of which these are a part, are so many years. Thus the events of the seventy weeks furnish a key to the whole vision. And the “most holy” was to be anointed; the most holy of the heavenly sanctuary. In the examination of the sanctuary, on chapter 8:14, we saw that a time came when the earthly sanctuary gave place to the heavenly, and the priestly ministration was

transferred to that. Before the ministration in the sanctuary commenced, the sanctuary and all the holy vessels were to be anointed. Exodus 40:9, 10. The last event, therefore, of the seventy weeks, here brought to view, is the anointing of the heavenly tabernacle, or the opening of the ministration there. Thus this first division of the 2300 days brings us to the commencement of the service in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, as the whole period brings us to the commencement of the service in the second apartment, or most holy place, of that sanctuary.

The argument must now be considered conclusive that the ninth chapter of Daniel explains the eighth, and that the seventy weeks are a part of the 2300 days; and with a few extracts from the writings of others we will leave this point.

The Advent Shield in 1844 said:--

“We call attention to one fact which shows that there is a necessary ‘connection’ between the seventy weeks of the ninth chapter, and something

else which precedes or follows it, called 'the vision.' It is found in the 24th verse: 'Seventy weeks are determined [are cut off] upon thy people, ... to seal up the vision,' etc. Now there are hut two significations to the phrase 'seal up.' They are, first, 'to make secret,' and second, 'to make sure.' We care not now in which of these significations the phrase is supposed to be used. That is not the point now before us. Let the signification be what it may, it shows that the prediction of the seventy weeks necessarily relates to something else beyond itself, called 'the vision,' in reference to which it performs this work, 'to seal up.' To talk of its sealing up itself is as much of an absurdity as to suppose that Josephus was so much afraid of the Romans that he refrained from telling the world that he thought the fourth kingdom of Daniel was 'the kingdom of the Greeks.' It is no more proper to say that the ninth chapter of Daniel 'is complete in itself,' than it would be to say that a map which was designed to show the relation of Massachusetts to the United States, referred to nothing but Massachusetts. It is no more complete in itself than a bond given in security for a note, or some other

document to which it refers, is complete in itself; and we doubt if there is a schoolboy of fourteen years in the land, of ordinary capacity, who would not, on reading the ninth chapter, with an understanding of the clause before us, decide that it referred to something distinct from itself, called the vision. What vision it is, there is no difficulty in determining. It naturally and obviously refers to the vision which was not fully explained to Daniel, and to which Gabriel calls his attention in the preceding verse,—the vision of the 8th chapter. Daniel tells us that Gabriel was commanded to make him understand that vision (8:16). This was not fully done at that interview connected with the vision; he is therefore sent to give Daniel the needed ‘skill and understanding,’ — to explain its ‘meaning’ by communicating to him the prediction of the seventy weeks.”

“We claim that the ninth of Daniel is an appendix to the eighth, and that the seventy weeks and the 2300 days, or years, commence together. Our opponents deny this.”[2]

“The grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, is that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9:24 are the first 490 days of the 2300 of the eighth chapter.”[3]

“If the connection between the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 and the 2300 days of Daniel 8 does not exist, the whole system is shaken to its foundation; if it does exist, as we suppose, the system must stand.”[4]

Says the learned Dr. Hales, in commenting upon the seventy weeks, “This chronological prophecy was evidently designed to explain the foregoing vision, especially in its chronological part of the 2300 days.”[5]

Verse 25. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. 26. And after threescore and two weeks

shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. 27. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

The angel now gives to Daniel the event which is to mark the commencement of the seventy weeks. They were to date from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. And not only is the event given which was to determine the time of the commencement of this period, but those events also which were to transpire at its close. Thus a double test is provided by which to try the application of this prophecy. But more than this, the period of seventy weeks is divided into three grand divisions, and one of these

is again divided, and the intermediate events are given which were to mark the termination of each one of these divisions. If, now, we can find a date which will harmonize with all these events, we have, beyond a doubt, the true application; for none but that which is correct could meet and fulfill so many conditions. Let the reader take in at one view the points of harmony to be made, that he may be the better prepared to guard against a false application. First, we are to find, at the commencement of the period, a commandment going forth to restore and build Jerusalem. To this work of restoration seven weeks are allotted. As we reach the end of this first division, seven weeks from the commencement, we are to find, secondly, Jerusalem, in its material aspect, restored, the work of building the street and the wall fully accomplished. From this point sixty-two weeks are measured off; and as we reach the termination of this division, sixty-nine weeks from the beginning, we are to see, thirdly, the manifestation before the world of the Messiah the Prince. One week more is given us, completing the seventy. Fourthly, in the midst of this week the Messiah is to be cut off, and

to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease; and, fifthly, when the last week of that period which was allotted to the Jews as the time during which they were to be the special people of God expires, we naturally look for the going forth of the blessing and work of God to other people.

We now inquire for the initial date which will harmonize with all these particulars. The command respecting Jerusalem was to include more than mere building. There was to be restoration; and by this we must understand all the forms and regulations of civil, political, and judicial society. When did such a command go forth? At the time these words were spoken to Daniel, Jerusalem lay in complete and utter desolation, and had thus been lying for seventy years. The restoration, pointed to in the future, must be its restoration from this desolation. We then inquire, When and how was Jerusalem restored after the seventy years' captivity?

There are but four events which can be taken as answering to the commandment to restore and

build Jerusalem. These are, (1) The decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the house of God, B. C. 536 (Ezra 1:1-4); (2) The decree of Darius for the prosecution of that work, which had been hindered, B. C. 519 (Ezra 6:1-12); (3) The decree of Artaxerxes to Ezra, B. C. 457 (Ezra 7); and (4) The commission to Nehemiah from the same king in his twentieth year, B. C. 444. (Nehemiah 2)

Dating from the first two of these decrees, the seventy weeks, being weeks of years,[1] 490 years in all, would fall many years short of reaching even to the Christian era; besides, these decrees had reference principally to the restoration of the temple and the temple-worship of the Jews, and not to the restoration of their civil state and polity, all of which must be included in the expression, “To restore and to build Jerusalem.”

These made a commencement of the work. They were preliminary to what was afterward accomplished. But of themselves they were altogether insufficient, both in their dates and in their nature, to meet the requirements of the

prophecy; and thus failing in every respect, they cannot be brought into the controversy as marking the point from which the seventy weeks are to date. The only question now lies between the decrees which were granted to Ezra and to Nehemiah respectively.

The facts between which we are to decide here are briefly these: In 457 B. C., a decree was granted to Ezra by the Persian emperor Artaxerxes Longimanus to go up to Jerusalem with as many of his people as were minded to go with him. The commission granted him an unlimited amount of treasure, to beautify the house of God, to procure offerings for its service, and to do whatever else might seem good unto him. It empowered him to ordain laws, set magistrates and judges, and execute punishment even unto death; in other words, to restore the Jewish state, civil and ecclesiastical, according to the law of God and the ancient customs of that people. Inspiration has seen fit to preserve this decree; and a full and accurate copy of it is given in the seventh chapter of the book of Ezra. In the original, this decree is given,

not in Hebrew, like the rest of the book of Ezra, but in the Chaldaic (or Eastern Aramaic), the language then used at Babylon; and thus we are furnished with the original document by virtue of which Ezra was authorized to restore and build Jerusalem.

Thirteen years after this, in the twentieth year of the same king, B. C. 444, Nehemiah sought and obtained permission to go up to Jerusalem. Nehemiah 2. Permission was granted him, but we have no evidence that it was anything more than verbal. It pertained to him individually, nothing being said about others going up with him. The king asked him how long a journey he wished to make, and when he would return. He received letters to the governors beyond the river, to help him on his way to Judea, and an order to the keeper of the king's forest for timber for beams, etc. When he arrived at Jerusalem, he found rulers and priests, nobles and people, already engaged in the work of building Jerusalem. Nehemiah 2:16. These were, of course, acting under the decree given to Ezra thirteen years before. And finally, Nehemiah, having arrived at Jerusalem, finished the work he

came to accomplish, in fifty-two days. (Nehemiah 6:15)

Now which of these commissions, Ezra's or Nehemiah's, constitutes the decree for the restoration of Jerusalem, from which the seventy weeks are to be dated? It hardly seems that there can be any question on this point.

1. The grant to Nehemiah cannot be called a decree. It was necessary that a Persian decree should be put in writing, and signed by the king. Daniel 6:8. Such was the document given to Ezra; but Nehemiah had nothing of the kind, his commission being only verbal. If it be said that the letters given him constituted the decree, then the decree was issued, not to Nehemiah, but to the governors beyond the river; besides, these would constitute a series of decrees, and not one decree, as the prophecy contemplates.

2. The occasion of Nehemiah's petition to the king for permission to go up to Jerusalem was the report which certain ones, returning, had brought

from thence, that those in the province were in great affliction and reproach, also that the wall of Jerusalem was broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire. Nehemiah 1. Whose work were these walls and gates that were broken down and burned with fire?--Evidently the work of Ezra and his associates; for it cannot for a moment be supposed that the utter destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar, one hundred and forty-four years previous to that time, would have been reported to Nehemiah as a matter of news, nor that he would have considered it, as he evidently did, a fresh misfortune, calling for a fresh expression of grief. A decree, therefore, authorizing the building of these, had gone forth previous to the grant to Nehemiah; and the attempt that had been made to execute the work, had fallen into embarrassment, which Nehemiah wished to relieve.

3. If any should contend that Nehemiah's commission must be a decree, because the object of his request was that he might build the city, it is sufficient to reply, as shown above, that gates and walls had been built previous to his going up;

besides, the work of building which he went to perform was accomplished in fifty-two days; whereas, the prophecy allows for the building of the city, seven weeks, or forty-nine years.

4. There was nothing granted to Nehemiah which was not embraced in the decree to Ezra; while the latter had all the forms and conditions of a decree, and was vastly more ample in its provisions.

5. It is evident from the prayer of Ezra, as recorded in chapter 9:9 of his book, that he considered himself fully empowered to proceed with the building of the city and the wall; and it is evident that he understood, further, that the conditional prophecies concerning his people were then fulfilled, from the closing words of that prayer, in which he says, “Should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldst not thou be angry with us till thou hadst consumed us, so that there should be no remnant nor escaping?”

6. Reckoning from the commission to Nehemiah, B. C. 444, the dates throughout are entirely disarranged; for from that point the troublesome times which were to attend the building of the street and wall, did not last seven weeks, or forty-nine years. Reckoning from that date, the sixtynine weeks, or 483 years, which were to extend to the Messiah the Prince, bring us to A. D. 40; but Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan, and the voice of the Father was heard from heaven declaring him his Son, in A. D. 27, thirteen years before. According to this calculation, the midst of the last or seventieth week, which is marked by the crucifixion, is placed in A. D. 44, but the crucifixion took place in A. D. 31, thirteen years previous. And lastly, the seventy weeks, or 490 years, dating from the twentieth of Artaxerxes, extend to A. D. 47, with absolutely nothing to mark their termination. Hence if that be the year, and the grant to Nehemiah the event, from which to reckon, the prophecy has proved a failure. As it is, it only proves that theory a failure which dates the seventy weeks from Nehemiah's commission in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes.

7. Will these dates harmonize if we reckon from the decree to Ezra? Let us see. In this case, 457 B. C. is our starting-point. Forty-nine years were allotted to the building of the city and the wall. On this point, Prideaux (*Connexion*, Vol. I, p. 322) says: “In the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus ended the first seven weeks of Daniel’s prophecy. For then the restoration of the church and state of the Jews in Jerusalem and Judea was fully finished, in that last act of reformation which is recorded in the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah, from the twenty-third verse to the end of the chapter, just forty-nine years after it had been commenced by Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.” This was B. C. 408.

So far we find harmony. Let us apply the measuring-rod of the prophecy still further. Sixty-nine weeks, or 483 years, were to extend to Messiah the Prince. Dating from B. C. 457, they end in A. D. 27. And what event then occurred? Luke thus informs us: “Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being

baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.” Luke 3:21, 22; margin, A. D. 27. After this, Jesus came “preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled.” Mark 1:14, 15. The time here mentioned must have been some specific, definite, and predicted period; but no prophetic period can be found then terminating, except the sixty-nine weeks of the prophecy of Daniel, which were to extend to the Messiah the Prince. The Messiah had now come; and with his own lips he announced the termination of that period which was to be marked by his manifestation.[7]

Here, again, is indisputable harmony. But further, the Messiah was to confirm the covenant with many for one week. This would be the last week of the seventy, or the last seven years of the 490. In the midst of the week, the prophecy informs us, he should cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. These Jewish ordinances,

pointing to the death of Christ, could cease only at the cross; and there they did virtually come to an end, though the outward observance was kept up till the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. After threescore and two weeks, according to the record, the Messiah was to be cut off. It is the same as if it had read: And after threescore and two weeks, in the midst of the seventieth week, shall Messiah be cut off, and cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Now, as the word midst here means middle, according to an abundance of authority which we might produce if necessary, the crucifixion is definitely located in the middle of the seventieth week.

It now becomes an important point to determine in what year the crucifixion took place. The following evidence is sufficient to be considered absolutely decisive on this question.

It is not to be questioned that our Saviour attended every Passover that occurred during his public ministry; and we have mention of only four such occasions previous to his crucifixion. These

are found in the following passages: John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 13:1. At the last-mentioned Passover he was crucified. From facts already established, let us then see where this would locate the crucifixion. As he began his ministry in the autumn of A. D. 27, his first Passover would occur the following spring, A. D. 28; his second, A. D. 29; his third, A. D. 30; and his fourth and last, A. D. 31. This gives us three years and a half for his public ministry, and corresponds exactly to the prophecy that he should be cut off in the midst, or middle, of the seventieth week. As that week of years commenced in the autumn of A. D. 27, the middle of the week would occur three and one-half years later, in the spring of 31, where the crucifixion took place. Dr. Hales quotes Eusebius, A. D. 300, as saying: "It is recorded in history that the whole time of our Saviour's teaching and working miracles was three years and a half, which is the half of a week [of years]. This, John the evangelist will represent to those who critically attend to his Gospel."

Of the unnatural darkness which occurred at the crucifixion, Hales, Vol. I, pp. 69, 70, thus speaks:

“Hence it appears that the darkness which ‘overspread the whole land of Judea’ at the time of our Lord’s crucifixion was preternatural, ‘from the sixth until the ninth hour,’ or from noon till three in the afternoon, in its duration, and also in its time, about full moon, when the moon could not possibly eclipse the sun. The time it happened, and the fact itself, are recorded in a curious and valuable passage of a respectable Roman Consul, Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator, about A. D. 514: ‘In the consulate of Tiberius Caesar Aug. V and Aelius Sejanus (u. c. 784, A. D. 31), our Lord Jesus Christ suffered, on the 8th of the calends of April (25th of March), when there happened such an eclipse of the sun as was never before nor since.

“In this year, and in this day, agree also the Council of Cesarea, A. D. 196 or 198, the Alexandrian Chronicle, Maximus Monachus, Nicephorus Constantinus, Cedrenus; and in this year, but on different days, concur Eusebius and Epiphanius, followed by Kepler, Bucher, Patinus, and Petavius, some reckoning it the 10th of the calends of April, others the 13th.” (See on chapter

11:22.)

Here, then, are thirteen credible authorities locating the crucifixion of Christ in the spring of A. D. 31. We may therefore set this down as a fixed date, as the most cautious or the most skeptical could require nothing more conclusive. This being in the middle of the last week, we have simply to reckon backward three and a half years to find where sixty-nine of the weeks ended, and forward from that point three and a half years to find the termination of the whole seventy. Thus going back from the crucifixion, A. D. 31, spring, three and a half years, we find ourselves in the autumn of A. D. 27, where, as we have seen, the sixty-nine weeks ended, and Christ commenced his public ministry. And going from the crucifixion forward three and a half years, we are brought to the autumn of A. D. 34, as the grand terminating point of the whole period of the seventy weeks. This date is marked by the martyrdom of Stephen, the formal rejection of the gospel of Christ by the Jewish Sanhedrin in the persecution of his disciples, and the turning of the apostles to the Gentiles. Acts 9:1-

18. And these are just the events which one would expect to take place when that specified period which was cut off for the Jews, and allotted to them as a peculiar people, should fully expire.

A word respecting the date of the seventh of Artaxerxes, when the decree for restoring Jerusalem was given to Ezra, and the array of evidence on this point is complete. Was the seventh of Artaxerxes B. C. 457? For all those who can appreciate the force of facts, the following testimony will be sufficient here:--

“The Bible gives the data for a complete system of chronology, extending from the creation to the birth of Cyrus--a clearly ascertained date. From this period downward we have the undisputed canon of Ptolemy, and the undoubted era of Nabonassar, extending below our vulgar era. At the point where inspired chronology leaves us, this canon of undoubted accuracy commences. And thus the whole arch is spanned. It is by the canon of Ptolemy that the great prophetic period of seventy weeks is fixed. This canon places the

seventh year of Artaxerxes in the year B. C. 457; and the accuracy of this canon is demonstrated by the concurrent agreement of more than twenty eclipses. This date we cannot change from B. C. 457, without first demonstrating the inaccuracy of Ptolemy's canon. To do this it would be necessary to show that the large number of eclipses by which its accuracy has been repeatedly demonstrated have not been correctly computed; and such a result would unsettle every chronological date, and leave the settlement of epochs and the adjustment of eras entirely at the mercy of every dreamer, so that chronology would be of no more value than mere guesswork. As the seventy weeks must terminate in A. D. 34 unless the seventh of Artaxerxes is wrongly fixed, and as that cannot be changed without some evidence to that effect, we inquire, What evidence marked that termination? The time when the apostles turned to the Gentiles harmonizes with that date better than any other which has been named. And the crucifixion in A. D. 31, in the midst of the last week, is sustained by a mass of testimony which cannot be easily invalidated."--Advent Herald.

From the facts above set forth, we see that, reckoning the seventy weeks from the decree given to Ezra in the seventh of Artaxerxes, B. C. 457, there is the most perfect harmony throughout. The important and definite events of the manifestation of the Messiah at his baptism, the commencement of his public ministry, the crucifixion, and the turning away from the Jews to the Gentiles, with the proclamation of the new covenant, all come in in their exact place, and like a bright galaxy of blazing orbs of light, cluster round to set their seal to the prophecy, and make it sure.

It is thus evident that the decree to Ezra in the seventh of Artaxerxes, B. C. 457, is the point from which to date the seventy weeks. That was the going forth of the decree in the sense of the prophecy. The two previous decrees were preparatory and preliminary to this; and indeed they are regarded by Ezra as parts of it, the three being taken as one great whole. For in Ezra 6:14, we read: “And they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of

Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes, king of Persia.” It will be noticed that the decrees of these three kings are spoken of as one,--“the commandment” [margin, “decree,” singular number] of Cyrus and Darius and Artaxerxes,” showing that they are all reckoned as a unit, the different decrees being but the successive steps by which the work was accomplished. And this decree could not be said to have “gone forth,” as intended by the prophecy, till the last permission which the prophecy required was embodied in the decree, and clothed with the authority of the empire. This point was reached in the grant given to Ezra, but not before. Here the decree assumed the proportions, and covered the ground, demanded by the prophecy, and from this point its “going forth” must be dated.

With the seventy weeks we are now done; but there remain a longer period and other important events to be considered. The seventy weeks are but the first 490 years of the 2300. Take 490 from 2300, and there remain 1810. The 490, as we have seen, ended in the autumn of A. D. 34. If to this

date we now add the remaining 1810 years, we shall have the termination of the whole period. Thus, to A. D. 34, autumn, add 1810, and we have the autumn of A. D. 1844. Thus speedily and surely do we find the termination of the 2300 days, when once the seventy weeks have been located.

One other point should here be noticed. We have seen that the seventy weeks are the first 490 days of the 2300; that these days are prophetic, signifying literal years, according to the Bible rule, a day for a year (Numbers 14:34; Ezekiel 4:6), as is proved by the fulfillment of the seventy weeks, and as all reliable expositors agree; that they commenced in 457 B. C. and ended in A. D. 1844, provided the number is right, and twenty-three hundred is the correct reading. With this point established, there would seem to be no room for further controversy. On this point Dr. Hales remarks:--

“There is no number in the Bible whose genuineness is better ascertained than that of the 2300 days. It is found in all the printed Hebrew

editions, in all the MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi's collations, and in all the ancient versions, except the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, which reads 2400, followed by Symmachus; and some copies noticed by Jerome, 2200, both evidently literal errors in excess and defect, which compensate each other and confirm the mean, 2300." — Chronology, Vol. II, p. 512.

The query may here arise how the days can be extended to the autumn of 1844 if they commence 457 B. C., as it requires only 1843 years, in addition to the 457, to make the whole number of 2300. Attention to one fact will clear this point of all difficulty; and that is, that it takes 457 full years before Christ, and 1843 full years after, to make 2300; so that if the period commenced with the very first day of 457, it would not terminate till the very last day of 1843. Now it will be evident to all that if any portion of the year 457 had passed away before the 2300 days commenced, just so much of the year 1844 must pass away before they would end. We therefore inquire, At what point in the year 457 are we to commence to reckon? From the

fact that the first forty-nine years were allotted to the building of the street and wall, we learn that the period is to be dated, not from the starting of Ezra from Babylon, but from the actual commencement of the work at Jerusalem; which it is not probable could be earlier than the seventh month (autumn) of 457, as he did not arrive at Jerusalem till the fifth month of that year. Ezra 7:9. The whole period would therefore extend to the seventh month, autumn, Jewish time, of 1844.

Those who oppose this view of the prophetic periods, have been wont in years past to meet us with this objection: “The 2300 days have not ended, because the time has passed, and the Lord has not come. Why the time passed in 1844 without the consummation of our hopes, we acknowledge to be a mystery; but the passing of the time is proof that the 2300 days have not ended.”

Time, however, is no respecter of persons nor of theories; and with the formidable scythe which he is represented as carrying, he sometimes

demolishes in the most summary manner the grotesque and gossamer theories of men, however dear they may be to their authors and defenders. It is so here. Heedless of the wild contortions of those who would fain compel him to stop and fulfill their darling predictions, he has kept on the swift but even tenor of his way until-- what? every limit is passed to which the 2300 days can be extended; and thus he has demonstrated that those days have passed. Let not this point be overlooked. Setting aside for a moment the arguments by which they are shown to have ended in 1844, and letting them date from any point where the least shadow of reason can be imagined for placing them, or from which the wildest dreamer could date them, it is still true that the utmost limit to which they could extend has gone by. They cannot possibly be dated at any point which would bring their termination so late as the present time. We therefore say again, with not a misgiving as to the truth of the assertion, nor a fear of its successful contradiction, Those days have ended!

The momentous declaration made by the angel

to Daniel, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,” is now explained. In our search for the meaning of the sanctuary and its cleansing, and the application of the time, we have found not only that this subject can be easily understood; but lo! the event is even now in process of accomplishment, and is almost finished. And here we pause a brief moment to reflect upon the solemn position into which we are brought.

We have seen that the sanctuary of this dispensation is the tabernacle of God in heaven, the house not made with hands, where our Lord ministers in behalf of penitent sinners, the place where between the great God and his Son Jesus Christ the “counsel of peace” prevails in the work of salvation for perishing men. Zechariah 6:13; Psalms 85:10. We have seen that the cleansing of the sanctuary consists in the removing of the sins from the same, and is the closing act of the ministration performed therein; that the work of salvation now centers in the heavenly sanctuary; and when the sanctuary is cleansed, the work is

done, and the plan is finished. Then the great scheme devised at the fall for the salvation of as many of the lost race as would avail themselves of its provisions, and carried forward for six thousand years, is brought to its final termination. Mercy no longer pleads, and the great voice is heard from the throne in the temple in heaven, saying, "It is done." Revelation 16:17. And what then?--All the righteous are safe for everlasting life; all the wicked are doomed to everlasting death. No decision can be changed, no reward can be lost, and no destiny of despair can be averted, beyond that point.

And we have seen (and this is what brings the solemnities of the Judgment to our own door) that that long prophetic period which was to mark the commencement of this final work in the heavenly sanctuary, has met its termination in our own generation. In 1844 the days ended. And since that time the final work for man's salvation has been going forward. This work involves an examination of every man's character; for it consists in the remission of the sins of those who shall be found

worthy to have them remitted, and determines who among the dead shall be raised, and who among the living shall be changed, at the coming of the Lord, and who, of both dead and living, shall be left to have their part in the fearful scenes of the second death. And all can see that such a decision as this must be rendered before the Lord appears. Every man's destiny is to be determined by the deeds done in the body, and each one is to be rewarded according to his works. 2 Corinthians 5:10; Revelation 22:12. In the books of remembrance kept by the heavenly scribes above, every man's deeds will be found recorded (Revelation 20:12); and in the closing sanctuary work these records are examined, and decision is rendered in accordance therewith. Daniel 7:9, 10. It would be most natural to suppose that the work would commence with the first members of the human race; that their cases would be first examined, and decision rendered, and so on with all the dead, generation by generation, in chronological succession along the stream of time, till we reach the last generation,--the generation of the living with whose cases the work would close. How long it will take to

examine the cases of all the dead, how soon the work will reach the cases of the living, no man can know. And as above remarked, since the year 1844, this solemn work has been going forward. The light of the types, and the very nature of the case, forbid that it should be of long continuance. John, in his sublime views of heavenly scenes, saw millions of attendants and assistants engaged with our Lord in his priestly work. Revelation 5. And so the ministration goes forward. It ceases not, it delays not, and it must soon be forever finished.

And here we stand--the last, the greatest, and the most solemn crisis in the history of our race immediately impending; the great plan of salvation about finished; the last precious years of probation almost ended; the Lord about to come to save those who are ready and waiting, and to cut asunder the careless and unbelieving; and the world--alas! what shall we say of them! — deceived with error, crazed with cares and business, delirious with pleasure, and paralyzed with vice, they have not a moment to spare in listening to solemn truth, nor a thought to bestow upon their eternal interests. Let

the people of God, with eternity right in view, be careful to escape the corruption that is in the world through lust, and prepare to pass the searching test, when their cases shall come up for examination at the great tribunal above.

To the careful attention of every student of prophecy we commend the subject of the sanctuary. In the sanctuary is seen the ark of God's testament, containing his holy law; and this suggests a reform in our obedience to that great standard of morality. The opening of this heavenly temple, or the commencement of the service in its second apartment, marks the commencement of the sounding of the seventh angel. Revelation 11:15, 19. The work performed therein is the foundation of the third message of Revelation 14,--the last message of mercy to a perishing world. This subject explains the great disappointment of the Adventists in 1844, by showing that they mistook the event to occur at the end of the 2300 days. It renders harmonious and clear past prophetic fulfilments, which are otherwise involved in impenetrable obscurity. It gives a definite idea of

the position and work of our great High Priest, and brings out the plan of salvation in its distinctive and beautiful features. It reins us up, as no other subject does, to the realities of the Judgment, and shows the preparation we need to be able to stand in the coming day. It shows us that we are in the waiting time, and puts us upon our watch; for we know not how soon the work will be finished, and our Lord appear. Watch, lest coming suddenly, he find you sleeping.

After stating the great events connected with our Lord's mission here upon the earth, the prophet in the last part of verse 27 speaks of the soon-following destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman power; and finally of the destruction of that power itself, called in the margin "the desolator." [8]

Notes:

1. Christology of the Old Testament, Vol. II, p. 301. Washington, 1839.
2. Signs of the Times, 1843.

3. Advent Shield, p. 49.

4. Harmony of the Prophetic Chronology, p. 33.

5. Chronology, Vol. II, p. 517.

6. The explanation of these prophetic periods is based on what is called the “year-day principle;” that is, making each day stand for a year, according to the Scriptural rule for the application of symbolic time. Ezekiel 4:6; Numbers 14:34. That the time in these visions of Daniel 8 and 9 is symbolic is evident from the nature and scope of the prophecy. The question calling out the answers on this point was, “How long the vision?” The vision, reckoning from 538 B. C. to our own time, sweeps over a period more than 2400 years in length. But if the 2300 days of the vision are literal days, we have a period of only a little over six years and a half for the duration of the kingdoms and the transaction of the great

events brought to view, which is absurd! The year-day principle numbers among its supporters such names as Augustine, Tichonius, Primasius, Andreas, the venerable Bede, Ambrosius, Ansbertus, Berengaud, and Bruno Astensis, besides the leading modern expositors. (See Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticae*, Vol. III, p. 241; and *The Sanctuary and its Cleansing*, pp. 45-52.) But what is more conclusive than all else is the fact that the prophecies have actually been fulfilled on this principle,--a demonstration of its correctness from which there is no appeal. This will be found in the prophecy of the seventy weeks throughout, and all the prophetic periods of Daniel 7 and 12, and Revelation 9, 12, and 13.

7. Luke declares that Jesus "began to be about thirty years of age" at the time of his baptism (Luke 3:23); and almost immediately after this he entered upon his ministry. How, then, could his ministry commence in A. D. 27, and he still be of the age named by Luke? The answer to this question is found in the fact that Christ

was born between three and four years before the beginning of the Christian era, that is, before the year marked A. D. 1. The mistake of dating the Christian era something over three years this side of the birth of Christ, instead of dating it from the year of his birth, as it was designed to be, arose on this wise: One of the most important of ancient eras was reckoned from the building of the city of Rome--ab urbe condita, expressed by the abbreviation A. U. C., or more briefly, U. C. In the year which is now numbered A. D. 532, Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian by birth, and a Roman abbot, who flourished in the reign of Justinian, invented the Christian era. According to the best evidence at his command, he placed the birth of Christ U. C. 753. But Christ was born before the death of Herod; and it was afterward ascertained on the clearest evidence that the death of Herod occurred in April, U. C. 750. Allowing a few months for the events recorded in Christ's life before the time of Herod's death, his birth is carried back to the latter part of U. C. 749, a

little over three years before A. D. 1. Christ was therefore thirty years of age in A. D. 27. “The vulgar [common] era began to prevail in the West about the time of Charles Martel and Pope Gregory II, A. D. 730; but was not sanctioned by any public Acts or Rescripts till the first German Synod, in the time of Carolomannus, Duke of the Franks, which, in the preface, was said to be assembled ‘Anno ab incarnatione Dom. 742, 11 Calendas Maii.’ But it was not established till the time of Pope Eugenius IV, A. D. 1431, who ordered this era to be used in the public Registers: according to Mariana and others.”— Hales’ Chronology, Vol. I, pp. 83, 84. (See also Life of Our Lord, by S. J. Andrews.) The Christian era had become so well established before the mistake above referred to was discovered, that no change in the reckoning has been attempted. It makes no material difference, as it does not interfere at all with the calculation of dates. If the era commenced with the actual year of Christ’s birth, the number of years B. C. in any case would be four years less, and the years A.

D. four years more. To illustrate: If we have a period of twenty years, one half before and the other half since the Christian era, we say that it commenced B. C. 10 and ended A. D. 10. But if we place the era back to the real point of Christ's birth, there would be no change of either terminus of the period, but we should then say that it commenced B. C. 6 and ended A. D. 14; that is, four years would be taken from the figures B. C. and added to those of A. D. Some have so far misapprehended this subject as to claim that the current year should have four years added to it, to denote the real year of the Christian era. This would be true, if the reckoning began from the actual date of Christ's birth. But this is not the case; the starting-point is between three and four years later.

8. That the expression "to anoint the most holy" refers, according to remarks on verse 24 of this chapter, to the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary previous to the beginning of Christ's ministry therein, and not to any anointing of

the Messiah himself, seems to be susceptible of the clearest proof. The words translated “most holy” are (kodesh kodashim), the “holy of holies,” an expression which, according to Gesenius, applies to the most holy place in the sanctuary, and which in no instance is applied to a person, unless this passage be an exception.

The Advent Shield, No. 1, p. 75, says: “And the last event of the seventy weeks, as enumerated in verse 24, was the anointing of the ‘most holy,’ or ‘the holy of holies,’ or the ‘sanctum sanctorum;’ not that which was on earth, made with hands, but the true tabernacle, into which Christ, our High Priest, is for us entered. Christ was to do in the true tabernacle in heaven what Moses and Aaron did in its pattern. (See Hebrews, chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9; Exodus 30:22-30; Leviticus 8:10-15.)”

Dr. Barnes, in his notes on this passage, and particularly on the words “most holy,” says:

“The phrase properly means ‘holy of holies,’ or most holy; it is applied often in the Scriptures to the inner sanctuary, or the portion of the tabernacle and temple containing the ark of the covenant, the two tables of stone, etc.” “It is not necessarily limited to the inner sanctuary of the temple, but may be applied to the whole house.” “Others have supposed that this refers to the Messiah himself, and that the meaning is that he who was most holy would then be consecrated, or anointed, as the Messiah. It is probable, as Hengstenberg (Christology, II, 321, 322) has shown, that the Greek translators thus understood it, but it is a sufficient objection to this that the phrase, though occurring many times in the Scriptures, is never applied to persons, unless this be an instance.” “It seems to me, therefore, that the obvious and fair interpretation is, to refer it to the temple.”

An understanding of the subject of the heavenly sanctuary would have relieved this scripture of the perplexity in which, in the

minds of some expositors, it seems to be involved.

Chapter 10

Daniel's Last Vision

Verse 1. In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and the thing was true, but the time appointed was long: and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision.

This verse introduces us to the last of the recorded visions of the prophet Daniel, the instruction imparted to him at this time being continued through chapters 11 and 12, to the close of the book. The third year of Cyrus was B. C. 534. Six years had consequently elapsed since Daniel's vision of the four beasts' in the first year of Belshazzar, B. C. 540; four years since the vision of the ram, hegoat, little horn, and 2300 days of chapter 8, in the third year of Belshazzar, B. C. 538; and four years since the instruction given to Daniel respecting the seventy weeks, in the first year of Darius, B. C. 538, as recorded in chapter 9.

On the overthrow of the kingdom of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, B. C. 538, Darius, through the courtesy of his nephew, Cyrus, was permitted to occupy the throne. This he did till the time of his death, about two years after. About this time, Cambyses, king of Persia, the father of Cyrus, having also died, Cyrus became sole monarch of the second universal empire of prophecy, B. C. 536. This being reckoned as his first year, his third year, in which this vision was given to Daniel, would be dated B. C. 534. The death of Daniel is supposed to have occurred soon after this, he being at this time, according to Prideaux, not less than ninety-one years of age.

Verse 2. In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. 3. I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled.

The marginal reading for “three full weeks” is “weeks of days;” which term Dr. Stonard thinks is here used to distinguish the time spoken of from

the weeks of years, brought to view in the preceding chapter.

For what purpose did this aged servant of God thus humble himself and afflict his soul? — Evidently for the purpose of understanding more fully the divine purpose concerning events that were to befall the church of God in coming time; for the divine messenger sent to instruct him says, “From the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand,” etc. Verse 12. There was then still something which Daniel did not understand, but in reference to which he earnestly desired light. What was it?—It was undoubtedly some part of his last preceding vision; namely, the vision of chapter 9, and through that of the vision of chapter 8, of which chapter 9 was but a further explanation. And as the result of his supplication, he now receives more minute information respecting the events included in the great outlines of his former visions.

This mourning of the prophet is supposed to have been accompanied with fasting; not an absolute abstinence from food, but a use of only

the plainest and most simple articles of diet. He ate no pleasant bread, no delicacies nor dainties; he used no flesh nor wine; and he did not anoint his head, which was with the Jews an outward sign of fasting. How long he would have continued this fast had he not received the answer to his prayer, we know not; but his course in continuing it for three full weeks shows that, being assured his request was lawful, he was not a person to cease his supplication till his petition was granted.

Verse 4. And in the four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the side of the great river, which is Hiddekel; 5. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz: 6. His body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in color to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude. 7. And I Daniel alone saw the vision: for the men that were with me saw not the vision; but a great quaking fell upon them, so

that they fled to hide themselves. 8. Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength 9. Yet heard I the voice of his words: and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground.

By the River Hiddekel the Syriac understands the Euphrates; the Vulgate, Greek, and Arabic, the Tigris; hence Wintle concludes that the prophet had this vision at the place where these rivers unite, as they do not far from the Persian Gulf.

A most majestic personage visited Daniel on this occasion. The description of him is almost parallel to that given of Christ in the Revelation 1:14-16; and the effect of his presence was about such as was experienced by Paul and his companions when the Lord met them on their way to Damascus. Acts 9:1-7. But this was not the Lord; for the Lord is introduced as Michael in verse 13. It must therefore have been an angel, but

one of no ordinary character. The inquiry then arises, Of what angel can such a description be truthfully given? There are some points of identity between this and other passages which plainly show that this was the angel Gabriel. In chapter 8:16 Gabriel is introduced by name. His interview with Daniel at that time produced exactly the same effect upon the prophet as that described in the passage before us. At that time Gabriel was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision, and he himself promised to make him know what should be in the last end of the indignation. Having given Daniel all the instruction he was able to bear on that occasion, he subsequently resumed his work, and explained another great point in the vision, as recorded in chapter 9:20-27. Yet we learn from chapter 10 that there were some points still unexplained to the prophet; and he set his heart again, with fasting and supplication, to understand the matter.

A personage now appears whose presence has the same effect upon Daniel as that produced by the presence of Gabriel at the first; and he tells

Daniel (verse 14), “Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days,” the very information Gabriel had promised to give, as recorded in chapter 8:19. But one conclusion can be drawn from these facts Daniel was seeking further light on the very vision which Gabriel had been commanded to make him understand. Once, already, he had made a special visit to Daniel to give him additional information when he sought it with prayer and fasting. Now, when he is prepared for further instruction, and again seeks it in the same manner in reference to the same subject, can it for a moment be supposed that Gabriel disregarded his instruction, lost sight of his mission, and suffered another angel to undertake the completion of his unfinished work? And the language of verse 14 clearly identifies the speaker with the one, who, in the vision of chapter 8, promised to do that work.

Verse 10. And, behold, an hand touched me, which set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands. 11. And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the

words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling. 12. Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words.

Daniel having fallen into a swoon at the majestic appearance of Gabriel (for so the expression “deep sleep” of verse 9 is generally understood), the angel approaches, and lays his hand upon him to give him assurance and confidence to stand in his presence. He tells Daniel that he is a man greatly beloved. Wonderful declaration! a member of the human family, one of the same race with us, loved, not merely in the general sense in which God loved the whole world when he gave his Son to die for them, but loved as an individual, and that greatly! Well might the prophet receive confidence from such a declaration as that, to stand even in the presence of Gabriel. He tells him, moreover, that he is come for the purpose

of an interview with him, and he wishes him to bring his mind into a proper state to understand his words. Being thus addressed, the holy and beloved prophet, assured, but yet trembling, stood before the heavenly angel.

“Fear not, Daniel,” continues Gabriel. He had no occasion to fear before one, even though a divine being, who had been sent to him because he was greatly beloved, and in answer to his earnest prayer. Nor ought the people of God of any age to entertain a servile fear of any of those agents who are sent forth to minister to their salvation. There is, however, a disposition manifested among far too many to allow their minds to conceive of Jesus and his angels as only stern ministers of justice, inflictors of vengeance and retribution, rather than as beings who are earnestly working for our salvation on account of the pity and love with which they regard us. The presence of an angel, should he appear bodily before them, would strike them with terror; and the thought that Christ is soon to appear, and they are to be taken into his presence, distresses and alarms them. We

recommend to such more amiable views of the relation which the Christian sustains to Christ, the head of the church, and a little more of that perfect love which casts out all fear.

On verse 12 Bagster has the following pointed note: “Daniel, as Bishop Newton observes, was now very far advanced in years; for the third year of Cyrus was the seventy-third of his captivity; and being a youth when carried captive, he cannot be supposed to have been less than ninety. Old as he was, ‘he set his heart to understand’ the former revelations which had been made to him, and particularly the vision of the ram and he-goat, as may be collected from the sequel; and for this purpose he prayed and fasted three weeks. His fasting and prayers had the desired effect, for an angel was sent to unfold to him those mysteries; and whoever would excel in divine knowledge must imitate Daniel, and habituate himself to study, temperance, and devotion.”

Verse 13. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but,

lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia.

How often the prayers of God's people are heard, while as yet there is no apparent answer. It was even so in this case with Daniel. The angel tells him that from the first day he set his heart to understand, his words were heard. Yet Daniel continued to afflict his soul with fasting, and to wrestle with God for three full weeks, all unaware that any respect was yet paid to his petition. But why was the delay?--The king of Persia withstood the angel. The answer to Daniel's prayer involved some action on the part of that king. This action he must be influenced to perform. It doubtless pertained to the work which he was to do, and had already begun to do, in behalf of the temple at Jerusalem and the Jews, his decree for the building of that temple being the first of the series which finally constituted that notable commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, at the going forth of which the great prophetic period of 2300 days was to begin. And the angel is despatched to influence

him to go forward in accordance with the divine will.

Ah, how little do we realize what is going on in the unseen world in relation to human affairs! Here, as it were, the curtain is for a moment lifted, and we catch a glimpse of the movements within. Daniel prays. The Creator of the universe hears, The command is issued to Gabriel to go to his relief. But the king of Persia must act before Daniel's prayer is answered; and the angel hastens to the Persian king. Satan no doubt musters his forces to oppose. They meet in the royal palace of Persia. All the motives of selfish interest and worldly policy which Satan can play upon, he doubtless uses to the best advantage to influence the king against compliance with God's will, while Gabriel brings to bear his influence in the other direction. The king struggles between conflicting emotions. He hesitates; he delays. Day after day passes away; yet Daniel prays on. The king still refuses to yield to the influence of the angel; three weeks expire, and lo! a mightier than Gabriel takes his place in the palace of the king, and Gabriel

appears to Daniel to acquaint him with the progress of events. From the first, said he, your prayer was heard; but during these three weeks which you have devoted to prayer and fasting, the king of Persia has resisted my influence and prevented my coming.

Such was the effect of prayer. And God has erected no barriers between himself and his people since Daniel's time. It is still their privilege to offer up prayer as fervent and effectual as his, and, like Jacob, to have power with God, and to prevail.

Who was Michael, who here came to Gabriel's assistance? The term signifies, "He who is like God;" and the Scriptures clearly show that Christ is the one who bears this name. Jude (verse 9) declares that Michael is the archangel. Archangel signifies "head or chief angel;" and Gabriel, in our text, calls him one, or, as the margin reads, the first, of the chief princes. There can be but one archangel; and hence it is manifestly improper to use the word, as some do, in the plural. The Scriptures never so use it. Paul, in 1 Thessalonians

4:16, states that when the Lord appears the second time to raise the dead, the voice of the archangel is heard. Whose voice is heard when the dead are raised?--The voice of the Son of God. (John 5:28) Putting these scriptures together, they prove, (1) that the dead are called from their graves by the voice of the Son of God; (2) that the voice which is then heard is the voice of the archangel, proving that the archangel is the Son of God; and (3) that the archangel is called Michael; from which it follows that Michael is the Son of God. In the last verse of Daniel 10, he is called "your prince," and in the first of chapter 12, "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people," expressions which can appropriately be applied to Christ, but to no other being.

Verse 14. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days.

The expression "yet the vision is for many days," reaching far into the future, and embracing what should befall the people of God even in the

latter days, shows conclusively that the days given in that vision, namely the 2300, cannot mean literal days, but must be days of years. (See on chapter 9, verses 25-27)

Verse 15. And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb. 16. And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my Lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength. 17. For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remaineth no strength in me, neither is there any breath left in me.

One of the most marked characteristics manifested by Daniel was the tender solicitude he felt for his people. Having come now clearly to comprehend that the vision portended long ages of oppression and suffering for the church, he was so affected by the view that his strength departed from

him, his breath ceased, and the power of speech was gone. The vision of verse 16 doubtless refers to the former vision of chapter 8.

Verse 18. Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me, 19. And said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong. And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak; for thou hast strengthened me. 20. Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. 21. But I will show thee that which is noted in the Scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.

The prophet is at length strengthened to hear in full the communication which the angel has to make. And Gabriel says, “Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee?” That is, do you now know to what end I have come? Do you understand my

purpose so that you will no more fear? He then announced his intention to return, as soon as his communication was complete, to fight with the king of Persia. The word with is, in the Septuagint, meta, and signifies, not against; but in common with, along-side of; that is, the angel of God would stand on the side of the Persian kingdom so long as it was in the providence of God that that kingdom should continue. “But when I am gone forth,” continues Gabriel, “lo, the prince of Grecia shall come.” That is, when he withdraws his support from that kingdom, and the providence of God operates in behalf of another kingdom, the prince of Grecia shall come, and the Persian monarchy be overthrown.

Gabriel then announced that none--God of course excepted--had an understanding with him in the matters he was about to communicate except Michael the prince. And after he had made them known to Daniel, then there were four beings in the universe with whom rested a knowledge of these important truths,--Daniel, Gabriel, Christ, and God. Four links in this ascending chain of witnesses,--

the first, Daniel, a member of the human family;
the last, Jehovah, the God of all!

Chapter 11

A Literal Prophecy

Verse 1. Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him. 2. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all; and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia.

We now enter upon a prophecy of future events, clothed not in figures and symbols, as in the visions of chapters 2, 7, and 8, but given mostly in plain language. Many of the signal events of the world's history, from the days of Daniel to the end of the world, are here brought to view. This prophecy, says Bishop Newton, may not improperly be said to be a comment and explanation of the vision of chapter 8; a statement showing how clearly he perceived the connection between that vision and the remainder of the book.

The angel, after stating that he stood, in the first year of Darius, to confirm and strengthen him, turns his attention to the future. Three kings shall yet stand up in Persia. To stand up means to reign; three kings were to reign in Persia, referring, doubtless, to the immediate successors of Cyrus. These were, (1) Cambyses, son of Cyrus; (2) Smerdis, an impostor; (3) Darius Hystaspes.

The fourth shall be far richer than they all. The fourth king from Cyrus was Xerxes, more famous for his riches than his generalship, and conspicuous in history for the magnificent campaign he organized against Grecia, and his utter failure in that enterprise. He was to stir up all against the realm of Grecia. Never before had there been such a levy of men for warlike purposes; never has there been since. His army, according to Herodotus, who lived in that age, consisted of five million two hundred and eighty-three thousand two hundred and twenty men (5,283,220). And not content with stirring up the East alone, he enlisted the Carthaginians of the West in his service, who took

the field with an additional army of three hundred thousand men, raising his entire force to the almost fabulous number of over five million and a half. As Xerxes looked over that vast concourse, he is said to have wept at the thought that in a hundred years from that time not one of all those men would be left alive.

Verse 3. And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. 4. And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those.

The facts stated in these verses plainly point to Alexander, and the division of his empire. (See on chapter 8:8) Xerxes was the last Persian king who invaded Grecia; and the prophecy therefore passes over the nine successors of Xerxes in the Persian empire, and next introduces Alexander the Great. Having overthrown the Persian empire, Alexander

“became absolute monarch of that empire, to the fullest extent it was ever possessed by any of the Persian kings.”[1] His dominion was great, including “the greater portion of the then known habitable world;” and he did according to his will. His will led him, B. C. 323, into a drunken debauch, as the result of which he died as the fool dieth; and his vainglorious and ambitious projects went into sudden, total, and everlasting eclipse. The kingdom was divided, but not for his posterity; it was plucked up for others besides those. Within fifteen years after his death, all his posterity had fallen victims to the jealousy and ambition of his leading generals. Not one of the race of Alexander was left to breathe upon the earth. So short is the transit from the highest pinnacle of earthly glory to the lowest depths of oblivion and death. The kingdom was rent into four divisions, and taken possession of by Alexander’s four ablest, or perhaps most ambitious and unprincipled generals,-Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy.

Verse 5. And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes; and he shall be

strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion.

The king of the north and the king of the south are many times referred to in the remaining portion of this chapter. It therefore becomes essential to an understanding of the prophecy clearly to identify these powers. When Alexander's empire was divided, the different portions lay toward the four winds of heaven, west, north, east, and south; these divisions of course to be reckoned from the standpoint of Palestine, the native land of the prophet. That division of the empire lying west of Palestine would thus constitute the kingdom of the west; that lying north, the kingdom of the north; that lying east, the kingdom of the east; and that lying south, the kingdom of the south. The divisions of Alexander's kingdom with respect to Palestine were situated as follows: Cassander had Greece and the adjacent countries, which lay to the west; Lysimachus had Thrace, which then included Asia Minor, and the countries lying on the Hellespont and Bosphorus, which lay to the north of Palestine; Seleucus had Syria and Babylon, which

lay principally to the east; and Ptolemy had Egypt and the neighboring countries, which lay to the south.

During the wars and revolutions which for long ages succeeded, these geographical boundaries were frequently changed or obliterated; old ones were wiped out, and new ones instituted. But whatever changes might occur, these first divisions of the empire must determine the names which these portions of territory should ever afterward bear, or we have no standard by which to test the application of the prophecy; that is, whatever power at any time should occupy the territory which at first constituted the kingdom of the north, that power, so long as it occupied that territory, would be the king of the north; and whatever power should occupy that which at first constituted the kingdom of the south, that power would so long be the king of the south. We speak of only these two, because they are the only ones afterward spoken of in the prophecy, and because, in fact, almost the whole of Alexander's empire finally resolved itself into these two divisions.

Cassander was very soon conquered by Lysimachus, and his kingdom, Greece and Macedon, annexed to Thrace. And Lysimachus was in turn conquered by Seleucus, and Macedon and Thrace annexed to Syria.

These facts prepare the way for an application of the text before us. The king of the south, Egypt, shall be strong. Ptolemy annexed Cyprus, Phoenicia, Caria, Cyrene, and many islands and cities to Egypt. Thus was his kingdom made strong. But another of Alexander's princes is introduced in the expression, "one of his princes." The Septuagint translates the verse thus: "And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his [Alexander's] princes shall be strong above him." This must refer to Seleucus, who, as already stated, having annexed Macedon and Thrace to Syria, thus became possessor of three parts out of four of Alexander's dominion, and established a more powerful kingdom than that of Egypt.

Verse 6. And in the end of years they shall

join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement; but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times.

There were frequent wars between the kings of Egypt and Syria. Especially was this the case with Ptolemy Philadelphus, the second king of Egypt, and Antiochus Theos, third king of Syria. They at length agreed to make peace upon condition that Antiochus Theos should put away his former wife, Laodice, and her two sons, and should marry Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Ptolemy accordingly brought his daughter to Antiochus, bestowing with her an immense dowry.

“But she shall not retain the power of the arm;” that is, her interest and power with Antiochus. And so it proved; for some time shortly after, in a fit of love, Antiochus brought back his former wife, Laodice, and her children, to court again. Then

says the prophecy, “Neither shall he [Antiochus] stand, nor his arm,” or seed. Laodice, being restored to favor and power, feared lest, in the fickleness of his temper, Antiochus should again disgrace her, and recall Berenice; and conceiving that nothing short of his death would be an effectual safeguard against such a contingency, she caused him to be poisoned shortly after. Neither did his seed by Berenice succeed him in the kingdom; for Laodice so managed affairs as to secure the throne for her eldest son, Seleucus Callinicus.

“But she [Berenice] shall be given up.” Laodice, not content with poisoning her husband, Antiochus, caused Berenice to be murdered. “And they that brought her.” Her Egyptian women and attendants, in endeavoring to defend her, were many of them slain with her. “And he that begat her,” margin, “whom she brought forth;” that is, her son, who was murdered at the same time by order of Laodice. “And he that strengthened her in these times;” her husband, Antiochus, as Jerome supposes, or those who took her part and defended

her.

But such wickedness could not long remain unpunished, as the prophecy further predicts, and further history proves.

Verse 7. But out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail: 8. And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and of gold; and he shall continue more years than the king of the north. 9. So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land.

This branch out of the same root with Berenice was her brother, Ptolemy Euergetes. He had no sooner succeeded his father, Ptolemy Philadelphia, in the kingdom of Egypt, than, burning to avenge the death of his sister, Berenice, he raised an immense army, and invaded the territory of the

king of the north, that is, of Seleucus Callinicus, who, with his mother, Laodice, reigned in Syria. And he prevailed against them, even to the conquering of Syria, Cilicia, the upper parts beyond the Euphrates, and almost all Asia. But hearing that a sedition was raised in Egypt, requiring his return home, he plundered the kingdom of Seleucus, took forty thousand talents of silver and precious vessels, and two thousand five hundred images of the gods. Among these were the images which Cambyses had formerly taken from Egypt and carried into Persia. The Egyptians, being wholly given to idolatry, bestowed upon Ptolemy the title of Euergetes, or the Benefactor, as a compliment for his having thus, after many years, restored their captive gods.

This, according to Bishop Newton, is Jerome's account, extracted from ancient historians; but there are authors still extant, he says, who confirm several of the same particulars. Appian informs us that Laodice, having killed Antiochus, and after him both Berenice and her child, Ptolemy, the son of Philadelphus, to revenge those murders, invaded

Syria, slew Laodice, and proceeded as far as Babylon. From Polybius we learn that Ptolemy, surnamed Euergetes, being greatly incensed at the cruel treatment of his sister, Berenice, marched with an army into Syria, and took the city of Seleucia, which was kept for some years afterward by the garrisons of the kings of Egypt. Thus did he enter into the fortress of the king of the north. Polyænus affirms that Ptolemy made himself master of all the country from Mount Taurus as far as to India, without war or battle; but he ascribes it by mistake to the father instead of the son. Justin asserts that if Ptolemy had not been recalled into Egypt by a domestic sedition, he would have possessed the whole kingdom of Seleucus. The king of the south thus came into the dominion of the king of the north, and returned to his own land, as the prophet had foretold. And he also continued more years than the king of the north; for Seleucus Callinicus died in exile, of a fall from his horse; and Ptolemy Euergetes survived him for four or five years.

Verse 10. But his sons shall be stirred up,

and shall assemble a multitude of great forces: and one shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through: then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress.

The first part of this verse speaks of sons, in the plural; the last part, of one, in the singular. The sons of Seleucus Callinicus were Seleucus Ceraunus and Antiochus Magnus. These both entered with zeal upon the work of vindicating and avenging the cause of their father and their country. The elder of these, Seleucus, first took the throne. He assembled a great multitude to recover his father's dominions; but being a weak and pusillanimous prince, both in body and estate, destitute of money, and unable to keep his army in obedience, he was poisoned by two of his generals after an inglorious reign of two or three years. His more capable brother, Antiochus Magnus, was thereupon proclaimed king, who, taking charge of the army, retook Seleucia and recovered Syria, making himself master of some places by treaty, and of others by force of arms. A truce followed, wherein both sides treated for peace, yet prepared

for war; after which Antiochus returned and overcame in battle Nicholas, the Egyptian general, and had thoughts of invading Egypt itself. Here is the “one” who should certainly overflow and pass through.

Verse 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.

Ptolemy Philopater succeeded his father, Euergetes, in the kingdom of Egypt, being advanced to the crown not long after Antiochus Magnus had succeeded his brother in the government of Syria. He was a most luxurious and vicious prince, but was at length roused at the prospect of an invasion of Egypt by Antiochus. He was indeed “moved with choler” for the losses he had sustained, and the danger which threatened him; and he came forth out of Egypt with a numerous army to check the progress of the Syrian king. The king of the north was also to set forth a

great multitude. The army of Antiochus, according to Polybius, amounted on this occasion to sixty-two thousand foot, six thousand horse, and one hundred and two elephants. In the battle, Antiochus was defeated, and his army, according to prophecy, was given into the hands of the king of the south. Ten thousand foot and three thousand horse were slain, and over four thousand men were taken prisoners; while of Ptolemy's army there were slain only seven hundred horse, and about twice that number of infantry.

Verse 12. And when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall he lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened by it.

Ptolemy lacked the prudence to make a good use of his victory. Had he followed up his success, he would probably have become master of the whole kingdom of Antiochus; but content with making only a few menaces and a few threats, he made peace that he might be able to give himself up to the uninterrupted and uncontrolled

indulgence of his brutish passions. Thus, having conquered his enemies, he was overcome by his vices, and, forgetful of the great name which he might have established, he spent his time in feasting and lewdness.

His heart was lifted up by his success, but he was far from being strengthened by it; for the inglorious use he made of it caused his own subjects to rebel against him. But the lifting up of his heart was more especially manifested in his transactions with the Jews. Coming to Jerusalem, he there offered sacrifices, and was very desirous of entering into the most holy place of the temple, contrary to the law and religion of that place; but being, though with great difficulty, restrained, he left the place, burning with anger against the whole nation of the Jews, and immediately commenced against them a terrible and relentless persecution. In Alexandria, where Jews had resided since the days of Alexander, and enjoyed the privileges of the most favored citizens, forty thousand, according to Eusebius, sixty thousand, according to Jerome, were slain in this persecution. The

rebellion of the Egyptians, and this massacre of the Jews, certainly were not calculated to strengthen him in his kingdom, but were sufficient rather almost totally to ruin it.

Verse 13. For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches.

The events predicted in this verse were to occur “after certain years.” The peace concluded between Ptolemy Philopater and Antiochus, lasted fourteen years. Meanwhile Ptolemy died from intemperance and debauchery, and was succeeded by his son, Ptolemy Epiphanes, a child then four or five years old. Antiochus, during the same time, having suppressed rebellion in his kingdom, and reduced and settled the eastern parts in their obedience, was at leisure for any enterprise, when young Epiphanes came to the throne of Egypt; and thinking this too good an opportunity for enlarging his dominion to be let slip, he raised an immense

army “greater than the former” (for he had collected many forces and acquired great riches in his eastern expedition), and set out against Egypt, expecting to have an easy victory over the infant king. How he succeeded we shall presently see; for here new complications enter into the affairs of these kingdoms, and new actors are introduced upon the stage of history.

Verse 14. And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shalt exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall.

Antiochus was not the only one who rose up against the infant Ptolemy. Agathocles, his prime minister, having possession of the king’s person, and conducting the affairs of the kingdom in his stead, was so dissolute and proud in the exercise of his power that the provinces which before were subject to Egypt rebelled; Egypt itself was disturbed by seditions; and the Alexandrians, rising up against Agathocles, caused him, his sister, his

mother, and their associates, to be put to death. At the same time, Philip, king of Macedon, entered into a league with Antiochus to divide the dominions of Ptolemy between them, each proposing to take the parts which lay nearest and most convenient to him. Here was a rising up against the king of the south sufficient to fulfill the prophecy, and the very events, beyond doubt, which the prophecy intended.

A new power is now introduced,--“the robbers of thy people;” literally, says Bishop Newton, “the breakers of thy people.” Far away on the banks of the Tiber, a kingdom had been nourishing itself with ambitious projects and dark designs. Small and weak at first, it grew with marvelous rapidity in strength and vigor, reaching out cautiously here and there to try its prowess, and test the vigor of its warlike arm, till, conscious of its power, it boldly reared its head among the nations of the earth, and seized with invincible hand the helm of their affairs. Henceforth the name of Rome stands upon the historic page, destined for long ages to control the affairs of the world, and exert a mighty

influence among the nations, even to the end of time.

Rome spoke; and Syria and Macedonia soon found a change coming over the aspect of their dream. The Romans interfered in behalf of the young king of Egypt, determined that he should be protected from the ruin devised by Antiochus and Philip. This was B. C. 200, and was one of the first important interferences of the Romans in the affairs of Syria and Egypt. Rollin furnishes the following succinct account of this matter:--

“Antiochus, king of Syria, and Philip, king of Macedonia, during the reign of Ptolemy Philopater, had discovered the strongest zeal for the interests of that monarch, and were ready to assist him on all occasions. Yet no sooner was he dead, leaving behind him an infant, whom the laws of humanity and justice enjoined them not to disturb in the possession of his father’s kingdom, than they immediately joined in a criminal alliance, and excited each other to shake off the lawful heir, and divide his dominions between them. Philip was to

have Caria, Libya, Cyrenaica, and Egypt; and Antiochus, all the rest. With this view, the latter entered Coele-Syria and Palestine, and in less than two campaigns made an entire conquest of the two provinces, with all their cities and dependencies. Their guilt, says Polybius, would not have been quite so glaring, had they, like tyrants, endeavored to gloss over their crimes with some specious pretense; but, so far from doing this, their injustice and cruelty were so barefaced, that to them was applied what is generally said of fishes, that the larger ones, though of the same species, prey on the lesser. One would be tempted, continues the same author, at seeing the most sacred laws of society so openly violated, to accuse Providence of being indifferent and insensible to the most horrid crimes; but it fully justified its conduct by punishing those two kings according to their deserts; and made such an example of them as ought, in all succeeding ages, to deter others from following their example. For, while they were meditating to dispossess a weak and helpless infant of his kingdom by piecemeal, Providence raised up the Romans against them, who entirely subverted

the kingdoms of Philip and Antiochus, and reduced their successors to almost as great calamities as those with which they intended to crush the infant king.”[2]

“To establish the vision.” The Romans being more prominently than any other people the subject of Daniel’s prophecy, their first interference in the affairs of these kingdoms is here referred to as being the establishment, or demonstration, of the truth of the vision which predicted the existence of such a power.

“But they shall fall.” Some refer this to those mentioned in the first part of the verse, who should stand up against the king of the south; others, to the robbers of Daniel’s people, the Romans. It is true in either case. If those who combined against Ptolemy are referred to, all that need be said is that they did speedily fall; and if it applies to the Romans, the prophecy simply looked forward to the period of their overthrow.

Verse 15. 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.

The tuition of the young king of Egypt was entrusted by the Roman Senate to M. Emilius Lepidus, who appointed Aristomenes, an old and experienced minister of that court, his guardian. His first act was to provide against the threatened invasion of the two confederated kings, Philip and Antiochus.

To this end he despatched Scopas, a famous general of Aetolia, then in the service of the Egyptians, into his native country to raise reinforcements for the army. Having equipped an army, he marched into Palestine and Coele-Syria (Antiochus being engaged in a war with Attalus in Lesser Asia), and reduced all Judea into subjection to the authority of Egypt.

Thus affairs were brought into a posture for the fulfillment of the verse before us. For Antiochus,

desisting from his war with Attalus at the dictation of the Romans, took speedy steps for the recovery of Palestine and Coele-Syria from the hands of the Egyptians. Scopas was sent to oppose him. Near the sources of the Jordan, the two armies met. Scopas was defeated, pursued to Sidon, and there closely besieged. Three of the ablest generals of Egypt, with their best forces, were sent to raise the siege, but without success. At length Scopas meeting, in the gaunt and intangible specter of famine, a foe with whom he was unable to cope, was forced to surrender on the dishonorable terms of life only; whereupon he and his ten thousand men were suffered to depart, stripped and naked. Here was the taking of the most fenced cities by the king of the north; for Sidon was, both in its situation and its defenses, one of the strongest cities of those times. Here was the failure of the arms of the south to withstand, and the failure also of the people which the king of the south had chosen, namely, Scopas and his AEtolian forces.

Verse 16. But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none

shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed.

Although Egypt could not stand before Antiochus, the king of the north, Antiochus could not stand before the Romans, who now came against him. No kingdoms were longer able to resist this rising power. Syria was conquered, and added to the Roman empire, when Pompey, B. C. 65, deprived Antiochus Asiaticus of his possessions, and reduced Syria to a Roman province.

The same power was also to stand in the Holy Land, and consume it. Rome became connected with the people of God, the Jews, by alliance, B. C. 161, from which date it holds a prominent place in the prophetic calendar. It did not, however, acquire jurisdiction over Judea by actual conquest till B. C. 63; and then in the following manner.

On Pompey's return from his expedition against Mithridates, king of Pontus, two

competitors, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, were struggling for the crown of Judea. Their cause came before Pompey, who soon perceived the injustice of the claims of Aristobulus, but wished to defer decision in the matter till after his long-desired expedition into Arabia, promising then to return, and settle their affairs as should seem just and proper. Aristobulus, fathoming Pompey's real sentiments, hastened back to Judea, armed his subjects, and prepared for a vigorous defense, determined, at all hazards, to keep the crown, which he foresaw would be adjudicated to another. Pompey closely followed the fugitive. As he approached Jerusalem, Aristobulus, beginning to repent of his course, came out to meet him, and endeavored to accommodate matters by promising entire submission, and large sums of money. Pompey, accepting this offer, sent Gabinius, at the head of a detachment of soldiers, to receive the money. But when that lieutenant-general arrived at Jerusalem, he found the gates shut against him, and was told from the top of the walls that the city would not stand to the agreement.

Pompey, not to be deceived in this way with impunity, put Aristobulus, whom he had retained with him, in irons, and immediately marched against Jerusalem with his whole army. The partisans of Aristobulus were for defending the place; those of Hyrcanus, for opening the gates. The latter being in the majority, and prevailing, Pompey was given free entrance into the city. Whereupon the adherents of Aristobulus retired to the mountain of the temple, as fully determined to defend that place as Pompey was to reduce it. At the end of three months a breach was made in the wall sufficient for an assault, and the place was carried at the point of the sword. In the terrible slaughter that ensued, twelve thousand persons were slain. It was an affecting sight, observes the historian, to see the priests, engaged at the time in divine service, with calm hand and steady purpose pursue their accustomed work, apparently unconscious of the wild tumult, though all around them their friends were given to the slaughter, and though often their own blood mingled with that of their sacrifices.

Having put an end to the war, Pompey demolished the walls of Jerusalem, transferred several cities from the jurisdiction of Judea to that of Syria, and imposed tribute on the Jews. Thus for the first time was Jerusalem placed by conquest in the hands of that power which was to hold the “glorious land” in its iron grasp till it had utterly consumed it.

Verse 17. He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him.

Bishop Newton furnishes another reading for this verse, which seems more clearly to express the sense, as follows: “He shall also set his face to enter by force the whole kingdom.” Verse 16 brought us down to the conquest of Syria and Judea by the Romans. Rome had previously conquered Macedon and Thrace. Egypt was now all that remained of the “whole kingdom” of Alexander,

not brought into subjection to the Roman power, which power now set its face to enter by force into that country.

Ptolemy Auletes died B. C. 51. He left the crown and kingdom of Egypt to his eldest son and daughter, Ptolemy and Cleopatra. It was provided in his will that they should marry together, and reign jointly; and because they were young, they were placed under the guardianship of the Romans. The Roman people accepted the charge, and appointed Pompey as guardian of the young heirs of Egypt.

A quarrel having not long after broken out between Pompey and Caesar, the famous battle of Pharsalia was fought between the two generals, Pompey, being defeated, fled into Egypt. Caesar immediately followed him thither; but before his arrival, Pompey was basely murdered by Ptolemy, whose guardian he had been appointed. Caesar therefore assumed the appointment which had been given to Pompey, as guardian of Ptolemy and Cleopatra. He found Egypt in commotion from

intestine disturbances, Ptolemy and Cleopatra having become hostile to each other, and she being deprived of her share in the government. Notwithstanding this, he did not hesitate to land at Alexandria with his small force, 800 horse and 3200 foot, take cognizance of the quarrel, and undertake its settlement. The troubles daily increasing, Caesar found his small force insufficient to maintain his position, and being unable to leave Egypt on account of the north wind which blew at that season, he sent into Asia, ordering all the troops he had in that quarter to come to his assistance as soon as possible.

In the most haughty manner he decreed that Ptolemy and Cleopatra should disband their armies, appear before him for a settlement of their differences, and abide by his decision. Egypt being an independent kingdom, this haughty decree was considered an affront to its royal dignity, at which the Egyptians, highly incensed, flew to arms. Caesar replied that he acted by virtue of the will of their father Auletes, who had put his children under the guardianship of the senate and people of Rome,

the whole authority of which was now vested in his person as consul; and that, as guardian, he had the right to arbitrate between them.

The matter was finally brought before him, and advocates appointed to plead the cause of the respective parties. Cleopatra, aware of the foible of the great Roman conqueror, judged that the beauty of her presence would be more effectual in securing judgment in her favor than any advocate she could employ. To reach his presence undetected, she had recourse to the following stratagem: Laying herself at full length in a bundle of clothes, Appolodorus, her Sicilian servant, wrapped it up in a cloth; tied it with a thong, and raising it upon his Herculean shoulders, sought the apartments of Caesar. Claiming to have a present for the Roman general, he was admitted through the gate of the citadel, entered into the presence of Caesar, and deposited the burden at his feet. When Caesar had unbound this animated bundle, lo! the beautiful Cleopatra stood before him. He was far from being displeased with the stratagem, and being of a character described in 2 Peter 2:14, the

first sight of so beautiful a person, says Rollin, had all the effect upon him she had desired.

Caesar at length decreed that the brother and sister should occupy the throne jointly, according to the intent of the will. Pothinus, the chief minister of state, having been principally instrumental in expelling Cleopatra from the throne, feared the result of her restoration. He therefore began to excite jealousy and hostility against Caesar, by insinuating among the populace that he designed eventually to give Cleopatra the sole power. Open sedition soon followed. Achillas, at the head of 20,000 men, advanced to drive Caesar from Alexandria. Skilfully disposing his small body of men in the streets and alleys of the city, Caesar found no difficulty in repelling the attack. The Egyptians undertook to destroy his fleet. He retorted by burning theirs. Some of the burning vessels being driven near the quay, several of the buildings of the city took fire, and the famous Alexandrian library, containing nearly 400,000 volumes, was destroyed.

The war growing more threatening, Caesar sent into all the neighboring countries for help. A large fleet came from Asia Minor to his assistance. Mithridates set out for Egypt with an army raised in Syria and Cilicia. Antipater the Idumean joined him, with 3000 Jews. The Jews, who held the passes into Egypt, permitted the army to pass on without interruption. Without this co-operation on their part, the whole plan must have failed. The arrival of this army decided the contest. A decisive battle was fought near the Nile, resulting in a complete victory for Caesar. Ptolemy, attempting to escape, was drowned in the river. Alexandria and all Egypt then submitted to the victor. Rome had now entered into and absorbed the whole of the original kingdom of Alexander.

By the “upright ones” of the text are doubtless meant the Jews, who gave him the assistance already mentioned. Without this, he must have failed; with it, he completely subdued Egypt to his power, B. C. 47.

“The daughter of women, corrupting her.” The

passion which Caesar had conceived for Cleopatra, by whom he had one son, is assigned by the historian as the sole reason of his undertaking so dangerous a campaign as the Egyptian war. This kept him much longer in Egypt than his affairs required, he spending whole nights in feasting and carousing with the dissolute queen. “But,” said the prophet, “she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him.” Cleopatra afterward joined herself to Antony, the enemy of Augustus Caesar, and exerted her whole power against Rome.

Verse 18. After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many: but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him.

War with Pharnaces, king of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, at length drew him away from Egypt. “On his arrival where the enemy was,” says Prideaux, “he, without giving any respite either to himself or them, immediately fell on, and gained an absolute victory over them; an account whereof

he wrote to a friend of his in these three words: Veni, vidi, vici; I came, I saw, I conquered.” The latter part of this verse is involved in some obscurity, and there is difference of opinion in regard to its application. Some apply it further back in Caesar’s life, and think they find a fulfillment in his quarrel with Pompey. But preceding and subsequent events clearly defined in the prophecy, compel us to look for the fulfillment of this part of the prediction between the victory over Pharnaces, and Caesar’s death at Rome, as brought to view in the following verse. A more full history of this period might bring to light events which would render the application of this passage unembarrassed.

Verse 19. Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.

After this conquest, Caesar defeated the last remaining fragments of Pompey’s party, Cato and Scipio in Africa, and Labienus and Varus in Spain. Returning to Rome, the “fort of his own land,” he

was made perpetual dictator; and such other powers and honors were granted him as rendered him in fact absolute sovereign of the whole empire. But the prophet had said that he should stumble and fall. The language implies that his overthrow would be sudden and unexpected, like a person accidentally stumbling in his walk. And so this man, who had fought and won five hundred battles, taken one thousand cities, and slain one million one hundred and ninety-two thousand men, fell, not in the din of battle and the hour of strife, but when he thought his pathway was smooth and strewn with flowers, and when danger was supposed to be far away; for, taking his seat in the senate chamber, upon his throne of gold, to receive at the hands of that body the title of king, the dagger of treachery suddenly struck him to the heart. Cassius, Brutus, and other conspirators rushed upon him, and he fell, pierced with twenty-three wounds. Thus he suddenly stumbled and fell, and was not found, B. C. 44.

Verse 20. Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom: but

within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.

Augustus Caesar succeeded his uncle, Julius, by whom he had been adopted as his successor. He publicly announced his adoption by his uncle, and took his name, to which he added that of Octavianus. Combining with Mark Antony and Lepidus to avenge the death of Caesar, they formed what is called the triumvirate form of government. Having subsequently firmly established himself in the empire, the senate conferred upon him the title of Augustus, and the other members of the Triumvirate being now dead, he became supreme ruler.

He was emphatically a raiser of taxes. Luke, in speaking of the events that transpired at the time when Christ was born, says: “And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed.” Luke 2:1. That taxing which embraced all the world was an event worthy of notice; and the person who enforced it has certainly a claim to the

title of “a raiser of taxes,” above every other competitor.

The St. Louis Globe Democrat, as quoted in Current Literature for July, 1895, says: “Augustus Caesar was not the public benefactor he is represented. He was the most exacting tax collector the Roman world had up to that time ever seen.”

And he stood up “in the glory of the kingdom.” Rome reached in his days the pinnacle of its greatness and power. The “Augustan Age” is an expression everywhere used to denote the golden age of Roman history. Rome never saw a brighter hour. Peace was promoted, justice maintained, luxury curbed, discipline established, and learning encouraged. In his reign, the temple of Janus was for the third time shut since the foundation of Rome, signifying that all the world was at peace; and at this auspicious hour our Lord was born in Bethlehem of Judea. In a little less than eighteen years after the taxing brought to view, seeming but a “few days” to the distant gaze of the prophet, Augustus died, not in anger nor in battle, but

peacefully in his bed, at Nola, whither he had gone to seek repose and health, A. D. 14, in the seventy-sixth year of his age.

Verse 21. And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.

Tiberius Caesar next appeared after Augustus Caesar on the Roman throne. He was raised to the consulate in his twenty-eighth year. It is recorded that as Augustus was about to nominate his successor, his wife, Livia, besought him to nominate Tiberius (her son by a former husband); but the emperor said, “Your son is too vile to wear the purple of Rome and the nomination was given to Agrippa, a very virtuous and much-respected Roman citizen. But the prophecy had foreseen that a vile person should succeed Augustus. Agrippa died; and Augustus was again under the necessity of choosing a successor. Livia renewed her intercessions for Tiberius; and Augustus, weakened by age and sickness, was more easily flattered, and

finally consented to nominate, as his colleague and successor, that “vile” young man. But the citizens never gave him the love, respect, and “honor of the kingdom,” due to an upright and faithful sovereign.

How clear a fulfillment is this of the prediction that they should not give him the honor of the kingdom. But he was to come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. A paragraph from the Encyclopedia Americana shows how this was fulfilled:--

“During the remainder of the life of Augustus, he [Tiberius] behaved with great prudence and ability, concluding a war with the Germans in such a manner as to merit a triumph. After the defeat of Varus and his legions, he was sent to check the progress of the victorious Germans, and acted in that war with equal spirit and prudence. On the death of Augustus, he succeeded, without opposition, to the sovereignty of the empire; which, however, with his characteristic dissimulation, he affected to decline, until repeatedly solicited by the servile senate.”

Dissimulation on his part, flattery on the part of the servile senate, and a possession of the kingdom without opposition--such were the circumstances attending his accession to the throne, and such were the circumstances for which the prophecy called.

The person brought to view in the text is called “a vile person.” Was such the character sustained by Tiberius? Let another paragraph from the Encyclopedia answer:--

“Tacitus records the events of this reign, including the suspicious death of Germanicus, the detestable administration of Sejanus, the poisoning of Drusus, with all the extraordinary mixture of tyranny with occasional wisdom and good sense which distinguished the conduct of Tiberius, until his infamous and dissolute retirement, A. D. 26, to the isle of Capreae, in the bay of Naples, never to return to Rome. On the death of Livia, A. D. 29, the only restraint upon his actions and those of the detestable Sejanus, was removed, and the

destruction of the widow and family of Germanicus followed. At length the infamous favorite extending his views to the empire itself, Tiberius, informed of his machinations, prepared to encounter him with his favorite weapon, dissimulation. Although fully resolved upon his destruction, he accumulated honors upon him, declared him his partner in the consulate, and, after long playing with his credulity, and that of the senate, who thought him in greater favor than ever, he artfully prepared for his arrest. Sejanus fell deservedly and unpitied; but many innocent persons shared in his destruction, in consequence of the suspicion and cruelty of Tiberius, which now exceeded all limits. The remainder of the reign of this tyrant is little more than a disgusting narrative of servility on the one hand, and of despotic ferocity on the other. That he himself endured as much misery as he inflicted, is evident from the following commencement of one of his letters to the senate: ‘What I shall write to you, conscript fathers, or what I shall not write, or why I should write at all, may the gods and goddesses plague me more than I feel daily that they are doing, if I can

tell.’ ‘What mental torture,’ observes Tacitus, in reference to this passage, ‘which could extort such a confession!’”

“Seneca remarks of Tiberius that he was never intoxicated but once in his life; for he continued in a state of perpetual intoxication from the time he gave himself to drinking, to the last moment of his life.”

Tyranny, hypocrisy, debauchery, and uninterrupted intoxication--if these traits and practices show a man to be vile, Tiberius exhibited that character in disgusting perfection.

Verse 22. And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant.

Bishop Newton presents the following reading as agreeing better with the original: “And the arms of the overflower shall be overflown from before him, and shall be broken.” The expressions signify revolution and violence; and in fulfillment we

should look for the arms of Tiberius, the overflow, to be overflowed, or, in other words, for him to suffer a violent death. To show how this was accomplished, we again have recourse to the Encyclopedia Americana, art. Tiberius:--

“Acting the hypocrite to the last, he disguised his increasing debility as much as he was able, even affecting to join in the sports and exercises of the soldiers of his guard. At length, leaving his favorite island, the scene of the most disgusting debaucheries, he stopped at a country house near the promontory of Micenum, where, on the 16th of March, 37, he sunk into a lethargy, in which he appeared dead; and Caligula was preparing with a numerous escort to take possession of the empire, when his sudden revival threw them into consternation. At this critical instant, Macro, the pretorian prefect, caused him to be suffocated with pillows. Thus expired the emperor Tiberius, in the seventy-eighth year of his age, and twenty-third of his reign, universally execrated.”

“The prince of the covenant” unquestionably

refers to Jesus Christ, “the Messiah the Prince,” who was to “confirm the covenant” one week with his people. Daniel 9:25-27. The prophet, having taken us down to the death of Tiberius, now mentions incidentally an event to transpire in his reign, so important that it should not be passed over; namely, the cutting off of the Prince of the covenant, or, in other words, the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. According to the prophecy, this took place in the reign of Tiberius. Luke informs us (3: 1-3) that in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar John the Baptist commenced his ministry. The reign of Tiberius is to be reckoned, according to Prideaux, Dr. Hales, Lardner, and others, from his elevation to the throne to reign jointly with Augustus, his step-father, in August, A. D. 12. His fifteenth year would therefore be from August, A. D. 26, to August, A. D. 27. Christ was six months younger than John, and is supposed to have commenced his ministry six months later, both, according to the law of the priesthood, entering upon their work when they were thirty years of age. If John commenced in the spring, in the latter portion of Tiberius’s fifteenth year, it

would bring the commencement of Christ's ministry in the autumn of A. D. 27; and right here the best authorities place the baptism of Christ, it being the exact point where the 483 years from B. C. 457, which were to extend to the Messiah the Prince, terminated; and Christ went forth proclaiming that the time was fulfilled. From this point we go forward three years and a half to find the date of the crucifixion; for Christ attended but four Passovers, and was crucified at the last one. Three and a half years from the autumn of A. D. 27, bring us to the spring of A. D. 31. The death of Tiberius is placed but six years later, in A. D. 37. (See on chapter 9:25-27)

Verse 23. And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people.

The "him" with whom the league here spoken of is made, must be the same power which has been the subject of the prophecy from the 14th verse; and that this is the Roman power is shown beyond controversy in the fulfillment of the

prophecy in three individuals, as already noticed, who successively ruled over the Roman empire; namely, Julius, Augustus, and Tiberius Caesar. The first, on returning to the fort of his own land in triumph, stumbled and fell, and was not found. Verse 19. The second was a raiser of taxes; and he reigned in the glory of the kingdom, and died neither in anger nor in battle, but peacefully in his own bed. Verse 20. The third was a dissembler, and one of the vilest of characters. He entered upon the kingdom peaceably, but both his reign and life were ended by violence. And in his reign the Prince of the covenant, Jesus of Nazareth, was put to death upon the cross. Verses 21, 22. Christ can never be broken or put to death again; hence in no other government, and at no other time, can we find a fulfillment of these events. Some attempt to apply these verses to Antiochus, and make one of the Jewish high priests the prince of the covenant, though they are never called such. This is the same kind of reasoning which endeavors to make the reign of Antiochus a fulfillment of the little horn of Daniel 8; and it is offered for the same purpose; namely, to break the great chain of evidence by

which it is shown that the Advent doctrine is the doctrine of the Bible, and that Christ is now at the door. But the evidence cannot be overthrown; the chain cannot be broken.

Having taken us down through the secular events of the empire to the end of the seventy weeks, the prophet, in verse 23, takes us back to the time when the Romans became directly connected with the people of God by the Jewish league, B. C. 161; from which point we are then taken down in a direct line of events to the final triumph of the church, and the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom. The Jews, being grievously oppressed by the Syrian kings, sent an embassy to Rome, to solicit the aid of the Romans, and to join themselves in "a league of amity and confederacy with them." [3] The Romans listened to the request of the Jews, and granted them a decree, couched in these words:--

"The decree of the senate concerning a league of assistance and friendship with the nation of the Jews. It shall not be lawful for any that are subject

to the Romans, to make war with the nation of the Jews, nor to assist those that do so, either by sending them corn, or ships, or money; and if any attack be made upon the Jews, the Romans shall assist them as far as they are able; and again, if any attack be made upon the Romans, the Jews shall assist them. And if the Jews have a mind to add to, or to take from, this league of assistance, that shall be done with the common consent of the Romans. And whatever addition shall thus be made, it shall be of force.” “This decree,” says Josephus, “was written by Eupolemus, the son of John, and by Jason, the son of Eleazer, when Judas was high priest of the nation, and Simon, his brother, was general of the army. And this was the first league that the Romans made with the Jews, and was managed after this manner.”

At this time the Romans were a small people, and began to work deceitfully, or with cunning, as the word signifies. And from this point they rose by a steady and rapid ascent to the height of power which they afterward attained.

Verse 24. He shall enter peacefully even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strongholds, even for a time.

The usual manner in which nations had, before the days of Rome, entered upon valuable provinces and rich territory, was by war and conquest. Rome was now to do what had not been done by the fathers or the fathers' fathers; namely, receive these acquisitions through peaceful means. The custom, before unheard of, was now inaugurated, of kings' leaving by legacy their kingdoms to the Romans. Rome came into possession of large provinces in this manner.

And those who thus came under the dominion of Rome derived no small advantage therefrom. They were treated with kindness and leniency. It was like having the prey and spoil distributed among them. They were protected from their

enemies, and rested in peace and safety under the aegis of the Roman power.

To the latter portion of this verse, Bishop Newton gives the idea of forecasting devices from strongholds, instead of against them. This the Romans did from the strong fortress of their sevenhilled city. “Even for a time;” doubtless a prophetic time, 360 years. From what point are these years to be dated? Probably from the event brought to view in the following verse.

Verse 25. And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him.

By verses 23 and 24, we are brought down this side of the league between the Jews and the Romans, B. C. 161, to the time when Rome had acquired universal dominion. The verse now before us brings to view a vigorous campaign against the

king of the south, Egypt, and the occurrence of a notable battle between great and mighty armies. Did such events as these transpire in the history of Rome about this time?--They did. The war was the war between Egypt and Rome; and the battle was the battle of Actium. Let us take a brief view of the circumstances that led to this conflict.

Mark Antony, Augustus Caesar, and Lepidus constituted the Triumvirate which had sworn to avenge the death of Julius Caesar. This Antony became the brother-in-law of Augustus by marrying his sister, Octavia. Antony was sent into Egypt on government business, but fell a victim to the arts and charms of Cleopatra, Egypt's dissolute queen. So strong was the passion he conceived for her, that he finally espoused the Egyptian interests, rejected his wife, Octavia, to please Cleopatra, bestowed province after province upon the latter to gratify her avarice, celebrated a triumph at Alexandria instead of Rome, and otherwise so affronted the Roman people that Augustus had no difficulty in leading them to engage heartily in a war against this enemy of their country. The war

was ostensibly against Egypt and Cleopatra; but it was really against Antony, who now stood at the head of Egyptian affairs. And the true cause of their controversy was, says Prideaux, that neither of them could be content with only half of the Roman empire; for Lepidus having been deposed from the Triumvirate, it now lay between them, and each being determined to possess the whole, they cast the die of war for its possession.

Antony assembled his fleet at Samos. Five hundred ships of war, of extraordinary size and structure, having several decks one above another, with towers upon the head and stern, made an imposing and formidable array. These ships carried two hundred thousand foot, and twelve thousand horse. The kings of Libya, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, Comagena, and Thrace, were there in person; and those of Pontus, Judea, Lycaonia, Galatia, and Media, had sent their troops. A more splendid and gorgeous military spectacle than this fleet of battle ships, as they spread their sails, and moved out upon the bosom of the sea, the world has rarely seen. Surpassing all in magnificence

came the galley of Cleopatra, floating like a palace of gold beneath a cloud of purple sails. Its flags and streamers fluttered in the wind, and trumpets and other instruments of war, made the heavens resound with notes of joy and triumph. Antony followed close after in a galley of almost equal magnificence. And the giddy queen, intoxicated with the sight of the warlike array, short-sighted and vainglorious, at the head of her infamous troop of eunuchs, foolishly threatened the Roman capital with approaching ruin.

Caesar Augustus, on the other hand, displayed less pomp but more utility. He had but half as many ships as Antony, and only eighty thousand foot. But all his troops were chosen men, and on board his fleet were none but experienced seamen; whereas Antony, not finding mariners sufficient, had been obliged to man his vessels with artisans of every class, men inexperienced, and better calculated to cause trouble than to do real service in time of battle. The season being far consumed in these preparations, Caesar made his rendezvous at Brundisium, and Antony at Corcyra, till the

following year.

As soon as the season permitted, both armies were put in motion on both sea and land. The fleets at length entered the Ambracian Gulf in Epirus, and the land forces were drawn up on either shore in plain view. Antony's most experienced generals advised him not to hazard a battle by sea with his inexperienced mariners, but to send Cleopatra back to Egypt, and hasten at once into Thrace or Macedonia, and trust the issue to his land forces, who were composed of veteran troops. But he, illustrating the old adage, *Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat* (whom God wishes to destroy, he first makes mad), infatuated by Cleopatra, seemed only desirous of pleasing her; and she, trusting to appearances only, deemed her fleet invincible, and advised immediate action.

The battle was fought Sept. 2, B. C. 31, at the mouth of the gulf of Ambracia, near the city of Actium. The world was the stake for which these stern warriors, Antony and Caesar, now played. The contest, long doubtful, was at length decided

by the course which Cleopatra pursued; for she, frightened at the din of battle, took to flight when there was no danger, and drew after her the whole Egyptian fleet. Antony, beholding this movement, and lost to everything but his blind passion for her, precipitately followed, and yielded a victory to Caesar, which, had his Egyptian forces proved true to him, and had he proved true to his own manhood, he might have gained.

This battle doubtless marks the commencement of the “time” mentioned in verse 24. And as during this “time” devices were to be forecast from the stronghold, or Rome, we should conclude that at the end of that period western supremacy would cease, or such a change take place in the empire that that city would no longer be considered the seat of government. From B. C. 31, a prophetic time, or 360 years, would bring us to A. D. 330. And it hence becomes a noteworthy fact that the seat of empire was removed from Rome to Constantinople by Constantine the Great in that very year. (See Encyclopedia Americana, art. Constantinople.)

Verse 26. Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain.

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

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.

Antony and Caesar were formerly in alliance. Yet under the garb of friendship, they were both aspiring and intriguing for universal dominion. Their protestations of deference to, and friendship for, each other, were the utterances of hypocrites. They spoke lies at one table. Octavia, the wife of Antony and sister of Caesar, declared to the people of Rome at the time Antony divorced her, that she had consented to marry him solely with the hope that it would prove a pledge of union between Caesar and Antony. But that counsel did not prosper. The rupture came; and in the conflict that ensued, Caesar came off entirely victorious.

Verse 28. Then shall he return into his land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land.

Two returnings from foreign conquest are here brought to view; the first, after the events narrated in verses 26 and 27, and the second, after this power had had indignation against the holy

covenant, and had performed exploits. The first was fulfilled in the return of Caesar after his expedition against Egypt and Antony. He returned to Rome with abundant honors and riches; for, says Prideaux (II, 380), “At this time such vast riches were brought to Rome from Egypt on the reducing of that country, and the return of Octavianus [Caesar] and his army from thence, that the value of money fell one half, and the price of provisions and all vendible wares was doubled thereon.” Caesar celebrated his victories in a three-days’ triumph,—a triumph which Cleopatra herself would have graced, as one of the royal captives, had she not artfully caused herself to be bitten by the fatal asp.

The next great enterprise of the Romans after the overthrow of Egypt, was the expedition against Judea, and the capture and destruction of Jerusalem. The holy covenant is doubtless the covenant which God has maintained with his people, under different forms, in different ages of the world, that is, with all believers in him. The Jews rejected Christ; and, according to the

prophecy that all who would not hear that prophet should be cut off, they were destroyed out of their own land, and scattered to every nation under heaven. And while Jews and Christians alike suffered under the oppressive hands of the Romans, it was doubtless in the reduction of Judea especially, that the exploits mentioned in the text were exhibited.

Under Vespasian the Romans invaded Judea, and took the cities of Galilee, Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, where Christ had been rejected. They destroyed the inhabitants, and left nothing but ruin and desolation. Titus besieged Jerusalem. He drew a trench around it, according to the prediction of the Saviour. A terrible famine ensued, the equal of which the world has, perhaps, at no other time witnessed. Moses had predicted that in the terrible calamities to come upon the Jews if they departed from God, even the tender and delicate woman should eat her own children in the straitness of the siege wherewith their enemies should distress them. Under the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, a literal fulfillment of this prediction occurred; and

he, hearing of the inhuman deed, but forgetting that he was the one who was driving them to such direful extremities, swore the eternal extirpation of the accursed city and people.

Jerusalem fell in A. D. 70. As an honor to himself, the Roman commander had determined to save the temple; but the Lord had said that there should not remain one stone upon another which should not be thrown down. A Roman soldier seized a brand of fire, and, climbing upon the shoulders of his comrades, thrust it into one of the windows of the beautiful structure. It was soon in the arms of the devouring element. The frantic efforts of the Jews to extinguish the flames were seconded by Titus himself, but all in vain. Seeing that the temple must perish, Titus rushed in, and bore away the golden candlestick, the table of show-bread, and the volume of the law, wrapped in golden tissue. The candlestick was afterward deposited in Vespasian's Temple to Peace, and copied on the triumphal arch of Titus, where its mutilated image is yet to be seen.

The siege of Jerusalem lasted five months. In that siege eleven hundred thousand Jews perished, and ninety-seven thousand were taken prisoners. The city was so amazingly strong that Titus exclaimed, when viewing the ruins, “We have fought with the assistance of God;” but it was completely leveled, and the foundations of the temple were plowed up by Tarentius Rufus. The duration of the whole war was seven years, and one million four hundred and sixty-two thousand (1,462,000) persons are said to have fallen victims to its awful horrors.

Thus this power performed great exploits, and again returned to his own land.

Verse 29. At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

The time appointed is probably the prophetic time of verse 24, which has been previously mentioned. It closed, as already shown, in A. D. 330, at which time this power was to return and

come again toward the south, but not as on the former occasion, when it went to Egypt, nor as the latter, when it went to Judea. Those were expeditions which resulted in conquest and glory. This one led to demoralization and ruin. The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople was the signal for the downfall of the empire. Rome then lost its prestige. The western division was exposed to the incursions of foreign enemies. On the death of Constantine, the Roman empire was divided into three parts, between his three sons, Constantius, Constantine II, and Constans. Constantine II and Constans quarreled, and Constans, being victor, gained the supremacy of the whole West. He was soon slain by one of his commanders, who, in turn, was shortly after defeated by the surviving emperor, and in despair ended his own days, A. D. 353. The barbarians of the North now began their incursions, and extended their conquests till the imperial power of the West expired in A. D. 476.

This was indeed different from the two former movements brought to view in the prophecy; and to

this the fatal step of removing the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople directly led.

Verse 30. For the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.

The prophetic narrative still has reference to the power which has been the subject of the prophecy from the sixteenth verse; namely, Rome. What were the ships of Chittim that came against this power, and when was this movement made? What country or power is meant by Chittim? Dr. A. Clarke, on Isaiah 23:1, has this note: "From the land of Chittim, it is revealed to them. The news of the destruction of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, is said to be brought to them from Chittim, the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean; for the Tyrians, says Jerome, on verse 6, when they saw they had no other means of escape, fled in their ships, and took refuge in Carthage, and in the islands of the Ionian

and Aegean Seas. So also Jochri on the same place.” Kitto gives the same locality to Chittim; namely, the coast and islands of the Mediterranean; and the mind is carried by the testimony of Jerome to a definite and celebrated city situated in that land; that is Carthage.

Was ever a naval warfare, with Carthage as a base of operations, waged against the Roman empire? We have but to think of the terrible onslaught of the Vandals upon Rome under the fierce Genseric, to answer readily in the affirmative. Sallying every spring from the port of Carthage at the head of his numerous and well-disciplined naval forces, he spread consternation through all the maritime provinces of the empire. That this is the work brought to view is further evident when we consider that we are brought down in the prophecy to this very time. In verse 29, the transfer of empire to Constantinople we understand to be mentioned. Following in due course of time, as the next remarkable revolution, came the irruptions of the barbarians of the North, prominent among which was the Vandal war

already mentioned. The years A. D. 428-468 mark the career of Genseric.

“He shall be grieved and return.” This may have reference to the desperate efforts which were made to dispossess Genseric of the sovereignty of the seas, the first by Majorian, the second by Leo, both of which proved to be utter failures; and Rome was obliged to submit to the humiliation of seeing its provinces ravaged, and its “eternal city” pillaged by the enemy. (See on Revelation 8:8)

“Indignation against the covenant;” that is, the Holy Scriptures, the book of the covenant. A revolution of this nature was accomplished in Rome. The Heruli, Goths, and Vandals, who conquered Rome, embraced the Arian faith, and became enemies of the Catholic Church. It was especially for the purpose of exterminating this heresy that Justinian decreed the pope to be the head of the church and the corrector of heretics. The Bible soon came to be regarded as a dangerous book that should not be read by the common people, but all questions in dispute were to be

submitted to the pope. Thus was indignity heaped upon God's word. And the emperors of Rome, the eastern division of which still continued, had intelligence, or connived with the Church of Rome, which had forsaken the covenant, and constituted the great apostasy, for the purpose of putting down "heresy." The man of sin was raised to his presumptuous throne by the defeat of the Arian Goths, who then held possession of Rome, in A. D. 538.

Verse 31. And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.

The power of the empire was committed to the carrying on of the work before mentioned. "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength," or Rome. If this applies to the barbarians, it was literally fulfilled; for Rome was sacked by the Goths, and Vandals, and the imperial power of the West ceased through the conquest of Rome by

Odoacer. Or if it refers to those rulers of the empire who were working in behalf of the papacy against the pagan and all other opposing religions, it would signify the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, which contributed its measure of influence to the downfall of Rome. The passage would then be parallel to Daniel 8:11 and Revelation 13:2.

“And they shall take away the daily sacrifice.” It was shown, on Daniel 8:13, that sacrifice is a word erroneously supplied; that it should be desolation; and that the expression denotes a desolating power, of which the abomination of desolation is but the counterpart, and to which it succeeds in point of time. The “daily” desolation was paganism, the “abomination of desolation” is the papacy. But it may be asked how this can be the papacy; since Christ spoke of it in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. And the answer is, Christ evidently referred to the ninth of Daniel, which is a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, and not to this verse of chapter 11, which does not refer to that event. Daniel, in the

ninth chapter, speaks of desolations and abominations, plural. More than one abomination, therefore, treads down the church; that is, so far as the church is concerned, both paganism and the papacy are abominations. But as distinguished from each other, the language is restricted, and one is the “daily” desolation, and the other is pre-eminently the transgression or “abomination” of desolation.

How was the daily, or paganism, taken away? As this is spoken of in connection with the placing or setting up of the abomination of desolation, or the papacy, it must denote, not merely the nominal change of the religion of the empire from paganism to Christianity, as on the conversion, so-called, of Constantine, but such an eradication of paganism from all the elements of the empire, that the way would be all open for the papal abomination to arise and assert its arrogant claims. Such a revolution as this, plainly defined, was accomplished; but not for nearly two hundred years after the death of Constantine.

As we approach the year A. D. 508, we behold a grand crisis ripening between Catholicism and the pagan influences still existing in the empire. Up to the time of the conversion of Clovis, king of France, A. D. 496, the French and other nations of Western Rome were pagan; but subsequently to that event, the efforts to convert idolaters to Romanism were crowned with great success. The conversion of Clovis is said to have been the occasion of bestowing upon the French monarch the titles of “Most Christian Majesty,” and “Eldest Son of the Church.” Between that time and A. D. 508, by alliances, capitulations, and conquests, the Arborici, the Roman garrisons in the West, Brittany, the Burgundians, and the Visigoths, were brought into subjection.

From the time when these successes were fully accomplished, namely, 508, the papacy was triumphant so far as paganism was concerned; for though the latter doubtless retarded the progress of the Catholic faith, yet it had not the power, if it had the disposition, to suppress the faith, and hinder the encroachments of the Roman pontiff. When the

prominent powers of Europe gave up their attachment to paganism, it was only to perpetuate its abominations in another form; for Christianity, as exhibited in the Catholic Church, was, and is, only paganism baptized.

In England, Arthur, the first Christian king, founded the Christian worship on the ruins of the pagan. Rapin (book. 2, p. 124), who claims to be exact in the chronology of events, states that he was elected monarch of Britain in 508.

The condition of the See of Rome was also peculiar at this time. In 498, Symmachus ascended the pontifical throne as a recent convert from paganism. He reigned to A. D. 514. He found his way to the papal chair, says Hu Pin, by striving with his competitor even unto blood. He received adulation as the successor of St. Peter, and struck the key-note of papal assumption by presuming to excommunicate the emperor Anastasius. The most servile flatterers of the pope now began to maintain that he was constituted judge in the place of God, and that he was the vicegerent of the Most High.

Such was the direction in which events were tending in the West. What posture did affairs at the same time assume in the East? A strong papal party now existed in all parts of the empire. The adherents of this cause in Constantinople, encouraged by the success of their brethren in the West, deemed it safe to commence open hostilities in behalf of their master at Rome. In 508 their partizan zeal culminated in a whirlwind of fanaticism and civil war, which swept in fire and blood through the streets of the eastern capital. Gibbon, under the years 508-518, speaking of the commotions in Constantinople, says:--

“The statues of the emperor were broken, and his person was concealed in a suburb, till, at the end of three days, he dared to implore the mercy of his subjects. Without his diadem, and in the posture of a suppliant, Anastasius appeared on the throne of the circus. The Catholics, before his face, rehearsed the genuine Trisagion; they exulted in the offer which he proclaimed by the voice of a herald of abdicating the purple; they listened to the

admonition that, since all could not reign, they should previously agree in the choice of a sovereign; and they accepted the blood of two unpopular ministers, whom their master, without hesitation, condemned to the lions. These furious but transient seditions were encouraged by the success of Vitalian, who, with an army of Huns and Bulgarians, for the most part idolaters, declared himself the champion of the Catholic faith. In this pious rebellion he depopulated Thrace, besieged Constantinople, exterminated sixty-five thousand of his fellow Christians, till he obtained the recall of the bishops, the satisfaction of the pope, and the establishment of the Council of Chalcedon, an orthodox treaty, reluctantly signed by the dying Anastasius, and more faithfully performed by the uncle of Justinian. And such was the event of the first of the religious wars which have been waged in the name, and by the disciples, of the God of Peace.”[4]

Let it be marked that in this year, 508, paganism had so far declined, and Catholicism had so far relatively increased in strength, that the

Catholic Church for the first time waged a successful war against both the civil authority of the empire and the church of the East, which had for the most part embraced the Monophysite doctrine. The extermination of 65,000 heretics was the result.

With the following extract, we close the testimony on this point:--

“We now invite our modern Gamaliels to take a position with us in the place of the sanctuary of paganism (since claimed as the ‘patrimony of St. Peter’) in 508. We look a few years into the past, and the rude paganism of the northern barbarians is pouring down upon the nominally Christian empire of Western Rome, triumphing everywhere, and its triumphs everywhere distinguished by the most savage cruelty. ... The empire falls, and is broken into fragments. One by one the lords and rulers of these fragments abandon their paganism, and profess the Christian faith. In religion the conquerors are yielding to the conquered. But still paganism is triumphant. Among its supporters

there is one stern and successful conqueror (Clovis); but soon he also bows before the power of the -new faith, and becomes its champion. He is still triumphant, but, as a hero and conqueror, reaches the zenith at the point we occupy, A. D. 508.

“In or near the same year, the last important subdivision of the fallen empire is publicly, and by the coronation of its triumphant ‘monarch,’ Christianized.

“The pontiff for the period on which we stand, is a recently converted pagan. The bloody contest which placed him in the chair was decided by the interposition of an Arian king. He is bowed to and saluted as filling ‘the place of God on earth.’ The senate is so far under his power that on suspicion that the interests of the See of Rome demand it, they excommunicate the emperor. ... In 508 the mine is sprung beneath the throne of the Eastern empire. The result of the confusion and strife it occasions is the humiliation of its rightful lord. Now the question is, At what time was paganism

so far suppressed as to make room for its substitute and successor, the papal abomination? When was this abomination placed in a position to start on its career of blasphemy and blood? Is there any other date for its being ‘placed,’ or ‘set up,’ in the room of paganism but 508? If the mysterious enchantress has not now brought all her victims within her power, she has taken her position, and some have yielded to the fascination. The others are at length subdued; ‘and kings, and peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues’ are brought under the spell which prepares them, even while ‘drunken with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,’ to ‘think they are doing God service,’ and to fancy themselves the exclusive favorites of Heaven while becoming an easier and richer prey for the damnation of hell.”[5]

From these evidences we think it clear that the daily, or paganism, was taken away in A. D. 508. This was preparatory to the setting up, or establishment, of the papacy, which was a separate and subsequent event. Of this the prophetic narrative now leads us to speak.

“And they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.” Having shown quite fully what constituted the taking away of the daily, or paganism, we now inquire, When was the abomination that maketh desolate, or the papacy, placed, or set up? The little horn that had eyes like the eyes of man was not slow to see when the way was open for his advancement and elevation. From the year 508 his progress toward universal supremacy was without a parallel.

When Justinian was about to commence the Vandal war, A. D. 533, an enterprise of no small magnitude and difficulty, he wished to secure the influence of the bishop of Rome, who had then attained a position in which his opinion had great weight throughout a large portion of Christendom. Justinian therefore took it upon himself to decide the contest which had long existed between the sees of Rome and Constantinople as to which should have the precedence, by giving the preference to Rome, and declaring, in the fullest and most unequivocal terms, that the bishop of that

city should be chief of the whole ecclesiastical body of the empire. A work on the Apocalypse, by Rev. George Croly, of England, published in 1827, presents a detailed account of the events by which the supremacy of the pope of Rome was secured. He gives the following as the terms in which the letter of Justinian was expressed:--

“Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant, emperor, consul, etc., to John, the most holy archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch.

“Rendering honor to the apostolic chair and to your holiness, as has been always, and is, our wish, and honoring your blessedness as a father, we have hastened to bring to the knowledge of your holiness all matters relating to the state of the churches; it having been at all times our great desire to preserve the unity of your apostolic chair, and the constitution of the holy churches of God, which has obtained hitherto, and still obtains.

“Therefore we have made no delay in subjecting and uniting to your holiness all the

priests of the whole East.... We cannot suffer that anything which relates to the state of the church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved without the knowledge of your holiness, who is **THE HEAD OF ALL THE HOLT CHURCHES**; for in all things, as we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your apostolic chair.”[6]

“The emperor’s letter,” continues Mr. Croly, “must have been sent before the 25th of March, 533; for in his letter of that date to Epiphanius, he speaks of its having been already despatched, and repeats his decision that all affairs touching the church shall be referred to the pope, ‘head of all bishops, and the true and effective corrector of heretics.’”

The pope, in his answer, returned the same month of the following year, 534, observes that among the virtues of Justinian, “one shines as a star,--his reverence for the apostolic chair, to which he has subjected and united all the churches, it being truly the head of all.”

The “Novellae” of the Justinian code give unanswerable proof of the authenticity of the title. The preamble of the 9th states that “as the elder Rome was the founder of the laws, so was it not to be questioned that in her was the supremacy of the Pontificate.” The 131st, on the ecclesiastical titles and privileges, chapter 2, states: “We therefore decree that the most holy pope of the elder Rome is the first of all the priesthood, and that the most blessed archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, shall hold the second rank after the holy apostolic chair of the elder Rome.”

Toward the close of the sixth century, John of Constantinople denied the Roman supremacy, and assumed for himself the title of universal bishop; whereupon, Gregory the great, indignant at the usurpation, denounced John, and declared, with unconscious truth, that he who would assume the title of universal bishop was Antichrist. Phocas, in 606, suppressed the claim of the bishop of Constantinople, and vindicated that of the bishop of Rome. But Phocas was not the founder of papal

supremacy. Says Croly, “That Phocas repressed the claim of the bishop of Constantinople is beyond a doubt. But the highest authorities among the civilians and annalists of Rome, spurn the idea that Phocas was the founder of the supremacy of Rome; they ascend to Justinian as the only legitimate source, and rightly date the title from the memorable year 533.” Again he says: “On reference to Baronius, the established authority among the Roman Catholic annalists, I found the whole detail of Justinian’s grants of supremacy to the pope formally given. The entire transaction was of the most authentic and regular kind, and suitable to the importance of the transfer.”[7]

Such were the circumstances attending the decree of Justinian. But the provisions of this decree could not at once be carried into effect; for Rome and Italy were held by the Ostrogoths, who were Arians in faith, and strongly opposed to the religion of Justinian and the pope. It was therefore evident that the Ostrogoths must be rooted out of Rome before the pope could exercise the power with which he had been clothed. To accomplish

this object, the Italian war was commenced in 534. The management of the campaign was entrusted to Belisarius. On his approach toward Rome, several cities forsook Vitiges, their Gothic and heretical sovereign, and joined the armies of the Catholic emperor. The Goths, deciding to delay offensive operations till spring, allowed Belisarius to enter Rome without opposition. “The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance.” Belisarius entered Rome Dec. 10, 536. But this was not an end of the struggle; for the Goths, rallying their forces, resolved to dispute his possession of the city by a regular siege. They commenced in March, 537. Belisarius feared despair and treachery on the part of the people. Several senators, and Pope Sylverius, on proof or suspicion of treason, were sent into exile. The emperor commanded the clergy to elect a new bishop. After solemnly invoking the Holy Ghost, says Gibbon, they elected the deacon Vigilius, who, by a bribe of two hundred pounds of gold, had purchased the honor.

The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the siege of Rome; but success did not attend their efforts. Their hosts melted away in frequent and bloody combats under the city walls; and the year and nine days during which the siege lasted, witnessed almost the entire consumption of the whole nation. In the month of March, 538, dangers beginning to threaten them from other quarters, they raised the siege, burned their tents, and retired in tumult and confusion from the city, with numbers scarcely sufficient to preserve their existence as a nation or their identity as a people.

Thus the Gothic horn, the last of the three, was plucked up before the little horn of Daniel 7. Nothing now stood in the way of the pope to prevent his exercising the power conferred upon him by Justinian five years before. The saints, times, and laws were now in his hands, not in purpose only, but in fact. And this must therefore be taken as the year when this abomination was placed, or set up, and as the point from which to date the predicted 1260 years of its supremacy.

Verse 32. And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.

Those that forsake the covenant, the holy Scriptures, and think more of the decrees of popes and the decisions of councils than they do of the word of God,--these shall he, the pope, corrupt by flatteries; that is, lead them on in their partisan zeal for himself by the bestowment of wealth, position, and honors.

At the same time a people shall exist who know their God; and these shall be strong, and do exploits. These were those who kept pure religion alive in the earth during the dark ages of papal tyranny, and performed marvelous acts of self-sacrifice and religious heroism in behalf of their faith. Prominent among these stand the Waldenses, Albigenses, Huguenots, etc.

Verse 33. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many, yet they shall fall

by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days.

The long period of papal persecution against those who were struggling to maintain the truth and instruct their fellow men in ways of righteousness, is here brought to view. The number of the days during which they were thus to fall is given in Daniel 7:25; 12:7; Revelation 12:6, 14; 13:5. The period is called, “a time, times, and the dividing of time;” “a time, times, and a half;” “a thousand two hundred and threescore days;” and “forty and two months.” It is the 1260 years of papal supremacy.

Verse 34. Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help, but many shall cleave to them with flatteries.

In Revelation 12, where this same papal persecution is brought to view, we read that the earth helped the woman by opening her mouth, and swallowing up the flood which the dragon cast out after her. The great Reformation by Luther and his co-workers furnished the help here foretold. The

German states espoused the Protestant cause, protected the reformers, and restrained the work of persecution so furiously carried on by the papal church. But when they should be helped, and the cause begin to become popular, many were to cleave unto them with flatteries, or embrace the cause from unworthy motives, be insincere, hollow-hearted, and speak smooth and friendly words through a policy of self-interest.

Verse 35. And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed.

Though restrained, the spirit of persecution was not destroyed. It broke out wherever there was opportunity. Especially was this the case in England. The religious state of that kingdom was fluctuating, it being sometimes under Protestant, and sometimes papal jurisdiction, according to the religion of the ruling house. The bloody Queen Mary was a mortal enemy to the Protestant cause, and multitudes fell victims to her relentless

persecutions. And this condition of affairs was to last more or less to the time of the end. 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 had for a time 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. That the oppression of the church by the papacy is what is here referred to, is evident, because that is the only one, with the possible exception of Revelation 2:10, connected with a “time appointed,” or a prophetic period.

Verse 36. And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak

marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that that is determined shall be done.

The king here introduced cannot denote the same power which was last noticed, namely, the papal power; for the specifications will not hold good if applied to that power.

Take a declaration in the next verse: “Nor regard any god.” This has never been true of the papacy. God and Christ, though often placed in a false position, have never been professedly set aside, and rejected from that system of religion. The only difficulty in applying it to a new power lies in the definite article the; for, it is urged, the expression “the king” would identify this as the one last spoken of. If it could be properly translated a king, there would be no difficulty; and it is said that some of the best Biblical critics give it this rendering, Mede, Wintle, Boothroyd, and others translating the passage, “A certain king shall do according to his will,” thus clearly introducing a

new power upon the stage of action.

Three peculiar features must appear in the power which fulfils this prophecy: (1) It must assume the character here delineated near the commencement of the time of the end, to which we were brought down in the preceding verse; (2) it must be a wilful power; (3) it must be an atheistical power; or perhaps the two latter specifications might be united by saying that its wilfulness would be manifested in the direction of atheism. A revolution exactly answering to this description did take place in France at the time indicated in the prophecy. Voltaire had sowed the seeds which bore their legitimate and baleful fruit. That boastful infidel, in his pompous but impotent self-conceit, had said, "I am weary of hearing people repeat that twelve men established the Christian religion. I will prove that one man may suffice to overthrow it." Associating with himself such men as Rousseau, D'Alembert, Diderot, and others, he undertook the work. They sowed to the wind, and reaped the whirlwind. Their efforts culminated in the revolution of 1793, when the Bible was

discarded, and the existence of the Deity denied, as the voice of the nation.

The historian thus describes this great religious change:--

“It was not enough, they said, for a regenerate nation to have dethroned earthly kings, unless she stretched out the arm of defiance toward those powers which superstition had represented as reigning over boundless space.”[8]

Again he says:--

“The constitutional bishop of Paris was brought forward to play the principal part in the most impudent and scandalous farce ever enacted in the face of a national representation. ... He was brought forward in full procession, to declare to the convention that the religion which he had taught so many years was, in every respect, a piece of PRIESTCRAFT, which had no foundation either in history or sacred truth. He disowned, in solemn and explicit terms, the EXISTENCE OF THE DEITY,

to whose worship he had been consecrated, and devoted himself in future to the homage of Liberty, Equality, Virtue, and Morality. He then laid on the table his episcopal decorations, and received a fraternal embrace from the president of the convention. Several apostate priests followed the example of this prelate. ... The world, for the FIRST time, heard an assembly of men, born and educated in civilization, and assuming the right to govern one of the finest of the European nations, uplift their united voice to deny the most solemn truth which man's soul receives, and renounce UNANIMOUSLY THE BELIEF AND WORSHIP OF DEITY.”[9]

A writer some years ago in Blackwood's Magazine said:--

“France is the only nation in the world concerning which the authentic record survives, that as a nation she lifted her hand in open rebellion against the Author of the universe. Plenty of blasphemers, plenty of infidels, there have been, and still continue to be, in England, Germany,

Spain, and elsewhere; but France stands apart in the world's history as the single state which, by the decree of her legislative assembly, pronounced that there was no God, and of which the entire population of the capital, and a vast majority elsewhere, women as well as men, danced and sang with joy in accepting the announcement."

But there are other and still more striking specifications which were fulfilled in this power.

Verse 37. 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.

The Hebrew word for woman is also translated wife; and Bishop Newton observes that this passage would be more properly rendered "the desire of wives." This would seem to indicate that this government, at the same time it declared that God did not exist, would trample under foot the law which God had given to regulate the marriage institution. And we find that the historian has, unconsciously perhaps, and if so all the more

significantly, coupled together the atheism and licentiousness of this government in the same order in which they are presented in the prophecy. He says:--

“Intimately connected with these laws affecting religion was that which reduced the union of marriage--the most sacred engagement which human beings can form, and the permanence of which leads most strongly to the consolidation of society--to the state of a mere civil contract of a transitory character, which any two persons might engage in and cast loose at pleasure, when their taste was changed or their appetite gratified. If fiends had set themselves at work to discover a mode of most effectually destroying whatever is venerable, graceful, or permanent in domestic life, and obtaining at the same time an assurance that the mischief which it was their object to create should be perpetuated from one generation to another, they could not have invented a more effectual plan than the degradation of marriage into a state of mere occasional cohabitation or licensed concubinage. Sophie Arnoult, an actress famous

for the witty things she said, described the republican marriage as the sacrament of adultery. These antireligious and antisocial regulations did not answer the purpose of the frantic and inconsiderate zealots by whom they had been urged forward.”[10]

“Nor regard any god.” In addition to the testimony already presented to show the utter atheism of the nation at this time, the following fearful language of madness and presumption is to be recorded:--

“The fear of God is so far from being the beginning of wisdom that it is the beginning of folly. Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness. The Supreme King, the God of the Jews and the Christians, is but a phantom. Jesus Christ is an impostor.”

Another writer says:--

“Aug. 26, 1792, an open profession of atheism was made by the National Convention; and

corresponding societies and atheistical clubs were everywhere fearlessly held in the French nation. Massacres and the reign of terror became the most horrid.”[11]

“Hebert, Chaumette, and their associates appeared at the bar, and declared that God did not exist.”[12]

At this juncture all religious worship was prohibited, except that of liberty and the country. The gold and silver plate of the churches was seized upon and desecrated. The churches were closed. The bells were broken and cast into cannon. The Bible was publicly burned. The sacramental vessels were paraded through the streets on an ass, in token of contempt. A week of ten days, instead of seven, was established, and death was declared, in conspicuous letters posted over their burial places, to be an eternal sleep. But the crowning blasphemy, if these orgies of hell admit of degrees, remained to be performed by the comedian Monvel, who, as a priest of Illuminism, said:--

“God, if you exist, avenge your injured name. I bid you defiance! You remain silent. You dare not launch your thunders! Who after this, will believe in your existence? The whole ecclesiastical establishment was destroyed.”[13]

Behold what man is when left to himself, and what infidelity is when the restraints of law are thrown off, and it has the power in its own hands! Can it be doubted that these scenes are what the omniscient One foresaw, and noted on the sacred page, when he pointed out a kingdom to arise which should exalt itself above every god, and disregard them all?

Verse 38. But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces: and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.

We meet a seeming contradiction in this verse. How can a nation disregard every god, and yet honor the god of forces? It could not at one and the same time hold both these positions; but it might

for a time disregard all gods, and then subsequently introduce another worship, and regard the god of forces. Did such a change occur in France at this time?--It did. The attempt to make France a godless nation produced such anarchy that the rulers feared the power would pass entirely out of their hands, and therefore perceived that, as a political necessity, some kind of worship must be introduced; but they did not intend to introduce any movement which would increase devotion, or develop any true spiritual character among the people, but only such as would keep themselves in power, and give them control of the national forces. A few extracts from history will show this. Liberty and country were at first the objects of adoration. "Liberty, equality, virtue, and morality," the very opposites of anything they possessed in fact or exhibited in practice, were words which they set forth as describing the deity of the nation. In 1794 the worship of the Goddess of Reason was introduced, and is thus described by the historian:--

"One of the ceremonies of this insane time stands unrivaled for absurdity combined with

impiety. The doors of the convention were thrown open to a band of musicians, preceded by whom, the members of the municipal body entered in solemn procession, singing a hymn in praise of liberty, and escorting, as the object of their future worship, a veiled female whom they termed the Goddess of Reason. Being brought within the bar, she was unveiled with great form, and placed on the right hand of the president, when she was generally recognized as a dancing girl of the opera, with whose charms most of the persons present were acquainted from her appearance on the stage, while the experience of individuals was further extended. To this person, as the fittest representative of that reason whom they worshiped, the National Convention of France rendered public homage. This impious and ridiculous mummerly had a certain fashion; and the installation of the Goddess of Reason was renewed and imitated throughout the nation, in such places where the inhabitants desired to show themselves equal to all the heights of the Revolution.”--Scott’s Life of Napoleon.

In introducing the worship of Reason, in 1794, Chaumette said:--

““Legislative fanaticism has lost its hold; it has given place to reason. We have left its temples; they are regenerated. To-day an immense multitude are assembled under its Gothic roofs, which, for the first time, will re-echo the voice of truth. There the French will celebrate their true worship--that of Liberty and Reason. There we will form new vows for the prosperity of the armies of the Republic; there we will abandon the worship of inanimate idols for that of Reason — this animated image, the masterpiece of creation.’

“A veiled female, arrayed in blue drapery, was brought into the convention; and Chaumette, taking her by the hand,--

““Mortals,’ said he, ‘cease to tremble before the powerless thunders of a God whom your fears have created. Henceforth acknowledge no divinity but Reason. I offer you its noblest and purest image; if you must have idols, sacrifice only to such as this.

... Fall before the august Senate of Freedom, Vail of Reason.’

“At the same time the goddess appeared, personified by a celebrated beauty, Madame Millard, of the opera, known in more than one character to most of the convention. The goddess, after being embraced by the president, was mounted on a magnificent car, and conducted, amidst an immense crowd, to the cathedral of Notre Dame, to take the place of the Deity. Then she was elevated on the high altar, and received the adoration of all present.

“On the 11th of November, the popular society of the museum entered the hall of the municipality, exclaiming: ‘Vive la Raison!’ and carrying on the top of a pole the half-burned remains of several books, among others the breviaries and the Old and New Testaments, which ‘expiated in a great fire,’ said the president, ‘all the fooleries which they have made the human race commit.’

“The most sacred relations of life were at the

same period placed on a new footing suited to the extravagant ideas of the times. Marriage was declared a civil contract, binding only during the pleasure of the contracting parties. Mademoiselle Arnoult, a celebrated comedian, expressed the public feeling when she called ‘marriage the sacrament of adultery.’”[14]

Truly, this was a strange god, whom the fathers of that generation knew not. No such deity had ever before been set up as an object of adoration. And well might it be called the god of forces; for the object of the movement was to cause the people to renew their covenant and repeat their vows for the prosperity of the armies of France. Read again a few lines from the extract already given:--

“We have left its temples; they are regenerated. To-day an immense multitude is assembled under its Gothic roofs, which for the first time, will re-echo the voice of truth. There the French will celebrate their true worship,--that of Liberty and Reason. There we will form new vows for the prosperity of the armies of the Republic.”[15]

Verse 39. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain.

The system of paganism which had been introduced into France, as exemplified in the worship of the idol set up in the person of the Goddess of Reason, and regulated by a heathen ritual which had been enacted by the National Assembly for the use of the French people, continued in force till the appointment of Napoleon to the provisional consulate of France in 1799. The adherents of this strange religion occupied the fortified places, the strongholds of the nation, as expressed in this verse.

But that which serves to identify the application of this prophecy to France, perhaps as clearly as any other particular, is the statement made in the last clause of the verse; namely, that they should “divide the land for gain.” Previous to the

Revolution, the landed property of France was owned by a few landlords in immense estates. These estates were required by the law to remain undivided, so that no heirs or creditors could partition them. But revolution knows no law; and in the anarchy that now reigned, as noted also in the eleventh of Revelation, the titles of the nobility were abolished, and their lands disposed of in small parcels for the benefit of the public exchequer. The government was in need of funds, and these large landed estates were confiscated, and sold at auction in parcels to suit purchasers. The historian thus records this unique transaction:--

“The confiscation of two thirds of the landed property of the kingdom, which arose from the decrees of the convention against the emigrants, clergy, and persons convicted at the Revolutionary Tribunals, ... placed funds worth above £700,000,000 sterling at the disposal of the government.”[16]

When did ever an event transpire, and in what country, fulfilling a prophecy more completely

than this? As the nation began to come to itself, a more rational religion was demanded, and the heathen ritual was abolished. The historian thus describes that event:--

“A third and bolder measure was the discarding of the heathen ritual, and reopening the churches for Christian worship; and of this the credit was wholly Napoleon’s, who had to contend with the philosophic prejudices of almost all his colleagues. He, in his conversation with them, made no attempts to represent himself a believer in Christianity, but stood only on the necessity of providing the people with the regular means of worship wherever it is meant to have a state of tranquillity. The priests who chose to take the oath of fidelity to the government were readmitted to their functions; and this wise measure was followed by the adherence of not less than 20,000 of these ministers of religion, who had hitherto languished in the prisons of France.”[17]

Thus terminated the Reign of Terror and the Infidel Revolution. Out of its ruins rose Bonaparte,

to guide the tumult to his own elevation, place himself at the head of the French government, and strike terror to the hearts of nations.

Verse 40. And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships: and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

After a long interval, the king of the south and the king of the north again appear on the stage of action. We have met with nothing to indicate that we are to look to any localities for these powers other than those which shortly after the death of Alexander, constituted respectively the southern and northern divisions of his empire. The king of the south was at that time Egypt, and the king of the north was Syria, including Thrace and Asia Minor. Egypt is still, by common agreement, the king of the south, while the territory which at first constituted the king of the north, has been for the past four hundred years wholly included within the

dominions of the sultan of Turkey. To Egypt and Turkey, then, in connection with the power last under consideration, we must look for a fulfillment of the verse before us.

This application of the prophecy calls for a conflict to spring up between Egypt and France, and Turkey and France, in 1798, which year, as we have seen, marked the beginning of the time of the end; and if history testifies that such a triangular war did break out in that year, it will be conclusive proof of the correctness of the application.

We inquire, therefore, Is it a fact that at the time of the end, Egypt did “push,” or make a comparatively feeble resistance, while Turkey did come like a resistless “whirlwind,” against “him,” that is, the government of France? We have already produced some evidence that the time of the end commenced in 1798; and no reader of history need be informed that in that very year a state of open hostility between France and Egypt was inaugurated.

To what extent this conflict owed its origin to the dreams of glory deliriously cherished in the ambitious brain of Napoleon Bonaparte, the historian will form his own opinion; but the French, or Bonaparte at least, contrived to make Egypt the aggressor. Thus, when in the invasion of that country he had secured his first foothold in Alexandria, he declared that “he had not come to ravage the country or to wrest it from the Grand Seignior, but merely to deliver it from the domination of the Mamelukes, and to revenge the outrages which they had committed against France.”[18]

Again the historian says: “Besides, he [Bonaparte] had strong reasons to urge against them [the Mamelukes]; for they had never ceased to ill-treat the French.”[19]

The beginning of the year 1798 found France indulging in immense projects against the English. The Directory desired Bonaparte to undertake at once a descent upon England; but he saw that no direct operations of that kind could be judiciously

undertaken before the fall, and he was unwilling to hazard his growing reputation by spending the summer in idleness. “But,” says the historian, “he saw a far-off land, where a glory was to be won which would gain a new charm in the eyes of his countrymen by the romance and mystery which hung upon the scene. Egypt, the land of the Pharaohs and the Ptolemies, would be a noble field for new triumphs.”[20]

But while still broader visions of glory opened before the eyes of Bonaparte in those Eastern historic lands, covering not Egypt only, but Syria, Persia, Hindustan, even to the Ganges itself, he had no difficulty in persuading the Directory that Egypt was the vulnerable point through which to strike at England by intercepting her Eastern trade. Hence, on the pretext above mentioned, the Egyptian campaign was undertaken.

The downfall of the papacy, which marked the termination of the 1260 years, and, according to verse 35, showed the commencement of the time of the end, occurred on the 10th of February, 1798,

when Rome fell into the hands of Berthier, the general of the French. On the 5th of March following, Bonaparte received the decree of the Directory relative to the expedition against Egypt. He left Paris May 3, and set sail from Toulon the 19th, with a large naval armament, consisting of 500 sail, carrying 40,000 soldiers and 10,000 sailors. July 5, Alexandria was taken, and immediately fortified. On the 23d the decisive battle of the pyramids was fought, in which the Mamelukes contested the field with valor and desperation, but were no match for the disciplined legions of the French. Murad Bey lost all his cannon, 400 camels, and 3000 men. The loss of the French was comparatively slight. On the 24th, Bonaparte entered Cairo, the capital of Egypt, and only waited the subsidence of the floods of the Nile to pursue Murad Bey to Upper Egypt, whither he had retired with his shattered cavalry, and so make a conquest of the whole country. Thus the king of the south was able to make but a feeble resistance.

At this juncture, however, the situation of Napoleon began to grow precarious. The French

fleet, which was his only channel of communication with France, was destroyed by the English under Nelson at Aboukir; and on September 2 of this same year, 1798, the sultan of Turkey, under feelings of jealousy against France, artfully fostered by the English ambassadors at Constantinople, and exasperated that Egypt, so long a semi-dependency of the Ottoman empire, should be transformed into a French province, declared war against France. Thus the king of the north (Turkey) came against him (France) in the same year that the king of the south (Egypt) “pushed,” and both “at the time of the end;” which is another conclusive proof that the year 1798 is the year which begins that period; and all of which is a demonstration that this application of the prophecy is correct; for so many events meeting so accurately the specifications of the prophecy could not take place together, and not be a fulfillment of the prophecy.

Was the coming of the king of the north, or Turkey, like the whirlwind in comparison with the pushing of Egypt? Napoleon had crushed the

armies of Egypt; he essayed to do the same thing with the armies of the sultan, who were menacing an attack from the side of Asia. Feb. 27, 1799, with 18,000 men, he commenced his march from Cairo to Syria. He first took the fort of El-Arish, in the desert, then Jaffa (the Joppa of the Bible), conquered the inhabitants of Naplous at Zeta, and was again victorious at Jafet. Meanwhile, a strong body of Turks had intrenched themselves at St. Jean d’Acre, while swarms of Mussulmans gathered in the mountains of Samaria, ready to swoop down upon the French when they should besiege Acre. Sir Sidney Smith at the same time appeared before St. Jean d’Acre with two English ships, reinforced the Turkish garrison of that place, and captured the apparatus for the siege, which Napoleon had sent across by sea from Alexandria. A Turkish fleet soon appeared in the offing, which, with the Russian and English vessels then co-operating with them, constituted the “many ships” of the king of the north.

On the 18th of March the siege commenced. Napoleon was twice called away to save some

French divisions from falling into the hands of the Mussulman hordes that filled the country. Twice also a breach was made in the wall of the city; but the assailants were met with such fury by the garrison, that they were obliged, despite their best efforts, to give over the struggle. After a continuance of sixty days, Napoleon raised the siege, sounded, for the first time in his career, the note of retreat, and on the 21st of May, 1799, commenced to retrace his steps to Egypt.

“And he shall overflow and pass over.” We have found events which furnish a very striking fulfillment of the pushing of the king of the south, and the whirlwind onset of the king of the north against the French power. Thus far there is quite a general agreement in the application of the prophecy. We now reach a point where the views of expositors begin to diverge. To whom do the words, he “shall overflow and pass over,” refer?-- to France or to the king of the north? The application of the remainder of this chapter depends upon the answer to this question. From this point two lines of interpretation are

maintained. Some apply the words to France, and endeavor to find a fulfillment in the career of Napoleon. Others apply them to the king of the north, and accordingly point for a fulfillment to events in the history of Turkey. We speak of these two positions only, as the attempt which some make to bring in the papacy here is so evidently wide of the mark that its consideration need not detain us. If neither of these positions is free from difficulty, as we presume no one will claim that it is, absolutely, it only remains that we take that one which has the weight of evidence in its favor. And we shall find one in favor of which the evidence does so greatly preponderate, to the exclusion of all others, as scarcely to leave any room for doubt in regard to the view here mentioned.

Respecting the application of this portion of the prophecy to Napoleon or to France under his leadership, so far as we are acquainted with his history, we do not find events which we can urge with any degree of assurance as the fulfillment of the remaining portion of this chapter, and hence do not see how it can be thus applied. It must, then, be

fulfilled by Turkey, unless it can be shown (1) that the expression “king of the north” does not apply to Turkey, or (2) that there is some other power besides either France or the king of the north which fulfilled this part of the prediction. But if Turkey, now occupying the territory which constituted the northern division of Alexander’s empire, is not the king of the north of this prophecy, then we are left without any principle to guide us in the interpretation; and we presume all will agree that there is no room for the introduction of any other power here. The French king, and the king of the north, are the only ones to whom the prediction can apply. The fulfillment must lie between them.

Some considerations certainly favor the idea that there is, in the latter part of verse 40, a transfer of the burden of the prophecy from the French power to the king of the north. The king of the north is introduced just before, as coming forth like a whirlwind, with chariots, horsemen, and many ships. The collision between this power and the French we have already noticed. The king of the north, with the aid of his allies, gained the day in

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

Verse 41. He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon.

The facts just stated relative to the campaign of the French against Turkey, and the repulse of the former at St. Jean d’Acre, were drawn chiefly from the Encyclopedia Americana. From the same source we gather further particulars respecting the

retreat of the French into Egypt, and the additional reverses which compelled them to evacuate that country.

Abandoning a campaign in which one third of the army had fallen victims to war and the plague, the French retired from St. Jean d’Acre, and after a fatiguing march of twenty-six days reentered Cairo in Egypt. They thus abandoned all the conquests they had made in Judea; and the “glorious land,” Palestine, with all its provinces, here called “countries,” fell back again under the oppressive rule of the Turk. Edom, Moab, and Ammon, lying outside the limits of Palestine, south and east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, were out of the line of march of the Turks from Syria to Egypt, and so escaped the ravages of that campaign. On this passage Adam Clarke has the following note: “These and other Arabians, they [the Turks] have never been able to subdue. They still occupy the deserts, and receive a yearly pension of forty thousand crowns of gold from the Ottoman emperors to permit the caravans with the pilgrims for Mecca to have a free passage.”

Verse 42. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape.

On the retreat of the French to Egypt, a Turkish fleet landed 18,000 men at Aboukir. Napoleon immediately attacked the place, completely routing the Turks, and re-establishing his authority in Egypt. But at this point, severe reverses to the French arms in Europe called Napoleon home to look after the interests of his own country. The command of the troops in Egypt was left with General Kleber, who, after a period of untiring activity for the benefit of the army, was murdered by a Turk in Cairo, and the command was left with Abdallah Menou. With an army which could not be recruited, every loss was serious.

Meantime, the English government, as the ally of the Turks, had resolved to wrest Egypt from the French. March 13, 1800, an English fleet disembarked a body of troops at Aboukir. The French gave battle the next day, but were forced to

retire. On the 18th Aboukir surrendered. On the 28th reinforcements were brought by a Turkish fleet, and the grand vizier approached from Syria with a large army. The 19th, Rosetta surrendered to the combined forces of the English and Turks. At Ramanieh a French corps of 4000 men was defeated by 8000 English and 6000 Turks. At Elmenayer 5000 French were obliged to retreat, May 16, by the vizier, who was pressing forward to Cairo with 20,000 men. The whole French army was now shut up in Cairo and Alexandria. Cairo capitulated June 27, and Alexandria, September 2. Four weeks after, Oct. 1, 1801, the preliminaries of peace were signed at London.

“Egypt shall not escape” were the words of the prophecy. This language seems to imply that Egypt would be brought into subjection to some power from whose dominion it would desire to be released. As between the French and Turks, how did this question stand with the Egyptians? — They preferred French rule. In R. R. Madden’s *Travels in Egypt, Nubia, Turkey, and Palestine in the years 1824-1827*, published in London in 1829,

it is stated that the French were much regretted by the Egyptians, and extolled as benefactors; that “for the short period they remained, they left traces of amelioration;” and that, if they could have established their power, Egypt would now be comparatively civilized. In view of this testimony, the language would not be appropriate if applied to the French; the Egyptians did not desire to escape out of their hands. They did desire to escape from the hands of the Turks, but could not.

Verse 43. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. In illustration of this verse we quote the following from Historic Echoes of the Voice of God, p. 49:--

“History gives the following facts: When the French were driven out of Egypt, and the Turks took possession, the sultan permitted the Egyptians to reorganize their government as it was before the French invasion. He asked of the Egyptians neither

soldiers, guns, nor fortifications, but left them to manage their own affairs independently, with the important exception of putting the nation under tribute to himself. In the articles of agreement between the sultan and the pasha of Egypt, it was stipulated that the Egyptians should pay annually to the Turkish government a certain amount of gold and silver, and ‘six hundred thousand measures of corn, and four hundred thousand of barley.’”

“The Libyans and the Ethiopians,” “the Cushim,” says Dr. Clarke, “the unconquered Arabs,” who have sought the friendship of the Turks, and many of whom are tributary to them to the present time.

Verse 44. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.

On this verse Dr. Clarke has a note which is worthy of mention. He says: “This part of the prophecy is allowed to be yet unfulfilled.” His note

was printed in 1825. In another portion of his comment, he says: “If the Turkish power be understood, as in the preceding verses, it may mean that the Persians on the east, and the Russians on the north, will at some time greatly embarrass the Ottoman government.”

Between this conjecture of Dr. Clarke’s, written in 1825, and the Crimean war of 1853-1856, there is certainly a striking coincidence, inasmuch as the very powers he mentions, the Persians on the east and the Russians on the north, were the ones which instigated that conflict. Tidings from these powers troubled him (Turkey). Their attitude and movements incited the sultan to anger and revenge. Russia, being the more aggressive party, was the object of attack. Turkey declared war on her powerful northern neighbor in 1853. The world looked on in amazement to see a government which had long been called “the Sick Man of the East,” a government whose army was dispirited and demoralized, whose treasuries were empty, whose rulers were vile and imbecile, and whose subjects were rebellious and threatening

secession, rush with such impetuosity into the conflict. The prophecy said that they should go forth with “great fury;” and when they thus went forth in the war aforesaid, they were described, in the profane vernacular of an American writer, as “fighting like devils.” England and France, it is true, soon came to the help of Turkey; but she went forth in the manner described, and as is reported, gained important victories before receiving the assistance of these powers.

Verse 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.

We have now traced the prophecy of the 11th of Daniel down, step by step, and have thus far found events to fulfill all its predictions. It has all been wrought out into history except this last verse. The predictions of the preceding verse having been fulfilled within the memory of the generation now living, we are carried by this one past our own day into the future; for no power has yet performed the

acts here described. But it is to be fulfilled; and its fulfillment must be accomplished by that power which has been continuously the subject of the prophecy from the 40th verse down to this 45th verse. If the application to which we have given the preference in passing over these verses, is correct, we must look to Turkey to make the move here indicated.

And let it be noted how readily this could be done. Palestine, which contains the “glorious holy mountain,” the mountain on which Jerusalem stands, “between the seas,” the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, is a Turkish province; and if the Turk should be obliged to retire hastily from Europe, he could easily go to any point within his own dominions to establish -his temporary headquarters, here appropriately described as the tabernacles, movable dwellings, of his palace; but he could not go beyond them. The most notable point within the limit of Turkey in Asia, is Jerusalem.

And mark, also, how applicable the language to

that power: "He shall come to his end, and none shall help him." This expression plainly implies that this power has previously received help. And what are the facts?--In the war against France in 1798-1801, England and Russia assisted the sultan. In the war between Turkey and Egypt in 1838-1840, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia intervened in behalf of Turkey. In the Crimean war in 1853-1856, England, France, and Sardinia supported the Turks. And in the late Russo-Turkish war, the great powers of Europe interfered to arrest the progress of Russia. And without the help received in all these instances, Turkey would probably have failed to maintain her position. And it is a notorious fact that since the fall of the Ottoman supremacy in 1840, the empire has existed only through the sufferance of the great powers of Europe. Without their pledged support, she would not be long able to maintain even a nominal existence; and when that is withdrawn, she must come to the ground. So the prophecy says the king comes to his end and none help him; and he comes to his end, as we may naturally infer because none help him,--because the support

previously rendered is withdrawn.

Have we any indications that this part of the prophecy is soon to be fulfilled? As we raise this inquiry, we look, not to dim and distant ages in the past, whose events, so long ago transferred to the page of history, now interest only the few, but to the present living, moving world. Are the nations which are now on the stage of action, with their disciplined armies and their multiplied weapons of war, making any movement looking to this end?

All eyes are now turned with interest toward Turkey; and the unanimous opinion of statesmen is, that the Turk is destined soon to be driven from Europe. Some years since, a correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing from the East, said: "Russia is arming to the teeth... to be avenged on Turkey... Two campaigns of the Russian army will drive the Turks out of Europe." Carleton, formerly a correspondent of the Boston Journal, writing from Paris under the head of "The Eastern Question," said:--

“The theme of conversation during the last week has not been concerning the Exposition, but the ‘Eastern Question.’ To what will it grow? Will there be war? What is Russia going to do? What position are the Western powers going to take? These are questions discussed not only in the cafés and restaurants, but in the Corps Legislatif. Perhaps I cannot render better service at the present time than to group together some facts in regard to this question, which, according to present indications, are to engage the immediate attention of the world. What is the ‘Eastern Question’? It is not easy to give a definition; for to Russia it may mean one thing, to France another, and to Austria still another; but sifted of every side issue, it may be reduced to this,-- the driving of the Turk into Asia, and a scramble for his territory.”

Again he says:--

“Surely the indications are that the sultan is destined soon to see the western border of his dominions break off, piece by piece. But what will follow? Are Roumania, Servia, Bosnia, and

Albania to set up as an independent sovereignty together, and take position among the nations? or is there to be a grand rush for the estate of the Ottoman? But that is of the future, a future not far distant.”

Shortly after the foregoing extracts were written, an astonishing revolution took place in Europe. France, one of the parties, if not the chief one, in the alliance to uphold the Ottoman throne, was crushed by Prussia in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870. Prussia, another party, was too much in sympathy with Russia to interfere with her movements against the Turk. England, a third, in an embarrassed condition financially could not think of entering into any contest in behalf of Turkey without the alliance of France. Austria had not recovered from the blow she received in her preceding war with Prussia; and Italy was busy with the matter of stripping the pope of his temporal power, and making Rome the capital of the nation. A writer in the New York Tribune remarked that if Turkey should become involved in difficulty with Russia, she could count on the

prompt “assistance of Austria, France, and England.” But none of these powers, nor any others who would be likely to assist Turkey, were at the time referred to in any condition to do so, owing principally to the sudden and unexpected humiliation of the French nation, as stated above.

Russia then saw that her opportunity had come. She accordingly startled all the powers of Europe in the fall of the same memorable year, 1870, by stepping forth and deliberately announcing that she designed to regard no longer the stipulations of the treaty of 1856. This treaty, concluded at the termination of the Crimean war, restricted the warlike operations of Russia in the Black Sea. But Russia must have the privilege of using those waters for military purposes, if she would carry out her designs against Turkey; hence her determination to disregard that treaty just at the time when none of the powers were in a condition to enforce it.

The ostensible reason urged by Russia for her movements in this direction, was, that she might

have a sea front and harbors in a warmer climate than the shores of the Baltic; but the real design was against Turkey. Thus the Churchman, of Hartford, Conn., in an able article on the present “European Medley,” states that Russia in her encroachments upon Turkey, “is not merely seeking a sea frontier, and harbors lying on the great highways of commerce, unclosed by arctic winters, but that, with a feeling akin to that which inspired the Crusades, she is actuated by an intense desire to drive the Crescent from the soil of Europe.”

This desire on the part of Russia has been cherished as a sacred legacy since the days of Peter the Great. That famous prince, becoming sole emperor of Russia in 1688, at the age of sixteen, enjoyed a prosperous reign of thirty-seven years, to 1725, and left to his successors a celebrated “last will and testament,” imparting certain important instructions for their constant observance. The 9th article of that “will” enjoined the following policy:-

-

“To take every possible means of gaining Constantinople and the Indies (for he who rules there will be the true sovereign of the world); excite war continually in Turkey and Persia; establish fortresses in the Black Sea; get control of the sea by degrees, and also of the Baltic, which is a double point, necessary to the realization of our project; accelerate as much as possible the decay of Persia; penetrate to the Persian Gulf; re-establish, if possible, by the way of Syria, the ancient commerce of the Levant; advance to the Indies, which are the great depot of the world. Once there, we can do without the gold of England.”

The eleventh article reads: “Interest the House of Austria in the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, and quiet their dissensions at the moment of the conquest of Constantinople (having excited war among the old states of Europe), by giving to Austria a portion of the conquest, which afterward will or can be reclaimed.”

The following facts in Russian history will show how persistently this line of policy has been

followed:--

“In 1696, Peter the Great wrested the Sea of Azov from the Turks, and kept it. Next, Catharine the Great won the Crimea. In 1812, by the peace of Bucharest, Alexander I obtained Moldavia, and the prettily-named province of Bessarabia, with its apples, peaches, and cherries. Then came the great Nicholas, who won the right of the free navigation of the Black Sea, the Dardanelles, and the Danube, but whose inordinate greed led him into the Crimean war, by which he lost Moldavia, and the right of navigating the Danube, and the unrestricted navigation of the Black Sea. This was no doubt a severe repulse to Russia, but it did not extinguish the designs upon the Ottoman power, nor did it contribute in any essential degree to the stability of the Ottoman empire. Patiently biding her time, Russia has been watching and waiting, and in 1870, when all the Western nations were watching the Franco-Prussian war, she announced to the powers that she would be no longer bound by the treaty of 1856, which restricted her use of the Black Sea; and since that time that sea has been, as

it was one thousand years ago, to all intents and purposes, a mare Russicum.”[21]

Napoleon Bonaparte well understood the designs of Russia, and the importance of her contemplated movements. While a prisoner on the island of St. Helena, in conversation with his governor, Sir Hudson Lowe, he gave utterance to the following opinion:--

“In the course of a few years, Russia will have Constantinople, part of Turkey, and all of Greece. This I hold to be as certain as if it had already taken place. All the cajolery and flattery that Alexander practiced upon me was to gain my consent to effect that object. I would not give it, foreseeing that the equilibrium of Europe would be destroyed. Once mistress of Constantinople, Russia gets all the commerce of the Mediterranean, becomes a naval power, and then God knows what may happen. The object of my invasion of Russia was to prevent this, by the interposition between her and Turkey of a new state, which I meant to call into existence as a barrier to her Eastern

encroachments.”

Kossuth, also, took the same view of the political board, when he said: “In Turkey will be decided the fate of the world.”

The words of Bonaparte, quoted above, in reference to the destruction of “the equilibrium of Europe,” reveal the motive which has induced the great powers to tolerate so long the existence on the Continent of a nation which is false in religion, destitute of humanity, and a disgrace to modern civilization. Constantinople is regarded, by general consent, as the grand strategic point of Europe; and the powers have each sagacity or jealousy enough to see, or think they see, the fact that if any one of the European powers gains permanent possession of that point, as Russia desires to do, that power will be able to dictate terms to the rest of Europe. This position no one of the powers is willing that any other power should possess; and the only apparent way to prevent it is for them all to combine, by tacit or express agreement, to keep each other out, and suffer the unspeakable Turk to

drag along his sickly Asiatic existence on the soil of Europe. This is preserving that “balance of power” over which they are all so sensitive. But this cannot always continue. “He shall come to his end and none shall help him.” The sick man seems determined to reduce himself most speedily to such a degree of offensiveness that Europe will be obliged to drive him into Asia, as a matter of safety to its own civilization.

When Russia, in 1870, announced her intention to disregard the treaty of 1856, the other powers, though incapable of doing anything, nevertheless, as was becoming their ideas of their own importance, made quite a show of offended dignity. A congress of nations was demanded, and the demand was granted. The congress was held, and proved, as everybody expected it would prove, simply a farce so far as restraining Russia was concerned. The San Francisco Chronicle of March, 1871, had this paragraph touching “The Eastern-Question Congress:”--

“It is quite evident that, as far as directing or

controlling the action of the Muscovite government is concerned, the congress is little better than a farce. England originated the idea of the congress, simply because it afforded her an opportunity of abandoning, without actual dishonor, a position she had assumed rather too hastily, and Russia was complacent enough to join in the 'little game,' feeling satisfied that she would lose nothing by her courtesy. Turkey is the only aggrieved party in this dextrous arrangement. She is left face to face with her hereditary and implacable enemy; for the nations that previously assisted her, ostensibly through friendship and love of justice, but really through motives of self-interest, have evaded the challenge so openly flung into the arena by the Northern Colossus. It is easy to foresee the end of this conference. Russia will get all she requires, another step will be taken toward the realization of Peter the Great's will, and the sultan will receive a foretaste of his apparently inevitable doom--expulsion from Europe."

From that point the smoldering fires of the "Eastern Question" continued to agitate and alarm

the nations of Europe, till in 1877 the flames burst forth anew. On the 24th of April in that year, Russia declared war against Turkey, ostensibly to defend the Christians against the inhuman barbarity of the Turks, really to make another trial to carry out her long-cherished determination to drive the Turk from Europe. The events and the results of that war of 1877-1878, are of such recent date that the general reader can easily recall them. It was evident from the first that Turkey was overmatched. Russia pushed her approaches till the very outposts of Constantinople were occupied by her forces. But diplomacy on the part of the alarmed nations of Europe again stepped in to suspend for awhile the contest. The Berlin Congress was held Jan. 25, 1878. Turkey agreed to sign conditions of peace. The conditions were that the straits of the Dardanelles should be open to Russian ships; that Russians should occupy Batoum, Kars, and Erzeroum; that Turkey should pay Russia £20,000,000 sterling (nearly \$100,000,000), as a war indemnity; and that the treaty should be signed at Constantinople. In making this announcement, the Allgemeine

Zeitung added: “The eventual entry of the Russians into Constantinople cannot longer be regarded as impracticable.”

The Detroit Evening News of Feb 20, 1878, said:--

“According to the latest version of the peace conditions, Turkey--besides her territorial losses, the surrender of a few ironclads, the repairs of the mouth of the Danube, the reimbursement of Russian capital invested in Turkish securities, the indemnity to Russian subjects in Constantinople for war losses, and the maintenance of about 100,000 prisoners of war--will have to pay to Russia, in round figures, a sum equivalent to about \$552,000,000 in our money. The unestimated items will easily increase this to six hundred million. With her taxable territory reduced almost to poverty-stricken Asia Minor, and with her finances at present in a condition of absolute chaos, it is difficult to see where she is going to get the money, however ready her present rulers may be to sign the contract.

“The proposition amounts to giving the czar a permanent mortgage on the whole empire, and contains an implied threat that he may foreclose at any time, by the seizure of the remainder of European Turkey. In this last aspect, all Europe has a vital interest in the matter, and particularly England, even if the conditions were not in themselves calculated to drive English creditors crazy, by destroying their last hope of ever getting a cent of their large investments in Turkish bonds. It makes Russia a preferred creditor of the bankrupt Porte, with the additional advantage of being assignee in possession, leaving creditors with prior claims out in the cold.”

The following paragraph taken from the Philadelphia Public Ledger, August, 1878, sets forth an instructive and very suggestive exhibit of the shrinkage of Turkish territory within the past sixty years, and especially as the result of the war of 1877:--

“Any one who will take the trouble to look at a

map of Turkey in Europe dating back about sixty years, and compare that with the new map sketched by the treaty of San Stefano as modified by the Berlin Congress, will be able to form a judgment of the march of progress that is pressing the Ottoman power out of Europe. Then, the northern boundary of Turkey extended to the Carpathian Mountains, and eastward of the River Sereth it embraced Moldavia as far north nearly as the 47th degree of north latitude. That map embraced also what is now the kingdom of Greece. It covered all of Servia and Bosnia. But by the year 1830 the northern frontier of Turkey was driven back from the Carpathians to the south bank of the Danube, the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia being emancipated from Turkish domination, and subject only to the payment of an annual tribute in money to the Porte. South of the Danube, the Servians had won a similar emancipation for their country. Greece also had been enabled to establish her independence. Then, as recently, the Turk was truculent and obstinate. Russia and Great Britain proposed to make Greece a tributary state, retaining the sovereignty of the Porte. This was

refused, and the result was the utter destruction of the powerful Turkish fleet at Navarino, and the erection of the independent kingdom of Greece. Thus Turkey in Europe was pressed back on all sides. Now, the northern boundary, which was so recently at the Danube, has been driven south to the Balkans. Roumania and Servia have ceased even to be tributary, and have taken their place among independent states. Bosnia has gone under the protection of Austria, as Roumania did under that of Russia in 1829. 'Rectified' boundaries give Turkish territory to Servia, Montenegro, and Greece.

Bulgaria takes the place of Roumania as a self-governing principality, having no dependence on the Porte, and paying only an annual tribute. Even south of the Balkans the power of the Turk is crippled, for Roumelia is to have 'home rule' under a Christian governor. And so again the frontier of Turkey in Europe is pressed back on all sides, until the territory left is but the shadow of what it was sixty years ago. To produce this result has been the policy and the battle of Russia for more than half a

century; for nearly that space of time it has been the struggle of some of the other ‘powers’ to maintain the ‘integrity’ of the Turkish empire. Which policy has succeeded, and which failed, a comparison of maps at intervals of twenty-five years will show. Turkey in Europe has been shriveled up in the last half century. It is shrinking back and back toward Asia, and, though all the ‘powers’ but Russia should unite their forces to maintain the Ottoman system in Europe, there is a manifest destiny visible in the history of the last fifty years that must defeat them.”

A correspondent of the Christian Union, writing from Constantinople under date of Oct. 8, 1878, said:--

“When we consider the difficulties which now beset this feeble and tottering government, the only wonder is that it can stand for a day. Aside from the funded debt of \$1,000,000,000 upon which it pays no interest, it has an enormous floating debt representing all the expenses of the war; its employees are unpaid; its army has not been

disbanded or even reduced; and its paper money has become almost worthless. The people have lost heart, and expect every day some new revolution or a renewal of the war. The government does not know which to distrust most, its friends or its enemies.”

Since 1878 the tendency of all movements in the East has been in the same direction, foreboding greater pressure upon the Turkish government in the direction of its expulsion from the soil of Europe. The occupation of Egypt by the English, which took place in 1883, is another step toward the inevitable result, and furnishes a movement which the Independent, of New York, ventures to call “the beginning of the end.”

In 1895 the world was startled by the report of the terrible atrocities inflicted by the Turks and Kurds upon the Armenians. Reliable reports show that many thousands have been slaughtered, with every circumstance of fiendish cruelty. The nations through their ambassadors protest and threaten; the sultan promises, but does nothing. He evidently has

not the disposition, if he has the power, to stay the tide of blood. Fanatical Moslems seem seized with a frenzy to destroy all the Armenian men and take their wives and children to slavery or a more lamentable fate. At this writing (January, 1897) thousands of widows and orphans are said to be wandering in the mountains of Armenia, perishing of cold and hunger; and they stretch out despairing hands to England and America to save them from total destruction. A thrill of horror has run through Christendom, and a cry is rising from all lands, Let the Turk be driven out, and come to his end! And yet the selfishness of the nations, and their jealousy of each other, restrain their hands from arresting this carnival of slaughter and ruin, by unseating the terrible Turk. How long, O Lord, how long?

Thus all evidence goes to show that the Turk must soon leave 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.”

Time will soon determine this matter; and it may be but a few months. 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.[22]

Notas:

1. Prideaux, Vol. I, p. 378.
2. Ancient History, Book 18, chap. 50.
3. 1 Mac. 8; Prideaux, II, 166; Josephus’s Antiquities, book 12, chap. 10, sec. 6.
4. Decline and Fall, Vol. IV, p. 526.
5. Second Advent Manual, pp. 79-81.
6. Croly, pp. 114, 115.
7. Apocalypse, p. 8.
8. Scott’s Napoleon, Vol. I, p. 172.
9. Id., Vol. I, p. 173.
10. Scott’s Napoleon, Vol. I, p. 173.
11. Smith’s Key to Revelation, p. 323.

12. Alison, Vol. I, p. 150.
13. Scott's Napoleon, Vol. I, p. 173.
14. Id.
15. During the time while the fantastic worship of reason was the national craze, the leaders of the revolution are known to history as "the atheists." But it was soon perceived that a religion with more powerful sanctions than the one then in vogue must be instituted, to hold the people. A form of worship therefore followed in which the object of adoration was the "Supreme Being." It was equally hollow so far as any reformation of life and vital godliness were concerned, but it took hold upon the supernatural. And while the goddess of Reason was indeed a "strange god," the statement in regard to honoring the "God of forces," may perhaps more appropriately be referred to this latter phase. See Thiers's French Revolution.
16. Alison, Vol. IV, p. 151.
17. Lockhart's Life of Napoleon, Vol. I, p. 154.
18. Thiers's French Revolution, Vol. IV, p. 268.
19. Id., p. 273.

20. White's History of France, p. 469.
21. San Francisco Chronicle.
22. Since the foregoing was written, the situation in Turkey has grown continually worse. Armenian massacres have continued, and between January and September, 1896, rebellion against the Turk broke out in Crete and Macedonia. Besides this, fanatical Moslems themselves show signs of dissatisfaction with the sultan, and threaten revolution. Serious disturbance has just taken place (September, 1896) in Constantinople, resulting in the slaughter of some two thousand Armenians. The crown-heads of Europe are now in consultation in regard to the disposition of the affairs of Turkey, with the prospect that some determination will be reached, and thus the only obstacle in the way of the dissolution of the Turkish empire be removed.

Chapter 12

Closing Scenes

Verse 1. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

A definite time is introduced in this verse, not a time revealed in names or figures which specify any particular year or month or day, but a time made definite by the occurrence of a certain event with which it stands connected. "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 very 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. But here are the events, to come, as we believe, in the following order: (1) Further pressure brought to bear in some way upon the Turk; (2) His retirement from Europe; (3) His final stand at Jerusalem; (4) The standing up of Michael, or the beginning of the reign of Christ, and his coming in the clouds of heaven. And it is not reasonable to suppose that any great amount of

time will elapse between these events.

Who, then, is Michael? and what is his standing up?--Michael is called, in Jude 9, the archangel. This means the chief angel, or the head over the angels. There is but one. Who is he? — He is the one whose voice is heard from heaven when the dead are raised. 1 Thessalonians 4:16. And whose voice is heard in connection with that event?--The voice of our Lord Jesus Christ. John 5:28. Tracing back the evidence with this fact as a basis, we reach the following conclusions: The voice of the Son of God is the voice of the archangel; the archangel, then, is the Son of God. But the archangel is Michael; hence also Michael is the Son of God. The expression of Daniel, “the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people,” is alone sufficient to identify the one here spoken of as the Saviour of men. He is the Prince of life (Acts 3:15); and God hath exalted him to be a “Prince and a Saviour.” Acts 5:31. He is the great Prince. There is no one greater, save the sovereign Father.

And he “standeth for the children of thy people.” He condescends to take the servants of God in this poor mortal state, and redeem them for the subjects of his future kingdom. He stands for us. His people are essential to his future purposes, an inseparable part of the purchased inheritance; and they are to be the chief agents of that joy in view of which Christ endured all the sacrifice and suffering which have marked his intervention in behalf of the fallen race. Amazing honor! Be everlasting gratitude repaid him for his condescension and mercy unto us! Be his the kingdom, power, and glory, forever and ever!

We now come to the second question, What is the standing up of Michael? The key to the interpretation of this expression is furnished us in verses 2 and 3 of chapter 11: “There shall stand up yet three kings in Persia;” “A mighty king shall stand up, that shall reign with great dominion.” There can be no doubt as to the meaning of these expressions in these instances. They signify to take the kingdom, to reign. The same expression in the verse under consideration must mean the same. At

that time, Michael shall stand up, shall take the kingdom, shall commence his reign.

But is not Christ reigning now?--Yes, associated with his Father on the throne of universal dominion. (Ephesians 1:20-22; Revelation 3:21) But this throne, or kingdom, he gives up at the end of this dispensation (1 Corinthians 15:24); and then he commences his reign brought to view in the text, when he stands up, or takes his own kingdom, the long-promised throne of his father David, and establishes a dominion of which there shall be no end. (Luke 1:32, 33)

An examination of all the events that constitute, or are inseparably connected with, this change in the position of our Lord, does not come within the scope of this work. Suffice it to say that then the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom "of our Lord and of his Christ." His priestly robes are laid aside for royal vesture. The work of mercy is done, and the probation of our race is ended. Then, he that is filthy is beyond the hope of recovery; and

he that is holy is beyond the danger of falling. All cases are decided. And from that time on, till the terrified nations behold the majestic form of their insulted King in the clouds of heaven, the nations are broken as with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel, by a time of trouble such as never was, a series of judgments unparalleled in the world's history, culminating in the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven in flaming fire, to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel. (2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8; Revelation 11:15; 22:11, 12)

Thus momentous are the events introduced by the standing up of Michael. And he thus stands up, or takes the kingdom, marking the introduction of this decisive period in human history, for some length of time before he returns personally to this earth. How important, then, that we have a knowledge of his position, that we may be able to trace the progress of his work, and understand when that thrilling moment draws near which ends his intercession in behalf of mankind, and fixes the destiny of all forever.

But how are we to know this? How are we to determine what is transpiring in the far-off heaven of heavens, in the sanctuary above?--God has been so good as to place the means of knowing this in our hands. When certain great events take place on earth, he has told us what events synchronizing with them, occur in heaven. By things which are seen, we thus learn of things that are unseen. As we "look through nature up to nature's God," so through terrestrial phenomena and events we trace great movements in the heavenly world. When the king of the north plants the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, a movement for which we already behold the initial steps, then Michael, our Lord, stands up, or receives from his Father the kingdom, preparatory to his return to this earth. Or it might have been expressed in words like these: Then our Lord ceases his work as our great High Priest, and the probation of the world is finished. The great prophecy of the 2300 days gives us definitely the commencement of the final division of the work in the sanctuary in heaven. The verse before us gives

us data whereby we can discover approximately the time of its close.

In connection with the standing up of Michael, there occurs a time of trouble such as never was. In Matthew 24:21 we read of a period of tribulation such as never was before it, nor should be after it. This tribulation, fulfilled in the oppression and slaughter of the church by the papal power, is already past; while the time of trouble of Daniel 12:1, is, according to the view we take, still future. How can there be two times of trouble, many years apart, each of them greater than any that had been before it, or should be after it? To avoid difficulty here, let this distinction be carefully noticed: The tribulation spoken of in Matthew is tribulation upon the church. Christ is there speaking to his disciples, and of his disciples in coming time. They were the ones involved, and for their sake the days of tribulation were to be shortened. Verse 22. Whereas, the time of trouble mentioned in Daniel is not a time of religious persecution, but of national calamity. There has been nothing like it since there was--not a church, but--a nation. This

comes upon the world. This is the last trouble to come upon the world in its present state. In Matthew there is reference made to time beyond that tribulation; for after that was past, there was never to be any like it upon the people of God. But there is no reference here in Daniel to future time after the trouble here mentioned; for this closes up this world's history. It includes the seven last plagues of Revelation 16, and culminates in the revelation of the Lord Jesus, coming upon his pathway of clouds in flaming fire, to visit destruction upon his enemies who would not have him to reign over them. But out of this tribulation every one shall be delivered who shall be found written in the book--the book of life; "for in Mount Zion... shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." (Joel 2:32)

Verse 2. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

This verse also shows how momentous a period is introduced by the standing up of Michael, or the commencement of the reign of Christ, as set forth in the first verse of this chapter; for the event here described in explicit terms is a resurrection of the dead. Is this the general resurrection which takes place at the second coming of Christ? or is there to intervene between Christ's reception of the kingdom and his revelation to earth in all his advent glory (Luke 19:12) a special resurrection answering to the description here given? One of these it must be; for every declaration of Scripture will be fulfilled.

Why may it not be the former, or the resurrection which occurs at the last trump? Answer: Because only the righteous, to the exclusion of all the wicked, have part in that resurrection. Those who sleep in Christ then come forth; but they only, for the rest of the dead live not again for a thousand years. Revelation 20:5. So then the general resurrection of the whole race is comprised in two grand divisions, first, of the righteous exclusively, at the coming of Christ;

secondly, of the wicked exclusively, a thousand years thereafter. The general resurrection is not a mixed resurrection. The righteous and the wicked do not come up promiscuously at the same time. But each of these two classes is set off by itself, and the time which elapses between their respective resurrections is plainly stated to be a thousand years.

But in the resurrection brought to view in the verse before us, many of both righteous and wicked come up together. It cannot therefore be the first resurrection, which includes the righteous only, nor the second resurrection, which is as distinctly confined to the wicked. If the text read, Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake to everlasting life, then the “many” might be interpreted as including all the righteous, and the resurrection be that of the just at the second coming of Christ. But the fact that some of the many are wicked, and rise to shame and everlasting contempt, bars the way to such an application.

It may be objected that this text does not affirm

the awakening of any but the righteous, according to the translation of Bush and Whiting; namely, “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, these to everlasting life, and those to shame and everlasting contempt.” It will be noticed, first of all, that this translation (which is not by any means above criticism) proves nothing till the evident ellipsis is supplied. This ellipsis some therefore undertake to supply as follows: “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, these [the awakened ones] to everlasting life, and those [the unawakened ones] to shame and everlasting contempt.” It will be noticed, again, that this does not supply the ellipses, but only adds a comment, which is a very different thing. To supply the ellipsis is simply to insert those words which are necessary to complete the sentence. “Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” is a complete sentence. The subject and predicate are both expressed. The next member, “Some [or these] to everlasting life,” is not complete. What is wanted to complete it? Not a comment, giving some one’s opinion as to who are intended by “these,” but a verb of which

these shall be the subject. What verb shall it be? This must be determined by the preceding portion of the sentence, which is complete, where the verb shall awake is used. This, then, is the predicate to be supplied: "Some [or these] shall awake to everlasting life." Applying the same rule to the next member, "Some [or those] to shame and everlasting contempt," which is not in itself a complete sentence, we find ourselves obliged to supply the same words, and read it, "Some [or those] shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt." Anything less than this will not complete the sense, and anything different will pervert the text; for a predicate to be supplied cannot go beyond one already expressed. The affirmation made in the text pertains only to the many who awake. Nothing is affirmed of the rest who do not then awake. And to say that the expression "to shame and everlasting contempt" applies to them, when nothing is affirmed of them, is not only to outrage the sense of the passage, but the laws of language as well. And of the many who awake, some come forth to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt, which

further proves a resurrection to consciousness for these also; for while contempt may be felt and manifested by others toward those who are guilty, shame can be felt and manifested only by the guilty parties themselves. This resurrection, therefore, as already shown, comprises some of both righteous and wicked, and cannot be the general resurrection at the last day.

Is there, then, any place for a special or limited resurrection, or elsewhere any intimation of such an event, before the Lord appears? The resurrection here predicted takes place when God's people are delivered from the great time of trouble with which the history of this world terminates; and it seems from Revelation 22:11 that this deliverance is given before the Lord appears. The awful moment arrives when he that is filthy and unjust is pronounced unjust still, and he that is righteous and holy is pronounced holy still. Then the cases of all are forever decided. And when this sentence is pronounced upon the righteous, it must be deliverance to them; for then they are placed beyond all reach of danger or fear of evil. But the

Lord has not at that time made his appearance; for he immediately adds, “And, behold, I come quickly.” The utterance of this solemn fiat which seals the righteous to everlasting life, and the wicked to eternal death, is supposed to be synchronous with the great voice which is heard from the throne in the temple of heaven, saying, It is done! Revelation 16:17. And this is evidently the voice of God, so often alluded to in descriptions of the scenes connected with the last day. Joel speaks of it, and says (chapter 3:16): “The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel.” The margin reads instead of “hope,” “place of repair, or harbor.” Then, at this time, when God’s voice is heard from heaven, just previous to the coming of the Son of man, God is a harbor for his people, or, which is the same thing, provides them deliverance. Here, then, at the voice of God, when the decisions of eternity are pronounced upon the race, and the last stupendous scene is just to open upon a doomed world, God gives to the astonished

nations another evidence and pledge of his power, and raises from the dead a multitude who have long slept in the dust of the earth.

Thus we see that there is a time and place for the resurrection of Daniel 12:2. We now add that a passage in the book of Revelation makes it necessary to suppose a resurrection of this kind to take place. Revelation 1:7 reads: “Behold, he cometh with clouds [this is unquestionably the second advent]; and every eye shall see him [of the nations then living on the earth], and they also which pierced him [those who took an active part in the terrible work of his crucifixion]; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.” Those who crucified the Lord, would, unless there was an exception made in their cases, remain in their graves till the end of the thousand years, and come up in the general assembly of the wicked at that time. But here it is stated that they behold the Lord at his second advent. They must therefore have a special resurrection for that purpose.

And it is certainly most appropriate that some

who were eminent in holiness, who labored and suffered for their hope of a coming Saviour, but died without the sight, should be raised a little before, to witness the scenes attending his glorious epiphany; as, in like manner, a goodly company came out of their graves after his resurrection, to behold his risen glory (Matthew 27:52, 53), and to escort him in triumph to the right hand of the throne of the majesty on high (Ephesians 4:8, margin); and also that some, eminent in wickedness, who have done most to reproach the name of Christ and injure his cause, and especially those who secured his cruel death upon the cross, and mocked and derided him in his dying agonies, should be raised, as part of their judicial punishment, to behold his return in the clouds of heaven, a celestial victor, in, to them, unendurable majesty and splendor.

One more remark upon this text before passing on. What is here said is supposed by some to furnish good evidence of the eternal conscious suffering of the wicked, because those of this character who are spoken of, come forth to shame

and everlasting contempt. How can they forever suffer these, unless they are forever conscious? It has already been stated that shame implies their consciousness; but it will be noticed that this is not said to be everlasting. This qualifying word is not inserted till we come to the contempt, which is an emotion felt by others toward the guilty parties, and does not render necessary the consciousness of those against whom it is directed. And so some read the passage: "Some to shame, and the everlasting contempt of their companions." And so it will be. Shame for their wickedness and corruption will burn into their very souls, so long as they have conscious being. And when they pass away, consumed for their iniquities, their loathsome characters and their guilty deeds excite only contempt on the part of all the righteous, unmodified and unabated so long as they hold them in remembrance at all. The text therefore furnishes no proof of the eternal suffering of the wicked.

Verse 3. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever

and ever.

The margin reads “teachers” in place of “wise.” And they that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; that is, of course, those who teach the truth, and lead others to a knowledge of it, just previous to the time when the events recorded in the foregoing verses are to be fulfilled. And, as the world estimates loss and profit, it costs something to be teachers of these things in these days. It costs reputation, ease, comfort, and often property; it involves labors, crosses, sacrifices, loss of friendship, ridicule, and, not unfrequently, persecution. And the question is often asked, How can you afford it? How can you afford to keep the Sabbath, and perhaps lose a situation, reduce your income, or it may be even hazard your means of support? O blind, deluded, sordid question! O what shortsightedness, to make obedience to what God requires a matter of pecuniary consideration! How unlike is this to the noble martyrs, who loved not their lives unto the death! No; the affording is all on the other side. When God commands, we cannot afford to

disobey. And if we are asked, How can you afford to keep the Sabbath, and do other duties involved in rendering obedience to the truth? we have only to ask in reply, How can you afford not to do it? And in the coming day, when those who have sought to save their lives shall lose them, and those who have been willing to hazard all for the sake of the truth and its divine Lord, shall receive the glorious reward promised in the text, and be raised up to shine as the firmament, and as the imperishable stars forever and ever, it will then be seen who have been wise, and who on the contrary, have made the choice of blindness and folly. The wicked and worldly now look upon Christians as fools and madmen, and congratulate themselves upon their superior shrewdness in shunning what they call their folly, and avoiding their losses. We need make no response; for those who now render this decision will soon themselves reverse it, and that with terrible though unavailing earnestness.

Meanwhile, it is the Christian's privilege to revel in the consolations of this marvelous promise. A conception of its magnitude can be gathered only

from the stellar worlds themselves. What are these stars, in the likeness of which the teachers of righteousness are to shine forever and ever? How much of brightness, and majesty, and length of days, is involved in this comparison?

The sun of our own solar system is one of these stars. If we compare it with this globe upon which we live (our handiest standard of measurement), we find it an orb of no small magnitude and magnificence. Our earth is 8000 miles in diameter; but the sun's diameter is 885,680 miles. In size it is one and a half million times larger than our globe; and in the matter of its substance, it would balance three hundred and fifty-two thousand worlds like ours. What immensity is this!

Yet this is far from being the largest or the brightest of the orbs which drive their shining chariots in myriads through the heavens. His proximity (he being only some ninety-five million miles from us) gives him with us a controlling presence and influence. But far away in the depths of space, so far that they appear like mere points of

light, blaze other orbs of vaster size and greater glory. The nearest fixed star, Alpha Centauri, in the southern hemisphere, is found, by the accuracy and efficiency of modern instruments, to be nineteen thousand million miles away; but the pole-star system is fifteen times as remote, or two hundred and eighty-five thousand million miles; and it shines with a luster equal to that of eighty-six of our suns; others are still larger, as, for instance, Vega, which emits the light of three hundred and forty-four of our suns; Capella, four hundred and thirty; Arcturus, five hundred and sixteen; and so on, till at last we reach the great star Alcyone, in the constellation of the Pleiades, which floods the celestial spaces with a brilliancy twelve thousand times that of the ponderous orb which lights and controls our solar system! Why, then, does it not appear more luminous to us?--Ah! its distance is twenty-five million diameters of the earth's orbit; and the latter is one hundred and ninety million miles! Figures are weak to express such distances. It will be sufficient to say that its glowing light must traverse space as light only travels,--192,000 miles a second,--for a period of more than seven

hundred years, before it reaches this distant world of ours!

Some of these monarchs of the skies rule singly, like our own sun. Some are double; that is, what appears to us like one star is found to consist of two stars--two suns with their retinue of planets, revolving around each other; others are triple; some are quadruple; and one, at least, is sextuple.

Besides this, they show all the colors of the rainbow. Some systems are white, some blue, some red, some yellow, some green; and this means different-colored days for the planets of those systems. Castor gives his planets green days. The double pole-star gives his yellow. In some, the different suns belonging to the same system are variously colored. Says Dr. Burr, in his *Ecce Coelum*, p. 136: "And, as if to make that Southern Cross the fairest object in all the heavens, we find in it a group of more than a hundred variously colored red, green, blue, and bluish-green suns, so closely thronged together as to appear in a powerful telescope like a superb bouquet, or piece

of fancy jewelry.”

And what of the age of these glorious bodies? A few years pass away, and all things earthly gather the mold of age, and the odor of decay. How much in this world has perished entirely! But the stars shine on as fresh as in the beginning. Centuries and cycles have gone by, kingdoms have arisen and slowly passed away; we go back beyond the dim and shadowy horizon of history, go back even to the earliest moment introduced by revelation, when order was evoked from chaos, and the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy--even then the stars were on their stately marches, and how long before this we know not; for astronomers tell us of nebulae lying on the farthest outposts of telescopic vision, whose light in its never-ceasing flight would consume five million years in reaching this planet. So ancient are these stellar orbs. Yet their brightness is not dimmed, nor their force abated. The dew of youth still seems fresh upon them. No broken outline shows the foothold of decay; no faltering motion reveals the decrepitude of age. Of all things visible,

these stand next to the Ancient of days; and their undiminished glory is a prophecy of eternity.

And thus shall they who turn many to righteousness shine in a glory that shall bring joy even to the heart of the Redeemer; and thus shall their years roll on forever and ever.

Verse 4. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

The “words” and “book” here spoken of, doubtless refer to the things which had been revealed to Daniel in this prophecy. These things were to be shut up and sealed until the time of the end; that is, they were not to be specially studied, or to any great extent understood, till that time. The time of the end, as has already been shown, commenced in 1798. As the book was closed up and sealed to that time, the plain inference is that at that time, or from that point, the book would be unsealed; that is, people would be better able to

understand it, and would have their attention specially called to this part of the inspired word. Of what has been done on the subject of prophecy since that time, it is unnecessary to remind the reader. The prophecies, especially Daniel's prophecy, have been under examination by all students of the word wherever civilization has spread abroad its light upon the earth. And so the remainder of the verse, being a prediction of what should take place after the time of the end commenced, says, "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Whether this running to and fro refers to the passing of people from place to place, and the great improvements in the facilities for transportation and travel made within the present century, or whether it means, as some understand it, a turning to and fro in the prophecies, that is, a diligent and earnest search into prophetic truth, the fulfillment is certainly and surely before our eyes. It must have its application in one of these two ways; and in both of these directions the present age is very strongly marked.

So of the increase of knowledge. It must refer

either to the increase of knowledge in general, the development of the arts and sciences, or an increase of knowledge in reference to those things revealed to Daniel, which were closed up and sealed to the time of the end. Here, again, apply it which way we will, the fulfillment is most marked and complete. Look at the marvelous achievements of the human mind, and the cunning works of men's hands rivaling the magician's wildest dreams, which have been accomplished within the last hundred years. It was recently stated in the Scientific American that within this time more advancement has been made in all scientific attainments, and more progress in all that tends to domestic comfort, the rapid transaction of business among men, the transmission of intelligence from one to another, and the means of rapid transit from place to place and even from continent to continent, than all that was done for three thousand years previous, put together.

By a series of vignettes the artist has given us in the accompanying plates a bird's-eye view of some of the most wonderful discoveries and

marvelous scientific and mechanical achievements of the present age. In the upper left hand corner of Plate I, we have--

1. The self-binding reaping machine, representing a large class of inventions by which the processes of agriculture have been revolutionized within the memory of multitudes now living.

2. On the circular shield is the cotton gin, which in its first rude form, by Whitney, in 1793, lifted cotton culture into one of the great industries of the world.

3. The sewing-machine, of the importance of which in the industrial world since its invention by Elias Howe, Jr., in 1846, nothing need be said.

4. An electric street-car, propelled by the trolley system, which represents the achievements in electrical discovery, such as electric lighting, electric power, as illustrated in the great Niagara plant, etc.

5. The phonograph, by which human speech can be indefinitely preserved and transmitted.

6. The invention of photography, with which, with its application to engraving, all are familiar.

7. Typical of the wonderful inventions in printing machinery, some perfecting presses delivering from a roll of paper, from 30,000 to 60,000 completed papers, printed on both sides, cut, pasted, and folded ready for delivery, every hour.

8. The monster siege and battle guns of the present day.

9. Represents the monstrous telescopes of the last quarter of a century, by which such marvelous discoveries in the heavens have been made.

10. The telephone, by which a man in Chicago can carry on vocal conversation with another man in New York.

11. The discovery of petroleum, which has revolutionized domestic lighting, and is making possible horseless vehicles for common roads.

12. A mining scene suggesting the pneumatic drill and other modern devices for tunneling mountains and exploring the hidden depths of the earth.

13. The steam fire-engine, one of the greatest safeguards of modern times.

14. The Brooklyn Bridge, showing what strides have been made in engineering skill in these days. This is probably soon to be surpassed by a similar and much larger structure, over the Hudson, connecting New York with Jersey City.

15. The Washington monument, the highest solid monument in the world (555 ft., 5½ inches).

16. The bicycle, working a revolution in suburban personal travel. The manufacturers'

estimate for the output in 1896, in the United States alone, is three quarters of a million machines. This, and trolley street-car propulsion, are rendering horses a drug on the market.

17. A telegraphic instrument. First put in operation in 1844. There are now untold thousands of miles of telegraphic wire in use.

18. The magnificent ocean iron ships of the present day. For passenger and war service nothing was ever produced to compare with the great steamers of the present decade.

19. Railway transportation. The empire express on N. Y. Central; fastest train in the world, averaging nearly sixty miles an hour. Jan. 1, 1890, according to Scientific American of Aug. 30, 1890, there were in the United States alone 161,397 miles of track. There were invested in American railways \$9,680,942,240. In 1889 five hundred million passengers, were carried, and the gross earnings were over one billion dollars.

Many other things might be spoken of, such as submarine armor to explore the depths of the sea, balloons to explore the spaces above us, power spinning-machines, and anesthetics to prevent pain in surgery, etc., etc.

What a galaxy of wonders to originate in a single age! How marvelous the scientific attainments of the present day, upon which all these discoveries and achievements concentrate their light! Truly, viewed from this standpoint, we have reached the age of the increase of knowledge.

And to the honor of Christianity let it be noted in what lands, and by whom, all these discoveries have been made, and so much done to add to the facilities and comforts of life. It is in Christian lands, among Christian men, since the great Reformation. Not to the Dark Ages, which furnished only a travesty of Christianity; not to pagans, who in their ignorance know not God, nor to those who in Christian lands deny him, is the credit of this progress due. Indeed, it is the very spirit of equality and individual liberty inculcated

in the gospel of Christ when preached in its purity, which unshackles human limbs, unfetters human minds, invites them to the highest use of their powers, and makes possible such an age of free thought and action, in which these wonders can be achieved.

Of the marvelous character of the present age, Victor Hugo speaks as follows:--

“In science it works all miracles; it makes saltpeter out of cotton, a horse out of steam, a laborer out of the voltaic pile, a courier out of the electric fluid, and a painter of the sun; it bathes itself in the subterranean waters, while it is warmed with the central fires; it opens upon the two infinities those two windows,--the telescope on the infinitely great, the microscope on the infinitely little; and it finds in the first abyss the stars of heaven, and in the second abyss the insects, which prove the existence of a God. It annihilates time, it annihilates distance, it annihilates suffering; it writes a letter from Paris to London, and has the answer back in ten minutes; it cuts off the leg of a

man--the man sings and smiles.”[1]

But if we take the other standpoint, and refer the increase of knowledge to an increase of Biblical knowledge, we have only to look at the wonderful light which, within the past sixty years, has shone upon the Scriptures. The fulfillment of prophecy has been revealed in the light of history. The use of a better principle of interpretation has led to conclusions showing, beyond dispute, that the end of all things is near. Truly the seal has been taken from the book, and knowledge respecting what God has revealed in his word, is wonderfully increased. We think it is in this respect that the prophecy is more especially fulfilled, but only in an age like the present could the prophecy, even in this direction, be accomplished.

That we are in the time of the end, when the book of this prophecy should no longer be sealed, but be open and understood, is shown by Revelation 10:1, 2, where a mighty angel is seen to come down from heaven with a little book in his hand open. For proof that the little book, there said

to be open, is the book here closed up and sealed, and that that angel delivers his message in this generation. (See on Revelation 10:2)

Verse 5. Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. 6. And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? 7. And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.

The question, “How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?” undoubtedly has reference to all that has previously been mentioned, including the standing up of Michael, the time of trouble, the deliverance of God’s people, and the special and

antecedent resurrection of verse 2. And the answer seems to be given in two divisions: First, a specific prophetic period is marked off; and, secondly, an indefinite period follows before the conclusion of all these things is reached; just as we have it in chapter 8:13, 14. When the question was asked, “How long the vision... to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?” the answer mentioned a definite period of 2300 days, and then an indefinite period of the cleansing of the sanctuary. So in the text before us, there is given the period of a time, times, and a half, or 1260 years, and then an indefinite period for the continuance of the scattering of the power of the holy people, before the consummation.

The 1260 years mark the period of papal supremacy. Why is this period here introduced? — Probably because this power is the one which does more than any other in the world’s history toward scattering the power of the holy people, or oppressing the church of God. But what shall we understand by the expression, “Shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy

people”? A literal translation of the Septuagint seems to present it in a clearer light: “When he shall have finished the scattering of the power of the holy people.” To whom does the pronoun he refer? According to the wording of this scripture, the antecedent would at first sight seem to be “Him that liveth forever,” or Jehovah, but, as an eminent expositor of the prophecies judiciously remarks, in considering the pronouns of the Bible we are to interpret them according to the facts of the case; and hence must frequently refer them to an antecedent understood, rather than to some noun which is expressed. So, here, the little horn, or man of sin, having been introduced by the particular mention of the time of his supremacy; namely, 1260 years, may be the power referred to by the pronoun he. For 1260 years he had grievously oppressed the church, or scattered its power. After his supremacy is taken away, his disposition toward the truth and its advocates still remains, and his power is still felt to a certain extent, and he continues his work of oppression just as far as he is able, till--when?--Till the last of the events brought to view in verse 1, the deliverance of God’s people,

every one that is found written in the book. Being thus delivered, persecuting powers are no longer able to oppress them; their power is no longer scattered; the end of the wonders brought to view in this great prophecy is reached; and all its predictions are accomplished.

Or, we may, without particularly altering the sense, refer the pronoun he to the one mentioned in the oath of verse 7, as “Him that liveth forever,” that is God, since he employs the agency of earthly powers in chastising and disciplining his people, and in that sense may be said himself to scatter their power. By his prophet he said concerning the kingdom of Israel, “I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, ... until He come whose right it is.” (Ezekiel 21:27) And again, “Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” Luke 21:24. Of like import is the prophecy of Daniel 8:13: “How long the vision... to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?” Who gives them to this condition?--God. Why?--To discipline; to “purify and make white” his people. How long? — Till the

sanctuary is cleansed.

Verse 8. And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? 9. And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. 10. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried: but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand: but the wise shall understand.

How forcibly are we reminded, by Daniel's solicitude to understand fully all that had been shown him, of Peter's words where he speaks of the prophets' inquiring and searching diligently to understand the predictions concerning the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow; and also of the fact that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister. How little were some of the prophets permitted to understand of what they wrote! But they did not therefore refuse to write. If God required it, they knew that in due time he would see that his people derived

from their writings all the benefit that he intended. So the language here used to Daniel was the same as telling him that when the right time should come, the wise would understand the meaning of what he had written, and be profited thereby. The time of the end was the time in which the Spirit of God was to break the seal from off this book; and consequently this was the time during which the wise should understand, while the wicked, lost to all sense of the value of eternal truth, with hearts callous and hardened in sin, would grow continually more wicked and more blind. None of the wicked understand. The efforts which the wise put forth to understand, they call folly and presumption, and ask, in sneering phrase, "Where is the promise of his coming?" And should the question be raised, Of what time and what generation speaketh the prophet this? the solemn answer would be, Of the present time, and of the generation now before us. This language of the prophet is now receiving a most striking fulfilment.

The phraseology of verse 10 seems at first sight to be rather peculiar: "Many shall be purified, and

made white, and tried.” How, it may be asked, can they be made white, and then tried (as the language would seem to imply), when it is by being tried that they are purified and made white? Answer: The language doubtless describes a process which is many times repeated in the experience of those, who, during this time, are being made ready for the coming and kingdom of the Lord. They are purified and made white to a certain degree, as compared with their former condition. Then they are again tried. Greater tests are brought to bear upon them. If they endure these, the work of purification is thus carried on to a still greater extent,--the process of being made white is made to reach a still higher stage. And having reached this state, they are tried again, resulting in their being still further purified and made white; and thus the process goes on till characters are developed which will stand the test of the great day, and a spiritual condition is reached which needs no further trial.

Verse 11. And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there

shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

We have here a new prophetic period introduced; namely, 1290 prophetic days, which would denote the same number of literal years. From the reading of the text, some have inferred (though the inference is not a necessary one) that this period begins with the setting up of the abomination of desolation, or the papal power, in 538, and consequently extends to 1828. But while we find nothing in the latter year to mark its termination, we do find evidence in the margin that it begins before the setting up of the papal abomination. The margin reads, "To set up the abomination," etc. With this reading the text would stand thus: "And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away to set up [or in order to set up] the abomination that maketh desolate, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days." The daily has already been shown to be, not the daily sacrifice of the Jews, but the daily or continual abomination, that is, paganism. (See on chapter 8:13) This had to be taken away to prepare

the way for the papacy. For the historical events showing how this was accomplished in 508, see on chapter 11:31. We are not told directly to what event these 1290 days reach; but inasmuch as their commencement is marked by a work which takes place to prepare the way for the setting up of the papacy, it would be most natural to conclude that their end would be marked by the cessation of papal supremacy. Counting back, then, 1290 years from 1798, we have the year 508, where it has been shown that paganism was taken away, thirty years before the setting up of the papacy. This period is doubtless given to show the date of the taking away of the daily, and it is the only one which does this. The two periods, therefore, the 1290 and the 1260 days, terminate together in 1798, the one beginning in 538, and the other in 508, thirty years previous.

Verse 12. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. 13. But go thou thy way till the end he; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

Still another prophetic period is here introduced, denoting 1335 years. The testimony concerning this period, like that which pertains to the 1290 years, is very meager. Can we tell when this period begins and ends? The only clue we have to the solution of this question, is the fact that it is spoken of in immediate connection with the 1290 years, which commenced, as shown above, in 508. From that point there shall be, says the prophet, 1290 days. And the very next sentence reads, "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days." From what point?--From the same point, undoubtedly, as that from which the 1290 date; namely, 508. Unless they are to be reckoned from this point, it is impossible to locate them, and they must be excepted from the prophecy of Daniel when we apply to it the words of Christ, "Whoso readeth, let him understand." Matthew 24:15. From this point they would extend to 1843; for 1335 added to 508 make 1843. Commencing in the spring of the former year, they ended in the spring of the latter.

But how can it be that they have ended, it may

be asked, since at the end of these days Daniel stands in his lot, which is by some supposed to refer to his resurrection from the dead? This question is founded on a misapprehension in two respects: First, that the days at the end of which Daniel stands in his lot are the 1335 days; and, secondly, that the standing of Daniel in his lot is his resurrection, which also cannot be sustained. The only thing promised at the end of the 1335 days is a blessing unto those who wait and come to that time; that is, those who are then living. What is this blessing? Looking at the year 1843, when these years expired, what do we behold?--We see a remarkable fulfillment of prophecy in the great proclamation of the second coming of Christ. Forty-five years before this, the time of the end commenced, the book was unsealed, and light began to increase. About the year 1843, there was a grand culmination of all the light that had been shed on prophetic subjects up to that time. The proclamation went forth in power. The new and stirring doctrine of the setting up of the kingdom of God, shook the world. New life was imparted to the true disciples of Christ. The unbelieving were

condemned, the churches were tested, and a spirit of revival was awakened of which modern times, at least, have furnished no parallel.

Was this the blessing? Listen to the Saviour's words: "Blessed are your eyes," said he to his disciples, "for they see; and your ears, for they hear." Matthew 13:16. And again he told his followers that prophets and kings had desired to see the things which they saw, and had not seen them. But "blessed," said he to them, "are the eyes which see the things that ye see." Luke 10:23, 24. If a new and glorious truth was a blessing in the days of Christ to those who received it, why was it not equally so in A. D. 1843?

It may be objected that those who engaged in this movement were disappointed in their expectations; so were the disciples of Christ at his first advent, in an equal degree. They shouted before him as he rode into Jerusalem, expecting that he would then take the kingdom; but the only throne to which he then went was the cross; and instead of being hailed as king in a royal palace, he

was laid a lifeless form in Joseph's new sepulcher. Nevertheless, they were "blessed" in receiving the truths they had heard.

It may be objected further that this was not a sufficient blessing to be marked by a prophetic period. Why not, since the period in which it was to occur; namely, the time of the end, is introduced by a prophetic period; since our Lord, in verse 14 of his great prophecy of Matthew 24, makes a special announcement of this movement; and since it is still further set forth in Revelation 14:6, 7, under the symbol of an angel flying through mid-heaven with a special announcement of the everlasting gospel to the inhabitants of the earth? Surely the Bible gives great prominence to this movement.

Two more questions remain to be briefly noticed: (1) What days are referred to in verse 13? (2) What is meant by Daniel's standing in his lot? Those who claim that the days are the 1335, are led to that application by looking back no further than to the preceding verse, where the 1335 days are

mentioned; whereas, in making an application of these days so indefinitely introduced, the whole scope of the prophecy should certainly be taken in from chapter 8. Chapters 9, 10, 11, and 12 are clearly a continuation and explanation of the vision of chapter 8; hence we may say that in the vision of chapter 8, as carried out and explained, there are four prophetic periods; namely, the 2300, 1260, 1290, and 1335 days. The first is the principal and longest period; the others are but intermediate parts and subdivisions of this. Now, when the angel tells Daniel, at the conclusion of his instructions, that he shall stand in his lot at the end of the days, without specifying which period was meant, would not Daniel's mind naturally turn to the principal and longest period, the 2300 days, rather than to any of its subdivisions? If this is so, the 2300 are the days intended. The reading of the Septuagint seems to look very plainly in this direction: "But go thy way and rest; for there are yet days and seasons to the full accomplishment [of these things]; and thou shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days." This certainly carries the mind back to the long period contained in the first vision, in relation to which

the subsequent instructions were given.

The 2300 days, as has been already shown, terminated in 1844, and brought us to the cleansing of the sanctuary. How did Daniel at that time stand in his lot? Answer: In the person of his Advocate, our great High Priest, as he presents the cases of the righteous for acceptance to his Father. The word here translated lot does not mean a piece of real estate, a “lot” of land, but the “decisions of chance,” or the “determinations of Providence.” At the end of the days, the lot, so to speak, was to be cast. In other words, a determination was to be made in reference to those who should be accounted worthy of a possession in the heavenly inheritance. And when Daniel’s case comes up for examination, he is found righteous, stands in his lot, is assigned a place in the heavenly Canaan. Does not the psalmist refer to this time and event, when he says (Ps. 1:5), “The ungodly shall not stand in the Judgment”?

When Israel was about to enter into the promised land, the lot was cast, and the possession

of each tribe was assigned. The tribes thus stood in their respective “lots” long before they entered upon the actual possession of the land. The time of the cleansing of the sanctuary corresponds to this period of Israel’s history. We now stand upon the borders of the heavenly Canaan, and decisions are being made, assigning to some a place in the eternal kingdom, and barring others forever therefrom. In the decision of his case, Daniel’s portion in the celestial inheritance will be made sure to him. And with him all the faithful will also stand. And when this devoted servant of God, who filled up a long life with the noblest deeds of service to his Maker, though cumbered with the weightiest cares of this life, shall enter upon his reward for well-doing, we too may enter with him into rest.

We draw the study of this prophecy to a close, with the remark that it has been with no small degree of satisfaction that we have spent what time and study we have on this wonderful prophecy, and in contemplating the character of this most beloved of men and most illustrious of prophets. God is no

respector of persons; and a reproduction of Daniel's character will secure the divine favor as signally even now. Let us emulate his virtues, that we, like him, may have the approbation of God while here, and dwell amid the creations of his infinite glory in the long hereafter.

Nota:

1. Le Petit Napoleon.