The Pilgrim Way Commentary on

Daniel

by Dr. John Cereghin
Pastor, Grace Baptist Church of
Smyrna, Delaware

The Pilgrim Way Commentary on Daniel
by Dr. John Cereghin
PO Box 66
Smyrna DE 19977
pastor@pilgrimway.org
website- www.pilgrimway.org

April 2025

Apology for This Work

This commentary on Daniel grew out of almost 40 years of both preaching through the book in three pastorates in Maryland, Delaware and North Carolina as well as teaching through the book as an instructor at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland. I needed my own notes and outlines as I taught and preached from Daniel, so this fuller commentary flows from those notes and outlines. Thus, the layout of this commentary is a practical one, written by a preacher to be preached from in the pulpit or to be taught in a Sunday School or in a Bible Study. It was not written from an isolated study of a theologian who had little contact with people or practical ministerial experience. There are many such commentaries on the market, and they tend to be somewhat dull and not very practical in their application.

This commentary cannot be easily classified into any single theological system and that is deliberate. I believe that no single theological system is an accurate presentation of Scriptural truth in and of itself. When Charles Spurgeon once wrote "There is no such thing as preaching Christ and Him crucified, unless we preach what nowadays is called Calvinism. It is a nickname to call it Calvinism; Calvinism is the gospel, and nothing else", he displayed a most unfortunate theological hubris. Calvinism is a flawed, limited, and uninspired theological system. There is some truth there, as there is in any theological system, but it ranks no better than other competing systems, such as Arminianism (which is nothing more than a modified version of Calvin's teachings), dispensationalism, covenant theology, Lutheranism, Romanism, Orthodox theology, pre-wrath rapture, take your pick. All these systems are flawed as they are all the products of human attempts to understand and systematize Biblical presentations. They can all make contributions to our overall understanding of the truth, but none may claim to be the only correct such presentation, at the expense of all others. Knowing the human impossibility for absolute neutrality and the human love for theological systems, I readily admit that I cannot be as dispassionate and uninfluenced by human teachings in these pages as I would like. No man can be. But I have made every attempt not to allow my own personal systems to influence my understanding of what the clear teaching of Scripture is.

I have freely consulted a wide variety of commentaries and sermons for insights and other views of various texts that I might have missed. As the old preacher once remarked "I've milked a lot of cows, but I've churned my own butter." Direct quotes are attributed to their proper source to prevent that unpardonable sin of literary theft. But simply because I quoted a writer should not be viewed as an endorsement of all that he wrote or of his theological system. I selected the quote because I found it interesting and useful, not because I am in any degree of agreement regarding the rest of his teachings. The most useful commentaries are from dispensationalists and premillennialists. The works from various "Plymouth Brethren" writers are also useful, despite the age of some of those works. The least useful works are the non-dispensational and non-premillennial, many of the being Reformed and holding to various interpretations of covenant theology and replacement theology.

This commentary is based on the text of our English Received Version, commonly referred to as the King James Version or the Authorized Version. I believe that this is the most preserved English translation available to us and that it is the superior translation in English. I can see no good reason to use or accept any of the modern versions, especially the current "flavor of the month" of the New Evangelicals and apostate fundamentalists, the corrupt and mis-named English Standard Version. When it comes to these modern, critical text versions, I reject them for a variety of reasons. One major reason is that they have not been proven on the field of battle. I have liver spots older that are older than the English Standard Version, but I am expected to toss my English Received Text, over 400 years old, and take up this new translation, whose ink is still barely dry? How many battles has the ESV won? How many missionaries have done great exploits with an NIV? What revivals have been birthed and nurtured with an NASB? We will stick with the translations and texts that our fathers used and that God has blessed. It is far too late in church histories to change our English Bible. We are also favorably inclined to the Geneva Bible, Tyndale Bible, Matthews Bible, and other "cousins" of our English text. The Greek text used is the underlying text of our English Received Text and its 1769 revision, which is the text most widely in use today by God's remnant.

We will do translation comparisons with the English Standard Version and the relatively new Legacy Standard Version, also known as the John MacArthur Version, since he is the driving force behind it. In many ways, the LSV is an unnecessary revision of the New American Standard Version of 1995.

The presupposition of this commentary is that what the Bible says is so and that we will not change the text to suit our theological fancy. It says what it says and that is what we must accept, else we will be found unfaithful stewards of the Word of God, a judgment we fear. We will not amend our text but will take it as it is the best we can.

This commentary certainly is not perfect, nor is it the final presentation of my understanding and application of Daniel. A commentary almost 40 years in the making can never truly be said to be finished. As new insights are granted by the Holy Spirit and as my understanding of the epistle deepens, additional material will be added, and sections will have to be re-written. One is never truly "finished" with any theological book. As one deepens and grows in his relationship with the Lord, so does his theological understandings and that should be reflected in one's writings.

This book was also written as a theological legacy to my four children and my three grandchildren. They will need to be mighty for God in their generation for their days will certainly be darker than the generation their father and grandfather grew up in. This book is an expression not only of the heart of a preacher in the early 21st century but also of a Christian father for his children, so they may more fully understand what their father believed and preached during his ministry. I named my youngest son Daniel in the hopes that he will be as mighty for God in his generation and Daniel was in his.

It is my sincere prayer that this unpretentious contribution to the body of Christian commentary literature will be a blessing to the remnant of God's saints in the earth as we approach the coming of our Lord.

Introduction to Daniel

Authorship- The prophet Daniel. Jesus identifies Daniel as the prophet who spoke of the "abomination of desolation" (9:27; 11:31; 12:11) in the Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24:15-16 (also in Mark 13:14; Luke 21:20). The writer shows an accurate knowledge of sixth-century events. The author also refers to himself as Daniel throughout the book (7:1; the rest of the references are in terms of pronouns either third person or first person singular). Liberals and the destructive critics who hold to a 168 B.C. date to Daniel would have to make the book a lie and a fraud. Although the book claims to be written by Daniel and the Lord testifies to that, it really isn't, according to them, thus questioning the trustworthiness of the book.

Except for the attack of Porphyry, a neo-Platonist philosopher (3rd century A.D.), no question was raised concerning the traditional 6th century B.C. date, the authorship of Daniel the prophet, or the genuineness of the book until the rise of higher criticism in the 17th and 18th century. Porphyry's attack immediately aroused a defense of Daniel by the church fathers. But we are confident that all of their attacks have been answered by Bible believing scholars as they have sought to defend the inspiration of this prophecy.

Place of Writing- Babylon, where Daniel lived in exile, serving in both the Babylonian and Persian governments.

Date of Writing- Early 6th century B.C. Daniel went to Babylon during the deportation of 605 BC and the book extends at least through 536 B.C., covering a period of about 70 years.

Manuscripts discovered at Qumran (the Dead Sea Scrolls) which date from the Maccabean period make it very unlikely that the book was written during the time of the Maccabees (around 168 B.C.) since it would have taken some time for it to have been accepted and included in the Hebrew canon.

Then there is linguistic evidence. Daniel's Aramaic section demonstrates grammatical evidence for an early date more closely associated with the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. than with the second century B.C. The Persian loan words in Daniel do not necessarily argue against an early date for the book since Daniel, who lived under the Persians, could have placed the material in its final form at the latter part of his life. Four of the nineteen Persian words are not translated well by the Greek renderings of about 100 B.C. implying that their meaning was lost or drastically changed meaning that it is very unlikely that Daniel was written in 168 B.C. The Persian words in Daniel are specifically old Persian words dating from around 300 B.C. This argues against a 168 B.C. date. The three Greek loan words in Daniel need not argue for a late date since there may well have been Greek writing prior to Plato (370 B.C.) where these words could have been used, and since they are the names of musical instruments

which often are circulated beyond national boundaries, and since Greek words are found in the Aramaic documents of Elephantine dated to the fifth-century B.C.

Then we have the internal apocalyptic evidence. The themes of the prominence of angels, the last judgment, the resurrection of the dead, and the establishment of the final kingdom are not themes that are limited to later apocryphal literature but have their roots in earlier biblical literature and even Zechariah.

The traditional dating of the Greek Old Testament (the so-called Septuagint, which has an uncertain date) is about 285 B.C. and it includes Daniel, showing that Daniel was in circulation at least a century before the liberal date, if this early date is accepted.

A Jewish tradition (whose reliability is uncertain, but it is still worth noting) as the High Priest showing Alexander the Great the prophecies Daniel made about him that motivated Alexander to spare destroying Jerusalem. This would be around 322 B.C., two centuries before the so-called late date.

Liberals and modernists insist on a date around 168 B.C. Those who hold to a late date see this work as "historical fiction" designed to "encourage the resistance movement against the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes". The date of 168 B.C. matches the evidence spoken of in Daniel 11:31-39; therefore, it is assumed that the book must have been written soon after that time. In reality, these liberal and modernistic remarks come from a disbelief in prophetic writings, or that any man could receive such prophecies and that they could be so accurately fulfilled, so they have "Daniel" writing after the fact yet under the guise of prophecy. If this was true, the book would be a fraud since Daniel clearly is engaging in prophecy. But infidels cannot accept the fact that a man can be so accurate with his prophecies as Daniel was unless they were written after the fact.

Observations

Daniel is a political prophet, serving in the governments of the pagan Babylonian and Medo-Persian Empires. God placed Daniel in a position of great secular influence as a strong witness of the true God among the heathen. Daniel's godly influence over Nebuchadnezzar and Darius is obvious.

Daniel clearly shows the sovereignty of God over the affairs of men, especially the Gentile nations.

There are some parallels between Daniel and Joseph:

1. Both ended up in foreign lands- Joseph was sold, Daniel deported.
2. Both were falsely accused.
3. Both interpreted dreams for kings.
4. Both were promoted to high positions in Gentile governments.
5. In God's providence, Joseph went to Egypt, endured slavery, converted Pharaoh, wound up ruling Egypt, and in this way prepared a place for his brothers. In the same way, Daniel went to Babylon, became second only to Nebuchadnezzar, eventually saw him converted, and helped prepare a place for the Jews when they were dragged into the fullness of exile 20 years later.

6. Eventually there arose a Pharaoh who did not recognize Joseph's work and did not honor the inhabitants of Goshen. The same thing happens in Daniel. The new bad ruler is Belshazzar, and we see from Daniel 5 that he did not know who Daniel was.

There are also similarities between Daniel and the Apostle John:

1. Both wrote in exile (Babylon and on Patmos)
2. Both were called “Beloved” (Daniel 11:10, John 21:7- the disciple whom Jesus loved)
3. Both began their ministries as teenagers
4. Both had long ministries, well into old age
5. Both prophesied about the end of the times of the Gentiles
6. Both saw the glory of God in devastating times
7. Both had visions of the glorified Christ.[1]

5. Since Daniel was written in Babylon and deals with Gentile world government, portions of it are written in Chaldee, as well as in Hebrew. The Chaldee sections run from chapters 2-7.

"The rabbins have endeavored to degrade Daniel, and have placed his prophecies among the hagiographa, books which they consider possessing a minor degree of inspiration; and it is probable that he meets with this treatment from them because his prophecies are proofs too evident that Jesus Christ is the true Messiah, and that he came at the very time that Daniel said the Prince Messiah should come. But the testimony and sayings of such men are infinitely overpowered by the testimony of Ezekiel, which has been produced above; and the testimony of our LORD, who gives him the title of prophet, Matthew 24:15, without the slightest intimation that he was to wear this title with abatement.”[2]

“In your King James Bible, Daniel is the last of what are known as the Major Prophets (called “Major” due to their length, not their content). But in the Hebrew Bible, the book has been relegated to the third section, called the “Writings” (Hagiographa in Gk.; Kethubim in Heb.). The Rabbis consider the Writings to be the least authoritative of the three sections of the Old Testament (the other two being, in order of importance, the Law and the Prophets), and Daniel has been put in the least of that section.

“The reason for this is that the Talmud denied Daniel was a prophet. Jesus Christ denied the Talmud (Mark 13:14), so modern versions, like the NIV, NASV, RSV, and ESV (the so-called “Conservative” version of the RSV), denied the word of Jesus Christ. They drop “Daniel the prophet” from Mark 13:14. The alibi for this, as it is in many other passages, is since you can find it somewhere else in Scripture (in this case, Matt. 24:15), it is perfectly all right to remove it from Mark 13:14. Of course, that destroys the Holy Spirit’s establishment of the statement, since, now, there is only one witness instead of two (2 Cor. 13:1).

1 H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture*.
2 Adam Clarke.

"The reason the Talmud denies Daniel as a prophet is, supposedly, because he is not called a prophet anywhere in the book. Of course, neither are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Malachi; yet every Hebrew Bible includes them in the "Twelve Prophets." In fact, Amos outright says in his book, "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son" (Amos 7:14).

"You say, "Yeah, but the Lord told him to prophesy in the next verse" (Amos 7:15). Exactly, and God called what He gave Daniel a "prophecy" (Dan. 9:24). Never mind all the gas about a prophet "forthtelling"; Daniel foretells the future to the "T" under the power of the Holy Spirit (Dan. 4:8–9, 18, 5:11).

"Now what is the real reason Jewish tradition (see Mark 7:7–13) denied the prophethood of Daniel? The Talmud had to get rid of Daniel as a prophet and obscure the authority of the book as much as possible because Daniel gave the exact time the Messiah would show up—Daniel 9:24–26. If the Jewish Rabbis acknowledged Daniel as a prophet, they would have to admit that they missed the coming of their Messiah and were responsible for having Him "cut off" (Dan. 9:26)."[3]

An unusual feature of Daniel is that a large section of it is written in Chaldee (or Syriack) (2:4-7:28). This section of the book deals specifically with the Gentile world powers so it was written in a Gentile language, that of the most powerful empire of that day. "Gleason L. Archer expresses the Aramaic problem, "The Jews apparently took no exception to the Aramaic sections in the book of Ezra, most of which consists in copies of correspondence carried on in Aramaic between the local governments of Palestine and the Persian imperial court from approximately 520 to 460 B.C. If Ezra can be accepted as an authentic document from the middle of the fifth century, when so many of its chapters were largely composed in Aramaic, it is hard to see why the six Aramaic chapters of Daniel must be dated two centuries later than that. It should be carefully observed that in the Babylon of the late sixth century, in which Daniel purportedly lived, the predominant language spoken by the heterogeneous population of this metropolis was Aramaic."[4]

There are non-inspired additions to Daniel in some Greek manuscripts, including "The Prayer of Azarias", "The Song of the Three Young Men", "Susanna", and "Bel and the Dragon". The Prayer of Azarias and The Song of the Three Young Men contain the prayer and praise of Daniel's three companions while in the fiery furnace in Daniel 3, with phrases from Psalm 148. Susanna is the story of a woman protected by Daniel, who obtains conviction of two judges guilty of attempting her seduction. Bel and the Dragon includes three stories in which Daniel destroys the image of Bel, kills the Dragon, and was fed by Habakkuk the prophet while living in the lions' den for six days. These stories have been rejected from the Scriptures as not properly in the book of Daniel for rather obvious reasons. But the stories surrounding Daniel were popular enough to inspire these legends and fanciful stories to grow up around him, like our stories of George Washington throwing a silver dollar across the Potomac River.

3 Peter Ruckman, *The Book of Daniel*, pages ix-xi.
4 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation.*

There is no underestimating the importance of the Book of Daniel. It is the key to prophecy and records prophecies unique to this book. Without a proper understanding of Daniel, it is impossible to have a complete understanding of other prophecies. The prophecies and the fulfillment of these prophecies are the strongest argument for the accuracy, dating and divine inspiration of this book.

There has never been a more urgent need for these kinds of young men and women of strong righteous character than today. This is a day of rank immorality, sexual confusion with sodomy and transgenderism, apostasy, wickedness, injustice, oppression, and materialism. , Few individuals (including Christians) step forth to take a stand for justice and righteousness. Daniel was born into such an environment, an age of terrible immorality, lawlessness, and violence when there was little justice or righteousness on the earth. Yet he rose above it all. Despite the temptations and the enticements of a vastly different culture, Daniel stood strong for the Lord, even in the face of death.

The most useful commentaries on Daniel will come from the dispensational and pre-millennial writers. The "Plymouth Brethren" contributed greatly in laying down the interpretative principals in properly understanding the book. The least useful works will be from the Reformers, Puritans, non-dispensationalists and those who hold to amillennial, postmillennial, historicist and/or preterist theological system.

A Summary of Critical Attacks Against Daniel:

1. About 200 B.C., the Prophets were added to the Law to compose the Jewish "Bible." Yet Daniel is not among the *Prophets,* being added to the *Sacred Writings* about A.D. 90, when the Jewish "Bible" was completed.
2. The book of Daniel is not mentioned in any Jewish literature until 140 B.C. when the Sibylline Oracles (3:397-400) refer to it. In Baruch 1:15-3:3 (written about 150 B.C.) there is a prayer similar to that in Daniel 9:4 ff. The book of Daniel is also alluded to in I Maccabees 2:59 ff. (written about 125 B.C.). Daniel is referred to 164 times in I Maccabees, the Sibylline Oracles, and Enoch (written about 95 B.C.).
3. Jesus Ben Sirach, about 190 B.C., lists the great men of Jewish history (Ecclesiasticus 44.1-50:24); but among these names that of Daniel is missing.
4. Words borrowed from the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek languages appear in Daniel.
5. Jeremiah is mentioned as a prophet (Daniel 9:2 "**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.")** and his writings are referred to.
6. In Jeremiah's time (also the period of Nebuchadnezzar) the Chaldeans are spoken of as a nation or people, referring to the Babylonians; but in the book of Daniel, they are known as astrologers, magicians, diviners of truth.
7. The book of Daniel is written partly in Aramaic, a language popular among the Jews in the second century B.C. but not at the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

8. The author has an excellent view of history after the time of Alexander the Great, especially during the Maccabean struggles; but his history shows many inaccuracies during the Babylonian and Persian periods.
9. The theology regarding the resurrection of the dead and ideas about angels show that the author lived at a later time than that of Nebuchadnezzar. The same may be said in regard to his concern for diet, fasting, and ritualistic prayers.
10. The pattern and purpose of the book of Daniel as an apocalypse, which reinterprets history from the time of Nebuchadnezzar until the time of Judas Maccabeus and Antiochus IV, and written in 165 B.C. fits better into the scheme and purpose of Daniel than if the book were written in the period of Nebuchadnezzar, predicting history for the next 450 years.

"It is claimed that no such person of influence and authority as Daniel ever lived at Babylon, because the name Daniel does not appear upon the monuments or among the historical records of Babylonia. The claim is premature because comparatively few such records have been unearthed or deciphered, and the absence of Daniel's name is no proof, for his Jewish name Daniel was changed to the heathen name Belteshazzar. Neither is it any proof because the name Belteshazzar does not appear, for the name might have been abbreviated and spelled differently, as was often the custom with lengthy names. The fact then of silence is no argument. For illustration, we read in Luke 2:41-50 that when Jesus was 12 years of age He went up to Jerusalem at the "Feast of the Passover." Did He not go up to any other Feast between that time and when He entered on His Public Ministry? We do not know. The Scriptures are silent. We know from John's Gospel that He went up to the Feasts regularly after His Baptism, is it not reasonable to suppose that He did before? The "Law" required every male to regularly attend the Feasts, and as Jesus scrupulously kept the Law, the inference is that He from His twelfth year went regularly to the Feasts, at least to the Passover Feast, which was a type of Himself. The silence then as to Daniel's name among the Babylonian records is no proof that he never existed.

"It is a fact that we must not forget, that heathen monarchs, like Nebuchadnezzar, recorded on the monuments only the things that glorified themselves, and the great men of their Empires are not mentioned. What about the governors, judges, generals, priests, wise men, and the sculptors, architects, engineers, etc., who planned, and supervised the building of the magnificent walls, towers, bridges, tubes, temples and palaces of "Great Babylon?" Their names do not appear upon the records, why then Daniel's? The Book of Daniel is discounted because it does not give a list of kings between Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. But why should it? It would seem from the record that Daniel was deposed from his high office at the death of Nebuchadnezzar, and does not publicly appear until he is called on to pronounce the doom of Belshazzar. Why then should he record events, etc., not connected with the purpose of his book?"[5]

These critical objections may be grouped under six heads:

1. rejection of its canonicity.
2. rejection of detailed prophecy.

5 Clarence Larkin, *The Book of Daniel*, pages 11,12.

3. rejection of miracles.
4. textual problems.
5. problems of language.
6. alleged historical inaccuracies.[6]

Names and titles of God in Daniel:

1. God of Heaven 2:44
2. God of Gods 2:47; 11:36
3. Lord of Kings 2:47
4. Revealer of Secrets 2:47
5. Most High God 3:26; 4:25
6. The Deliverer 3:39
7. King of Heaven 4:37
8. The Living God 6:20
9. Lord God 9:3
10. Great and Dreadful God 9:4
11. Covenant-keeping God 9:4
12. God of His Fathers 11:37

Names and Titles of Christ in Daniel:

1. The Stone 2:35,45
2. A Great Mountain 2:35
3. Son of God 3:25
4. Ancient of Days 7:9
5. Son of Man 7:13
6. Lord of His Kingdom 7:14
7. Prince of princes 8:25
8. The Most Holy 9:24
9. Messiah 9:25

New Testament References to Daniel:

1. Eternal Kingdom- 2:44 with 1 Corinthians 15:24
2. Reconciliation for Iniquity 9:24 with 2 Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 9:12
3. Christ cut-off- His rejection and suffering 9:26a with Matthew 27:22-35
4. Abomination of Desolation 9:27 with Matthew 24:15
5. Daniel in the lion's den- 6:23 with Hebrews 11:33
6. Names written in the book- 12:1 with Luke 10:20b; Revelation 13:8
7. Eternal punishment- 12:2 with Matthew 25:46; John 5:28,29
8. Reward for soulwinning- 12:3 with 1 Thessalonians 2:19,20

Outline of Daniel:

PART 1: Historical 1-6

1. Historical background 1:1,2
2. Daniel's Resolve Not To Defile Himself 1:3-21
3. Nebuchadnezzar's Dream 2:1-49
4. Nebuchadnezzar's Image 3:1-30
5. Nebuchadnezzar's Judgment and Restoration 4:1-37
6. Belshazzar's Feast 5:1-29
7. Babylon's Fall 5:30,31
8. Daniel In The Lion's Den 6:1-28

PART 2: Prophetic 7-12

9. Daniel's First Vision: The Four Beasts 7:1-28
10. Daniel's Second Vision: The Goat and Ram 8:1-27
11. Daniel's Prayer of Confession 9:1-19

6 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*.

12. Daniel's Third Vision: The Seventy Weeks 9:20-27
13. A Prophetic Hermeneutic 10:1
14. Daniel's Fourth Vision: The Battle In The Heavenlies 10:2-21
15. Daniel's Fifth Vision: The Career of Antiochus 11:1-45
16. The Tribulation and Beyond 12:1-3
17. "Shut Up The Words" 12:4
18. Prophetic Time Frames 12:5-12
19. The Promise to Daniel 12:13

Outline from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture*, page 144 (edited):

1. Mainly Historical Daniel 1-6
    - A. Hebrews in a Heathen Court Daniel 1
        - i. Around 606 B.C.
        - ii. Under Nebuchadnezzar
    - B. A Dream of Destiny Daniel 2
        - i. Around 603 B.C.
        - ii. Under Nebuchadnezzar
    - C. Faithfulness Tested by Fire Daniel 3
        - i. Undated
        - ii. Under Nebuchadnezzar
    - D. The Tragedy of a Tree Daniel 4
        - i. Undated
        - ii. Under Nebuchadnezzar Daniel 5
    - E. The Feast and the Fingers
        - i. Around 541 B.C.
        - ii. Under Belshazzar
    - F. The Lions and the Lion-Hearted Daniel 6
        - i. Around 538 B.C.
        - ii. Under Darius
2. Mainly Prophetical Daniel 7-12
    - A. Godless Kingdoms and the Kingdom of God Daniel 7
    - B. The Ram and the He-Goat Daniel 8
    - C. A Prophet at Prayer Daniel 9
    - D. The Mystery of a Man Daniel 10
    - E. A Struggle for Sovereignty Daniel 11
    - F. A Vision of Victory Daniel 12

Daniel Chapter 1

1. Historical background 1:1,2

1:1 In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it.

This is recorded in 2 Kings 24:1. The date would be 606-605 B.C. Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, ruled from 609-597 BC.

"The book of Daniel has reference to the time during which Israel, the people of God, are under subjection to the Gentiles. At its opening we discover an accomplishment of the threat made to Hezekiah; Isaiah 39:6,7 (**Behold, days come when all that is in thy house, and that which thy fathers have laid up until this day, shall be carried to Babylon: nothing shall be left, saith Jehovah. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, whom thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon**.). The throne of God has been taken from Jerusalem; the power and the kingdom have been transferred to the Gentiles; and Israel, as to its actual state (being no longer, by the judgment of God, His people) is kept in captivity. But God does not abandon them: only He administers His blessings according to their actual necessity. The things most needful for them to know, under their existing trials, were the history of this dominion of the Gentiles, to which they were subjected, and also the effect of these changes upon the promises which belonged to them."[7]

The **"third year**" of Jehoiakim is the same as the "fourth year" in Jeremiah 25:1. This would be 606 B.C... Both dates are correct but were written from different perspectives for counting years. Daniel used the Chaldean method that did not count the accession year of a king as part of the actual reign where Jeremiah used the Hebrew method that did. This is to be expected since Daniel had spent most of his life in Babylon and would tend to use a Babylonian method of reckoning time rather than a Hebrew one. Also, Nebuchadnezzar set out on his expedition near the close of Jehoiakim's third year, from where Daniel reckons, but did not accomplish the subjugation of Jerusalem of Jerusalem until about the ninth month of the following year, from where Jeremiah reckons.

"This king was raised to the throne of Judea in the place of his brother Jehoahaz, by Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, 2 Kings 23:34-36, and continued tributary to him during the first three years of his reign; but in the fourth, which was the first of Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah 25:1, Nebuchadnezzar completely defeated the Egyptian army near the Euphrates, Jeremiah 46:2; and this victory put the neighboring countries of Syria, among which Judea was the chief, under the Chaldean government. Thus Jehoiakim, who had first been tributary to Egypt, became now the vassal of the king of Babylon, 2 Kings 24:1."[8]

"Now, trying to line up the events of Jehoiakim's reign as given in 2 Kings 24:1–2; 2 Chronicles 36:5–7; and Daniel 1:1–2 can be difficult, and I am not sure anybody has it completely right. What we know for sure is that Jehoiakim had an eleven-year reign (2 Kings 23:36; 2 Chron. 36:5), and we know that in the third full year of that reign, Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem and took captives and some of the Temple vessels back to Babylon (Dan. 1:1–2).

7 John Nelson Darby, *Collect Works*, volume 5, pages 123-124.
8 Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*.

After that, it becomes “shaky.” Some of the commentators make Nebuchadnezzar’s attack in 2 Chronicles 36:6–7 the siege of Daniel 1:1–2. If that be the case, then obviously Nebuchadnezzar either brought Jehoiakim back from Babylon and reinstated him as a subservient King until Jehoiakim rebelled three years later (2 Kings 24:1), or he never took him to Babylon as he intended. That is the position taken by both Easton and Smith in their Bible dictionaries. Other expositors have 2 Chronicles 36:6–7 as a second attack of Nebuchadnezzar at the end of the reign of Jehoiakim, in which the King of Judah was assassinated by his own people and his body thrown over the wall before Nebuchadnezzar could haul him off to Babylon (see Jer. 22:18–19, 36:30). We will reserve our judgment in these matters for what we know for sure and leave the speculation to others until the Lord gives us (or someone else) more light from the Scriptures, not secular history or scholars’ opinions.”[9]

"Nebuchadnezzar- really Nebuchadrezzar II (b. *c.* 630--d. *c.* 561 BC), the second and greatest king of the Chaldean dynasty of Babylonia (reigned *c.* 605-*c.* 561 BC). He was known for his military might, the splendor of his capital, Babylon, and his important part in Jewish history.

Nebuchadnezzar II was the oldest son and successor of Nabopolassar, founder of the Chaldean empire. He is known from cuneiform inscriptions, the Bible and later Jewish sources, and classical authors. His name, from the Akkadian Nabu-kudurri-usur, means "O Nabu, watch over my heir." While his father disclaimed royal descent, Nebuchadnezzar claimed the third-millennium Akkadian ruler Naram-Sin as ancestor. The year of his birth is uncertain, but it is not likely to have been before 630 BC, for according to tradition Nebuchadnezzar began his military career as a young man, appearing as a military administrator by 610. He is first mentioned by his father as working as a laborer in the restoration of the temple of Marduk, the chief god of the city of Babylon and the national god of Babylonia.

In 607/606 B.C., as crown prince, Nebuchadnezzar commanded an army with his father in the mountains north of Assyria, subsequently leading independent operations after Nabopolassar's return to Babylon. After a Babylonian reverse at the hands of Egypt in 606/605, he served as commander in chief in his father's place and by brilliant generalship shattered the Egyptian army at Carchemish and Hamath, thereby securing control of all Syria. After his father's death on Aug. 16, 605 BC, Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon and ascended the throne within three weeks. This rapid consolidation of his accession and the fact that he could return to Syria shortly afterward reflected his strong grip on the empire.

On expeditions in Syria and Palestine from June to December of 604 BC, Nebuchadnezzar received the submission of local states, including Judah, and captured the city of Ashkelon. With Greek mercenaries in his armies, further campaigns to extend Babylonian control in Palestine followed in the three succeeding years. On the last occasion (601/600 BC), Nebuchadnezzar clashed with an Egyptian army, with heavy losses; this reverse was followed by the defection of certain vassal states, Judah among them. This brought an intermission in the series of annual campaigns in 600/599 BC, while Nebuchadnezzar remained in Babylonia repairing his losses of chariots. Measures to regain control were resumed at the end of 599/598 BC (December to March). Nebuchadnezzar’s strategic planning appeared in his attack on the Arab tribes of northwestern Arabia, in preparation for the occupation of Judah. He attacked Judah a year later and captured Jerusalem on March 16, 597 BC, deporting King Jehoiachin to Babylon. After a further brief Syrian campaign in 596/595 BC, Nebuchadnezzar had to act in eastern Babylonia to repel a threatened invasion, probably from Elam (modern southwestern Iran). Tensions in Babylonia were revealed by a rebellion late in 595/594 BC involving elements of the army, but he was able to put this down decisively enough to undertake two further campaigns in Syria during 594 B.C.

9 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer’s Commentary on Daniel*, page 2,

Nebuchadnezzar's further military activities are known not from extant chronicles but from other sources, particularly the Bible, which records another attack on Jerusalem and a siege of Tyre (lasting 13 years, according to the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus) and hints at an invasion of Egypt. The siege of Jerusalem ended in its capture in 587/586 BC and in the deportation of prominent citizens, with a further deportation in 582 BC. In this respect he followed the methods of his Assyrian predecessors. Much influenced by the Assyrian imperial tradition, Nebuchadnezzar consciously pursued a policy of expansion, claiming the grant of universal kingship by Marduk and praying to have "no opponent from horizon to sky." From cuneiform fragments he is known to have attempted the invasion of Egypt, the culmination of his expansionist policy, in 568/567 B.C.

In addition to being a brilliant tactician and strategist, Nebuchadnezzar was also prominent in international diplomacy, as shown in his sending an ambassador (probably Nabonidus, a successor) to mediate between the Medes and Lydians in Asia Minor. He died about 561 BC and was succeeded by his son Awil-Marduk (Evil-Merodach of 2 Kings).

Nebuchadnezzar's main activity, other than as military commander, was the rebuilding of Babylon. He completed and extended fortifications begun by his father, built a great moat and a new outer defense wall, paved the ceremonial Processional Way with limestone, rebuilt and embellished the principal temples, and cut canals. This he did not only for his own glorification but also in honor of the gods. He claimed to be "the one who set in the mouth of the people reverence for the great gods" and disparaged predecessors who had built palaces elsewhere than at Babylon and had only journeyed there for the New Year Feast.

Little is known of his family life beyond the tradition that he married a Median princess, whose yearning for her native terrain he sought to ease by creating gardens simulating hills. A structure representing these hanging gardens cannot be positively identified in either the cuneiform texts or the archaeological remains.

Despite the fateful part he played in Judah's history, Nebuchadnezzar is seen in Jewish tradition in a predominantly favorable light. He gave orders for the protection of Jeremiah, who regarded him as God's appointed instrument whom it was impiety to disobey, and the prophet Ezekiel expressed a similar view at the attack on Tyre. A corresponding attitude to Nebuchadnezzar, as God's instrument against wrongdoers, occurs in the Apocrypha in 1 Esdras and, as protector to be prayed for, in Baruch. In Daniel and in Bel and the Dragon, Nebuchadnezzar appears as a man, initially deceived by bad advisers, who welcomes the situation in which truth is triumphant and God is vindicated."[10]

"The father of Nebuchadnezzar was Nabopolassar, probably a Chaldean prince. His mother is not known by name. The classical historians mention two wives: Amytis, the daughter of Astyages, and Nitocris, the mother of Nabunaid. The monuments mention three sons: Evil-merodach who succeeded him, Marduk-shum-utsur, and Marduk-nadin-achi. A younger brother of Nebuchadnezzar, called Nabu-shum-lishir, is mentioned on a building-inscription tablet from the time of Nabopolassar.

From these sources we learn that Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father on the throne of Babylon in 604 BC, and reigned till 561 BC. He probably commanded the armies of Babylon from 609. BC. At any rate, he was at the head of the army which defeated Pharaoh-necoh at Carchemish on the Euphrates in 605 BC (2 Kings 23:31; 2 Chronicles 35:20 ff). After having driven Necoh out of Asia and settled the affairs of Syria and Palestine, he was suddenly recalled to Babylon by the death of his father. There he seems quietly to have ascended the throne. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim (or 3rd according to the Babylonian manner of reckoning (Daniel 1:1)), he came up first against Jerusalem and carried away part of the vessels of the temple and a few captives of noble lineage. Again, in Jehoiakim's 11th year, he captured Jerusalem, put

10 *Encyclopedia Briticanna*, 1997 CD edition, edited for accuracy.

Jehoiakim, its king, into chains, and probably killed him. His successor, Jehoiachin, after a three months' reign, was besieged in Jerusalem, captured, deposed, and carried captive to Babylon, where he remained in captivity 37 years until he was set free by Evil-merodach. In the 9th year of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar made a 4th expedition against Jerusalem which he besieged, captured, and destroyed (see Jeremiah 52). In addition to these wars with Judah, Nebuchadnezzar carried on a long siege of Tyre, lasting 13 years, from his 7th to his 20th year. He had at least three wars with Egypt. The first culminated in the defeat of Necoh at Carchemish; the second in the withdrawal of Hophra (Apries) from Palestine in the 1st year of the siege of Jerusalem under Zedekiah; and the third saw the armies of Nebuchadnezzar entering Egypt in triumph and defeating Amasis in Nebuchadnezzar's 37th year. In the numerous building and honorific inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar he makes no mention by name of his foes or of his battles; but he frequently speaks of foes that he had conquered and of many peoples whom he ruled. Of these peoples he mentions by name the Hittites and others. In the *Wady-Brissa* inscription, he speaks of a special conquest of Lebanon from some foreign foe who had seized it; but the name of the enemy is not given. The inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar show that he was a very religious man, probably excelling all who had preceded him in the building of temples, in the institution of offerings, and the observance of all the ceremonies connected with the worship of the gods. His larger inscriptions usually contain two hymns and always close with a prayer. Mention is frequently made of the offerings of precious metals, stones and woods, of game, fish, wine, fruit, grain, and other objects acceptable to the gods. It is worthy of note that these offerings differ in character and apparently in purpose from those in use among the Jews. For example, no mention is made in any one of Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions of the pouring out or sprinkling of blood, nor is any reference made to atonement, or to sin."[11]

"In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came to Jerusalem and besieged it; and the LORD gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, along with some of the vessels of the house of God; and he brought them to the land of Shinar, to the house of his gods, and he brought them into the treasury of his gods." This statement, that Nebuchadnezzar invested Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim, has been regarded as problematic because of statements we find elsewhere in the Bible. To get a full picture, let us consider all of these.

First, 2 Kings 23:36-24:1: "Jehoitim was 25 years old when he became king, and he reigned 11 years in Jerusalem; and his mother's name was Zebidah the daughter of Pedaiah. And he did evil in the LORD'S sight, of Rumah, according to all that his fathers had done. In his days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up, and Jehoiakim became his servant three years; then he turned and rebelled against him."

2 Chronicles 36:6-7 adds more: "Jehoiakim was 25 years old when he became king, and he reigned 11 years in Jerusalem; and he did evil in the sight of the LORD his God. Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up against him and bound him with bronze to take him to Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar also brought of the articles of the LORD's house to Babylon and put them in his temple at Babylon."

Neither of these passages tells us when Nebuchadnezzar came up to Jerusalem this first time. Jeremiah 25:1 adds light on the subject: "The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah, in the 4th year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah (that was the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon)."

In the oracle God says that Nebuchadnezzar is "My servant" (Jeremiah 25:9) and that all the "nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 years" (v. 11). So, Jeremiah says that Nebuchadnezzar's 1st year is Jehoiakim's 4th, and predicts that Nebuchadnezzar will conquer

11 *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.*

Judah and all surrounding nations; while Daniel 1:1 says that Nebuchadnezzar, as king, conquered Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim. Is there a difficulty here? Not yet. At this point the problem can easily be resolved. Sometime during the 3rd year of Jehoiakim, Nabopolassar King of Babylon died and his son Nebuchadnezzar became king. This is Nebuchadnezzar's Year 0, for the year is given to Nabopolassar as his last. During this year, Nebuchadnezzar invested and took Jerusalem. He brought Jehoiakim and some of the golden vessels of the Temple back to Babylon. Equivalent to the golden vessels were some of the nobility of Judah, which they symbolized, including Daniel and his friends; thus a party of the Judalite nobility's youths was also brought to Babylon. Then Jehoiakim was sent back to rule Judah as Nebuchadnezzar's vassal.

After Jehoiakim returned to Jerusalem, Jeremiah was given the prophecy recorded in Jeremiah 25, which was that from now on Nebuchadnezzar was going to rule the world. Keil in his commentary goes to great lengths to insist that this prophecy had to come before Nebuchadnezzar's first investiture of Jerusalem, thus creating a conflict with Daniel 1:1. But Keil is simply being perverse. The prophecy of Jeremiah 25 says that Nebuchadnezzar is going to rule from now on, and that he will in time utterly destroy Jerusalem. Nothing in the prophecy conflicts with the notion that Nebuchadnezzar had already taken Jerusalem once.

In fact, the prediction in Jeremiah 25:9-11 certainly did not take place until the final destruction of Jerusalem: "Behold, I will send and take all the families of the north" says the LORD, "even to Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, My servant, and will bring them against this land, even against its inhabitants, and against all these nations round about; and I will put them under the ban and make them a horror and a hissing and an everlasting desolation. Moreover, I will cause to perish from them the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones and the light of the lamp. And this whole land shall be desolation and a horror, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years."

If, however, someone still wants to insist that Jeremiah 25 was prophesied before Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem the first time, the matter is still easy to explain. Daniel 1:1 simply says that Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim. Perhaps the siege was not completed until the 4th year of Jehoiakim. On the basis of Daniel 1-2, however, we must reject this possibility.

In 605 BC (using our present current consensus chronological dating system), Crown Prince Nebuchadnezzar was sent by his ailing father Nabopolassar to fight the Egyptians, who had three years previously invaded Babylonian territory and established themselves at Carchemish. In the spring of that year Nebuchadnezzar defeated the Egyptians at Carchemish, and then pursued them to Egypt. Thereafter he conquered Syria and Palestine. He probably took Jerusalem at this time, and probably without a fight. Pharaoh Neco had killed King Josiah at Megiddo three years earlier when he was advancing into Babylonian territory. Pharaoh had put Jehoiakim on the throne. Now that Pharaoh had been defeated, Jehoiakim could see the handwriting on the wall, and submitted to Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 23:29-37).

Then, on August 15, 605 B.C.**,** Nabopolassar King of Babylon died. Nebuchadnezzar immediately dropped everything and rushed to Babylon to take control before anarchy and conspiracy could get a foothold. He ascended the throne on September 7. This was still in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim.

The 4th year of Jehoiakim began in the fall, and thus shortly after Nebuchadnezzar became King of Babylon. After becoming king, Nebuchadnezzar quickly returned to Palestine and Syria and completed his conquests. He returned to Babylon with much spoil in late February of 604 BC. The Babylonians counted their kings' regal years from spring to spring, not from fall to fall; and Nebuchadnezzar shook hands with the statues of the gods Bed and Bel's son on the first day of Nisan (April 2, 604 B.C.). This began his first year of reign, by Babylonian reckoning, midway through the 4th year of Jehoiakim.

Putting it all together: In the summer of 605 BC Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem and shipped back to Babylon some gold from the Temple, some of the youth of the nobility, and King Jehoiakim. Nebuchadnezzar himself went to Babylon to become king shortly thereafter. Nebuchadnezzar is called King of Babylon in Daniel 1:1 because that is how he is known to history, even though he had not yet officially become king. A few months later, after Jehoiakim returned to Jerusalem, God told Jeremiah to inform him and the people that from now on Nebuchadnezzar was His servant, and all nations would need to submit to him. The message to Jehoiakim was: "Don't even think about rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar."[12]

Thus, Jordan offers this chronology of the early chapters of Daniel, which is as good as anything else out there:[13]

xJ- year of rule by Jewish reckoning
xB- year of rule by Babylonian reckoning

608 BC Death of Josiah fighting for Babylon
Three month rule of Jehoahaz
Accession of Jehoiakim
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 1. This is the first year of the 70 years of Babylonian world dominance spoken of in Jeremiah 25.

607 BC
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 2.

606 BC
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 3.

605 BC
2nd Quarter: Egyptians defeated at Carchemish.
3rd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzzar conquers Palestine and Jerusalem. Daniel and Jehoiakim are sent back to Babylon. Daniel's 1st (partial) year of education begins. Nebuchadnezzar hears of father's death and flies to Babylon.
4th Quarter: Beginning of 4th year of Jehoiakim. By Jewish reckoning, Nebuchadnezzar's first year begins. Prophecy of Jeremiah 25. Daniel's 2nd year of education, corresponding with Nebuchadnezzar's 1st year of rule. Jehoiakim serves Nebuchadnezzar this whole year, but it is evidently not counted as one of the three years he served, probably because the revelation of Nebuchadnezzar's rule as God's servant was not given through Jeremiah until after the year began.

604 BC
1st Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar completes conquest of Palestine.
2nd Quarter: By Babylonian reckoning, Nebuchadnezzar's first year begins here.
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 5 begins. Nebuchadnezzar 2J (2 by Jewish reckoning). Daniel's 3rd year of education begins. -First full year of Jehoiakim's servitude.

603 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 2B (2 by Babylonian reckoning).
3rd Quarter: Daniel's graduation. Daniel interprets dreams and is elevated to power (Dan. 2).

12 James Jordan, Biblical Chronology, volume 6, number 12, December 1994.
13 James Jordan, Biblical Chronology, volume 7, number 1, January 1995.

4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 6 begins. Nebuchadnezzar 3J. Second year of Jehoiakim's servitude.

602 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 3B.
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 7 begins. Nebuchadnezzar 4J. Third year of Jehoiakim's servitude.

601 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 4B
4th Quarter. Jehoiakim 8. Nebuchadnezzar 5J. Nebuchadnezzar stalemated by Egypt (in December). Jehoiakim revolts.

600 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 5B
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 9. Nebuchadnezzar 6J

599 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 6B
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 10. Nebuchadnezzar 7J. Nebuchadnezzar invades Palestine; takes 3023 Jews captive; Jeremiah 52:28.

598 BC
1st Quarter: End of Palestinian campaign. 3023 Jews taken captive to Babylon in Nebuchadnezzar's 7th year.
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 7B
4th Quarter: Jehoiakim 11. Nebuchadnezzar 8J. Jehoiakim dies. Jehoiachin becomes king (December 9; 2 Chronicles 36:9), rebels against Nebuchadnezzar. Siege of Jerusalem (begins December)

597 BC
1st Quarter: Completion of Siege (Mar. 16). End of Jehoiachin's 3-month reign. 10, CM) many taken captive, including Ezekiel (Jeremiah 52:29; Ezekiel 1:1-3). Zedekiah put on throne. (Biblical records say this is in Nebuchadnezzar's 8th year, while Babylonian records put it in his 7th year because his 8th year does not begin until spring.)
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 8B
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 1. Nebuchadnezzar 9J

592 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 13B
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 6. Nebuchadnezzar 14J

591 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 14B
3rd Quarter: 6th month, 5th day: God abandons Temple, Ezekiel 8:1ff.
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 7**.** Nebuchadnezzar 15J. First year of God's desolation of the Temple.

590 BC
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 15B
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 8. Nebuchadnezzar 16J

589 BC
***2nd Quarter*:** Nebuchadnezzar 16B

4th Quarter: Zedekiah 9**.** Nebuchadnezzar 17J

588 BC
1st Quarter: 10th month, 10th day: Investiture of Jerusalem begins, (Jan. 15). This begins God's Indignation against the cities of Judah that surrounded Jerusalem, Zechariah 1:12.
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 17B
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 10. Nebuchadnezzar 18J

587 BC - 832 Jews taken captive during siege; Jeremiah 52:29.
2nd Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 18B
4th Quarter: Zedekiah 11. Nebuchadnezzar 19J

586 BC
2nd *Quarter:* Nebuchadnezzar 19B
3rd Quarter: 4th month, 9th day: Fall of Jerusalem (July 18). 5th month, 7th-10th day: Burning of Jerusalem and Temple (Aug. 12-15). (Note that even by Babylonian reckoning, Jerusalem fell in Nebuchadnezzar=s 19th year.)
4th Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 20J.

583 BC
4th Quarter: Nebuchadnezzar 23J. Sometime during this year, 745 Jews taken into captivity; Jeremiah 52:30.

"The date of this deportation by Nebuchadnezzar (605 B.C.), as Daniel recorded it, was the third year of King Jehoiakim's reign (v. 1). However, Jeremiah wrote that the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (605 B.C.) was the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign (Jer. 25:1; cf. 46:2). Many critics of Daniel have seized upon this apparent contradiction and have tried to discredit this prophecy.

Scholars have proposed several solutions to this problem. The best one, from my viewpoint, is that Daniel wrote from the Babylonian perspective and Jeremiah from the Jewish. It would have been only natural for Daniel to do so since he spent virtually all of his life in Babylon. The Babylonians considered the first year of their kings' reigns as the accession year, the year they acceded to the throne. That "year" sometimes lasted only a few months. The first regnal year, the first full year of their reign, began with the first day of the new civil year. For the Babylonians this was the first of Nisan (late March and early April). This is the accession-year system of dating.

Jeremiah was writing from the Jewish perspective. During the reigns of Jehoash to Hoshea the Jews also followed the accession-year system. However, the Jews began their civil years on the first of Tishri (late September and early October). This explanation harmonizes these references."[14]

1:2 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.

It's not that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Judah through his military might but rather that God gave Judah into Nebuchadnezzar's hand. If God had not allowed it, Nebuchadnezzar would not have been able to capture Jerusalem even with a million-man army. But this verse matches 2 Kings 24:1 ("**In his days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up, and Jehoiakim**

14 Thomas Constable, *Notes on Daniel*, page 12.

became his servant three years: then he turned and rebelled against him") and 2 Chronicles 36:6 ("**Against him came up Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and bound him in fetters, to carry him to Babylon**.").

Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem and Judah is the beginning of Gentile world domination, which will not end until the Second Coming.

"**Land of Shinar**"- another name, geographically, for Babylon- Genesis 11:2 "**And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there.".**

"**treasure house of his god**" The temple of Bel, chief Babylonian god. It also could have been Marduk. This is where the treasury was to finance the religion. The dedicated monies to this religion would also be stored here.

"**he brought the vessels into the treasure house of his god."** There is a sense of divine justice in this. The Jews had brought idols into the temple in their apostasy, so God allows the temple vessels and furniture to be carried away and placed in the temple of a heathen god.

2. Daniel's Resolve Not To Defile Himself 1:3-21

1:3 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;

These children (teenagers) were deported by Nebuchadnezzar and taken to Babylon where they would be indoctrinated in all things Babylonian, so they might serve their new masters. These young people were the cream of the crop of high academic and social standing in Judah. Nebuchadnezzar maintained this typically Assyrian practice into his reign. The State always wants the children so they can capture their minds early and mold them to what the State wants them to be.

These young men also functioned as hostages, to ensure the loyalty of the King of Judah.

This exile of the young men into Babylon, separated from their parents, is in fulfillment of Deuteronomy 28:32,41 ("**Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people, and thine eyes shall look, and fail with longing for them all the day long: and there shall be no might in thine hand…. Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them; for they shall go into captivity."),** as one of the curses for Israel's apostasy.

The motivations behind this indoctrination included:

1. They were hostages, thereby ensuring the loyalty of their families to submit to the new government.
2. To train men to serve in the expanded bureaucracy.
3. To train them as liaisons between the Babylonian government and the exiled Jewish nation.
4. They were trophies, as Nebuchadnezzar claimed the best and brightest of the youth of Judah as his own, to serve him.

There are similarities between Joseph and Daniel that should also be noted:

1. Both were prisoners in foreign lands.

2. Both dreamed dreams and were interpreters of dreams. They also interpreted dreams when the native "wise men" could not.
3. Both were severely tested morally.
4. Both had their names changed by heathen kings.
5. Both had the unusual and strong favor of their captors. Eventually, both were promoted to high governmental positions.
6. Both lived holy lives in heathen lands. Their characters were presented as blameless.

Notice that the young men were chosen, as they would be more pliable and easier to indoctrinate than the older exiles. The glories and magnificence of Nebuchadnezzar's court would probably amaze and intimidate the younger exiles more than it would the older ones.

"eunuch" is a man who has been castrated, as was common in royal households, especially with men charged with administrating or guarding the harems or concubines of royalty. They were castrated for obvious reasons. Eunuchs also rose to high and powerful positions in many kingdoms, as seen in Acts 8 with the Ethiopian eunuch. It is also used by the Lord in Matthew 19:12 to describe one who willingly foregoes a sexual relationship (marriage) in life. It is possible that Daniel and his fellows were made eunuchs in order to serve in the Babylonian government. Physical castration is not necessarily involved, except in the case of the apostate church father Origen, who did castrate himself because of this verse. This "great Bible scholar" (liberal and apostate cliché) couldn't accurately interpret this idea so he unnecessarily had himself mutilated! It would appear Daniel and his fellows may have been made eunuchs, as the Lord warned Hezekiah in 2 Kings 20:18 ("**And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon**.") and in Isaiah 39:7 ("**And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon**.").

Oriental kings often used eunuchs for high officials. They had no sons to carry on a kingly dynasty, so their motivation for assassination or other political intrigue would be diminished.

The etymology of this word is from *eune*, "bed," + *-ekhein*, "to have, hold".

1:4 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.

Would to God we had some teenagers like this in our churches today! Since these young people were of royal blood, they would have had a superior education to begin with. But with that education went some character, we would assume. If the boys had a reputation for wildness and rebellion, it is doubtful that Nebuchadnezzar would have wasted any effort on them. The requirements Nebuchadnezzar was looking for was that they were:

1. No blemish physically or morally
2. Well-favored, had a good upbringing and a good reputation and character
3. Cunning in knowledge, well-able to study and to act as scholars
4. Understanding science, probably also included the occult arts, which were popular in Babylon
5. Had ability to stand in the king's palace, who had the mental fortitude and character to serve the king aptly

6. They could be taught in the learning and tongue (language) of the Chaldeans. They had to be teachable and intelligent.

"cunning" From Middle English cunning, kunning, konnyng, alteration of earlier Middle English cunninde, kunnende, cunnand, from Old English *cunnende*, present participle of *cunnan* ("to know how to, be able to"), equivalent to con + -ing. From Middle English cunning, kunnyng, partially from Old English **cunning* (verbal noun), from *cunnan* ("to know how to, be able to"); partially from Old English *cunnung* ("knowledge, trial, probation, experience, contact, carnal knowledge"), from *cunnian* ("to search into, try, test, seek for, explore, investigate, experience, have experience of, to make trial of, know"), equivalent to con + -ing. Cognate with Scots cunnand ("cunning"), German dialectal könnend ("cunning"), Icelandic kunnandi ("cunning"). The idea then is "ability", "experience". It does not necessarily have the negative connotation that it has today.

It is interesting that nothing is mentioned about them being educated in the religion of the Chaldeans. Nebuchadnezzar needed administrators, not theologians. He had wise men and priests for the spiritual needs of his empire. But if they had been "Babylonianized", their conversion to Babylonian religion would have no-doubt followed and would have been required. This assumed conversion to Babylonian religion would further insure the loyalty of these young men to the State.

These young men must have really been something. The king was in need of counselors and administrators whom he could receive good advice. Every ruler needs that. There was something in these men that the king's "talent scouts" spotted and sought to develop.

But what they would have been taught! The Babylonians were not stupid but were highly advanced and educated. They were able to figure out the date of the birth of Christ when the Jews missed it.

"the Chaldeans" were Babylonians but were the cream of society, the best and the brightest in the nation.

AV	ESV	LSV
4 Children in whom *was* no blemish, but well favoured, 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.	4 youths without blemish, of good appearance and skillful in all wisdom, endowed with knowledge, understanding learning, and competent to stand in the king's palace, and to teach them the literature and language of the Chaldeans.	4 youths in whom was no defect, who were good in appearance, showing insight in every *branch of* wisdom, being thoroughly knowledgeable and discerning knowledge, and who had ability to stand in the king's palace; and *he said for him* to teach them the literature and tongue of the Chaldeans.

"**science**" "Notice the word "science," as in 1 Timothy 6:2 the word has been removed from both passages in the new "Bibles" The modern, apostate Conservatives, Fundamentalists, and Evangelicals have made a "god" of science and do not want the reader to connect it with Babylon."[15]

15 Peter Ruckman, *Ruckman Reference Bible*, page 1137.

1:5 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.

This wine and meat were clearly offered to the false Babylonian gods, which is what bothered Daniel in Daniel 1:8. Paul deals with this same issue in 1 Corinthians 8, but it would have been a much worse problem and situation to Daniel the Jew than to the Gentile Corinthians.

The Babylonians had a three-year training and education program for these young Hebrew exiles, to make them fit to stand before Nebuchadnezzar and to serve in his administration. It would take three years for them to learn the language and become familiar with the basics of Babylonian education. It took them three years to see the face of a heathen king, yet Christians have access to the very throne-room of the King of Kings as soon as they are saved! How much more accessible is our King! And we need not wait three years or finish any "indoctrination" program before we are allowed access to our King.

It must have been a shock to these captives to be treated so well by the king. They were captives and would normally have been enslaved or killed. But they were offered scholarships instead of slavery and were given the best education in the world, groomed to serve in the most powerful kingdom in the world. We must be careful in this, for the world is always seeking to lure Christian young people away with promises of similar honors. It was an honor that Nebuchadnezzar was bestowing on them, but they were still captives in a strange land where God was not honored. Daniel would live in Babylon for the rest of his life, but he never forgot he was a Jew. Moses had similar struggles as a Jew in the upper ranks of Egyptian society.

This "daily provision of the king's meat" was what was allotted to these young people daily, as prescribed by the government. We have something similar today when the Government starts telling you how much soda you can drink a day, how much fat and salt you should have and what kind of immunization shots you need.

1:6 Now among these were of the children of Judah, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah:

As we will see, these are four of the best that Judah had to offer. And they were so noble, yet they were teenagers, far from home, separated from family and exiled in a heathen land where their God was not known or honored. Yet they still served God, witnessed for Him and did not compromise. What character!

The meanings behind the Hebrew names:

1. Daniel- "God is (my) judge."
2. Hananiah- "God has favored."
3. Mishael- "Who as is God is?"
4. Azariah- "God has helped."

1:7 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 Abednego.

This was another step in the process of de-Jewishizing[16] of these exiles- take their Jewish names from then and give him heathen names. But changing their outward name did not change their inward character. You can change a man's name but you can't change his character, for good or bad.

It has always bothered me that we usually refer to Daniel's three friends by their heathen, Babylonian names instead of their godly, Hebrew names. This is especially true in children's literature. This changing of names would be another attempt to get these Hebrews to abandon their Jewish heritage and patriotism and to accept the new Babylonian order. It would also signify the "victory" of the Babylonian gods over the Hebrew "gods" in forcing these Hebrews to abandon their names, based on their God, and forcing them to accept names based on Babylonian gods. But changing a man's name does not change his character, and the attempt failed with these four, although it might have been more successful with the other Jewish exiles. This practice of the changing of names was a mark of dominion and authority. It was customary for masters to impose new names upon their slaves; and rulers often, on their ascending the throne, assumed a name different from that which they had before. With the change of name, the Babylonians expected to change the religion of the Hebrew exiles, which did not work with Daniel and his fellows.

Compare how Joseph also had his named changed to Zaphnath-paaneah by Pharaoh in Genesis 41:45 ("**And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnathpaaneah; and he gave him to wife Asenath the daughter of Potipherah priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt.**"). Name-changing is a common enough practice in the Bible, as even the Lord did it, as He changed Simon's name to Peter in Mark 3:16 ("**And Simon he surnamed Peter;**").

But in this case, you can change a man's name but that doesn't mean his character is changed too. These four men retained their character even after they were saddled with heathen names.

The meaning behind the new, Babylonian names:

1. Belteshazzar- Bel Protect the King, or Whom Bel Favors.
2. Shadrach- Command of Aku, or Illuminated By The Sun God.
3. Meshach- Who is what Aku, or Venus, is?
4. Abed-nego- Servant of Nebo.

"And now we come to the real purpose of the training. Nebuchadnezzar wants to take these Jewish young men and erase all their roots so they would be completely displaced and transplanted. He is going to try to turn them into Chaldeans.

He intends to change what they learn. Those Jews were to be taught the Scriptures from the time they were children (Deut. 6:7; 2 Tim. 3:15) so they would learn to fear the Lord and obey Him (Deut. 4:10, 31:12). Nebuchadnezzar intends to send them off to public school to learn evolution, philosophy, hedonism, and Marxism.

He intends to change their language. They won't be speaking Hebrew anymore; they'll be speaking Chaldean. You don't teach the kiddies how to read so they can read the Bible, like your forefathers intended. You teach them to read just enough to program them with magazines, newspapers, and a bunch of pornographic stuff. You remove the language of the Bible from their speech as much as possible with 323 (plus!) different versions so they don't know what it says. You pump their eyes and ears full of stuff about sex, liquor, drugs, cussing, perversion, and generally living like hell, through radio and television, until they talk and act like the stuff they see and hear.

16 Yes, I made up that word!.

He changes their diet. Here in verse 5, they are to eat what the King eats and drink what he drinks. In modern application, you take the kids off Bible reading and prayer, and put them on a steady diet of radio, television, computers, magazines, trashy books, rock music, movies, etc., to change their appetite away from spiritual things.

And finally, he changes their names. That breaks the ties of family. Those boys, up to this point, had been born and raised as "Daniel" ("God is my judge"), "Hananiah" ("Jehovah has given"), "Mishael" ("Who is like God!"), and "Azariah" ("Whom Jehovah helps") (vs. 6). Their parents had given them those names to remind them the Lord was their God…. So in changing their names, Nebuchadnezzar was also changing their religion. You get rid of Jesus Christ and the Bible, and substitute for them Elvis Presley, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, Madonna, Michael Jackson, Miley Cyrus, LeBron James, "J Lo," Robin Williams, Chris Rock, et al. The heroes and "role models" for teenagers these days aren't Statesmen, inventors, doctors, or preachers; they are actors, rock musicians, athletes, and dirty comedians who live like the devil and have the morals of an alley cat. The kids learn to please and serve self instead of the God who made them."[17]

1:8 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.

This is a great verse to preach at a young people's meeting. Daniel's over-riding burden was to stay right with God and not to defile himself with the world. He wanted to remain both morally pure and ceremonially pure. He had such a burden as a teenager! We simply cannot get over this. He had no love for Babylon. He must tolerate it as he had no choice. Daniel might be in Babylon but Daniel was determined not to let Babylon get into him. This would require the doctrine of Biblical separation. Daniel would separate himself (as much as he could) from all things Babylonian in order to maintain his Jewishness and, more importantly, his identification with God. Daniel understood that the more Babylonian he got, the less Jewish he would be. He also understood that he could not be both Babylonian and faithful to God. He could be one or the other but not both.

This "**king's meat**" could have been unclean foods or foods with the blood not drained out. To eat and drink of it would be to give a passive and tacit approval of the Babylonian idolatry. It would also result in ceremonial defilement according to the Law of Moses. The more carnal of the Hebrew exiles may have prided themselves that they had been selected for such honors, or may have rationalized compromise by saying "I'm in a heathen land and I have no choice and must obey Romans 13", but not a spiritual man like Daniel. It was this spirituality and faithfulness that causes Daniel to stand out from the other exiles and made God use him in such a great way. See David's declaration in Psalm 141:4 and Solomon's proverb in Proverbs 23:3.

It is likely is that this meat had been offered to idols. Like most heathen, Nebuchadnezzar was a very religious man. It was the practice of pagan idolaters, before they ate their food, to offer it to the gods. Paul deals with this for the Christian in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10. An idol, in and of itself, is nothing (1 Corinthians 8:4 "**As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one."**). But the idol represents a devil (1 Corinthians 10:19,20 "**What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils**."). While a thing sacrificed to an idol may not mean anything to you as a Christian, it does

17 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*, pages 7-8.

to the lost person making the offering. Moreover, it might offend a Christian who has not grown enough in the Lord to realize his liberty in Christ. The rule of thumb is, don't be a stumbling block to a young Christian or an unbeliever.

The Christian was allowed to buy and eat any meat he wanted, but if he didn't want to violate his conscience or someone else's, he wasn't to inquire as from where it came (1 Corinthians 10:25,26 "**Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience sake: For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof**."). If he were invited over to someone's house for dinner (especially of his host was not a Christian), he could eat what was set before him without asking questions about its source (1 Corinthians 10:27 "**If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake**."). This may happen on the mission field more than it would here at home. If his host said, "I got this cut of beef for a good price because it was marked down after it had been offered to Diana (or Jupiter)," then the Christian was to push it away and say, "No thank you." This was for testimony's sake. That way no one could associate him with the idolatry behind the meat.

Here is where we start seeing Daniel's character, even as a teenager. We have teenagers standing for God and against the powers of their age, in a foreign land, in captivity, without the support of parents or a church. Maybe they had Babylonian names forced on them, but they could draw a line here. He didn't object to the heathen education he was being subjected to or the new heathen name he had been given, but he would draw the line at this food issue.

I think part of what shaped Daniel's character apart from the training of his parents) was Jeremiah's ministry. Daniel was alive (but young) during Jeremiah's ministry and probably heard him preach, or at least knew of him. Daniel would study Jeremiah's prophecies through his life, which helped him to understand the nature and length of the Babylonian Captivity as well as the start of the times of the Gentiles. The lasting effect of an older preacher on a young hearer! We can never know what the full effect of such a ministry will have on the young people who hear it. It was something that Daniel never got away from.

Notice how Daniel approached the "prince of the eunuchs". He was not preachy, arrogant, holier-than-thou, nasty or pushy. Daniel was respectful of his authority and made his request with that recognition and respect. It is true that you can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar! But more importantly is the fact that Daniel recognized the authority of the unbelievers and respected it. He even gave the "bare minimum" amount of respect to Belshazzar in chapter 5, even though Daniel did not like him. We are to show the proper respect to the "powers that be", regardless of how godly or ungodly they are. We do not show our approval upon them or what they do by showing these governmental leaders the respect they are due. Rather, we honor the God who put those people into those positions.

They were willing to learn from the Babylonians and live among the Babylonians, but were not willing to allow themselves to be defiled by the Babylonians. They practiced separation while in Babylon, as they were in Babylon but were not of Babylon.

1:9 Now God had brought Daniel into favor and tender love with the prince of the eunuchs.

Like Joseph and Potiphar and Joseph with Pharaoh. God will always touch the heart of the right man to help His servants.

"**tender love**" Only a perverted and filthy mind would try to read homosexuality into this. All it means is that God worked in hearts in a very special way to bring Daniel into a very favorable relationship with those who had been placed over him. There were better days in history when you could talk of this sort of affection between men without sodomy being read into it.

The Hebrew word here is "racham" (translated **"tender love**" in the Authorized Version). It is translated "**tender mercies**" in Psalms 25:6, 40:11, 69:16, 77:9. One of its meanings is "compassion."

1:10 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.

This has the force of an emphatic denial- "the King *should not see* your faces lacking..."

"Everyone else in your church is doing it! Why do you have to be different? It isn't hurting them!" This is an appeal to peer pressure and the herd mentality. We see then that of all the Jewish exiles, it seems that only Daniel and his three friends made any attempt to remain true to the Law of Moses. This is very disturbing until we remember the extremely low spiritual state of the Jews at the time of their Babylonian exile.

If Daniel didn't measure up to the other Hebrew young people physically, this prince could be put to death- or, at least, he feared he could be. Life was cheap in Babylon and was subject to the whim of the king. Melzar rightly feared for his life if Daniel and his companions were not ready to stand before the King at the appointed hour.

1:11 Then said Daniel to Melzar, whom the prince of the eunuchs had set over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah,

Their Hebrew names are still being used, or at least referred to, at this point.

"Melzar" a title, not a proper name, as an "overseer" or "steward." He was working under the "prince of the eunuchs".

1:12 Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink.

Daniel was in submission to the authorities placed over him, even if they were godless, and would have obeyed except in this case, it would have required Daniel sinning, so he decided to obey God rather than man and declared that the command of God trumps the command of the king, even if he was the most powerful man on the earth at this time. Daniel was also respectful in his request, not arrogant or sanctimonious. Daniel also showed his concern for the welfare of those who were made responsible for him. Daniel's friends were also in on this.

"**ten days**" Very reasonable. What was ten days compared to three years? It would be easy to spare ten days for such a test and no harm would be done. If the test failed, the results would not be very noticeable, and no one would get in trouble with the king.

Compare with the Church at Smyrna in Revelation 2:10 ("**Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give**

thee a crown of life.") where the Lord tells them they will have tribulation ten days. An interesting parallel.

"Ten" is that number of the Gentiles. Daniel was the prophet who spoke of the Gentile would powers and their demise, so we should not be surprised to see the number "ten" have a prominent place in relation to him.

"**pulse** is from the French 'pols', which is from a Latin word meaning 'porridge'. 'Pulse' is grain or see of beans, peas or lentils used as food."[18] This would be a very mean diet.

1:13 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.

"**Let the others eat**." Daniel was not one to force his convictions on others. It is always best to lead by example rather than to try to force your convictions upon others.

The proposal- "if my countenance looks worse on vegetables and water than it does of those who eat the king's food, then you'll know that God is with me and that He will sustain my countenance without the aid of your food that has been dedicated to heathen gods. But if I look worse, then I'll eat whatever you set before me." In other words, Daniel said that the blessing of God would do more for his countenance than would the best food the world had to offer. This test would run for 10 days.

"countenance" is from the Anglo-Norman, from Latin contineō ("hold together"). It has the idea of appearance, especially the features and expression of the face.

1:14 So he consented to them in this matter, and proved them ten days.

Ten is the number of Gentile world power. Is there any special significance with this (already noted in the notes in Daniel 1:12), as Daniel the Jew takes on the power and diet of the Gentile Babylonian Empire? The Gentiles were testing the Jews here and the Jews came out very well as a result.

1:15 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.

The power of God over the power of a heathen king's diet was manifested through Daniel's faith, character and convictions. Bread and water the blessing of God helps both soul and body better than all the delicacies of the world's table.

We must make sure that we do not allow verses like this to be used as a proof-text for vegetarianism! The Bible certainly does not condemn the eating of meat. The issue as to whether you want to eat meat or not is left to individual preferences, and we really have no right to judge brethren on this issue (Romans 14). But if anyone insists upon using this account to prove that God approves of vegetarianism more than he does meat-eating, let him remember that this was only a temporary exercise, used to prove a point.

18 Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 274.

1:16 Thus Melzar took away the portion of their meat, and the wine that they should drink; and gave them pulse.

Daniel and his companions thus receive a permanent change in the diet. If it was good enough to get Daniel into this superior physical condition, then it was also good enough to keep him in such a state.

AV	ESV	LSV
16 Thus **Melzar** took away the portion of their meat, and the wine that they should drink; and gave them pulse.	16 So the steward took away their food and the wine they were to drink, and gave them vegetables.	16 So the overseer continued to withhold their choice food and the wine they were to drink, and kept giving them vegetables.

Both the ESV and LSV eliminate Melzar's name.

1:17 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.

A divine reward for their faithfulness. These were skills that would serve them well later and would be very useful and helpful as they carried out their duties as civil servants in Nebuchadnezzar's empire.

Daniel got a double portion, not only the knowledge and skill, but also understanding of dreams and visions. Daniel's Babylonian learning is similar to Moses' learning in all the wisdom and learning of Egypt (Acts 7:22 **"And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds.").**

1:18 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.

"**end of the days**" at the end of the 3 years of Daniel 1:5. In the ancient Near East, ritual and ascetical purification was always regarded as a necessary preparation for contact with a deity and as a prerequisite for receiving mystical revelations.

1:19 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.

They were examined, or tested, by the King himself, whom they impressed as no other did or could. The context suggests that Nebuchadnezzar was very impressed with them and engaged in some rather deep discussions with them.

1:20 And in all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king enquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm.

"**ten times better**" Again, the number ten appears, this time in a comparative context regarding Daniel's victory over the Gentiles, or, by an extended application, Israel's eventual victory over the Gentile world power. But how exactly Daniel and his friends were literally "ten times better"

is difficult to give objectively, except to say that whatever the Babylonians knew or could do, Daniel and his friends could also know or know much better. God's men could beat these heathen at anything due to the divine aid and depositum given them.

Astrology was very important and highly respected in Babylon, just like it is today. Regardless, it is still not a Biblical practice or "science" and it is never endorsed by Scripture.

AV	ESV	LSV
20 And in all matters of wisdom *and* understanding, that the king enquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians *and* **astrologers** that *were* in all his realm.	20 And in every matter of wisdom and understanding about which the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and enchanters that were in all his kingdom.	20 And as for every matter of wisdom in understanding which the king sought from them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians *and* conjurers who *were* in all his kingdom.

"astrologers" The ESV uses "enchanters". The LSV uses "conjurers". They do the same in 2:2,10,27.

1:21 And Daniel continued even unto the first year of king Cyrus

The secret to Daniel's longevity in serving in a heathen government was his character, faithfulness and faith in God. Daniel survived the fall of Babylon and continued straight into the new administration. See the end of Daniel 5 and the whole of Daniel 6.

"**the first year of King Cyrus**" This would be about 536 B.C. Daniel may have lived to see the return from the exile, although he himself did not participate in the return. He probably never saw his homeland again and died in exile. This is not a conflict with Daniel 10:1. Daniel did indeed continue into the first year of Cyrus, and even beyond.

There are several tribulation parallels in Daniel 1.

1. Jews are in captivity in Babylon (a type of persecution of Israel in the tribulation by "Mystery Babylon the Great".
2. The Jewish eunuchs would have had no relations with women (we never read about Daniel being married), compare with the 144,000 in Revelation 7, where they are virgins.
3. The ten days of testing- Daniel 1:12 with Revelation 2:10.

Daniel Chapter 2

Chapter 2 starts to deal with the Times of the Gentiles. All of the kingdoms mentioned here exercise their power and dominion without reference to God. These are not godly kingdoms, nor do they acknowledge God.

3. Nebuchadnezzar's Dream 2:1-49

2:1 And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him.

Nebuchadnezzar may have been a co-regent up to this time. This "**second year**" may refer to when he started ruling alone. Nebuchadnezzar did not become king until after the death of his father, Nebopolassar, in 605 B. C., so the second years of his reign would be 603 B. C., if we place the year of Daniel's exile and arrival in Babylon at 606 B. C.

God often used dreams to communicate prophetic visions. What is interesting is watching God devote so much prophetic revelation to a heathen king. God took a very close interest in Nebuchadnezzar with these dreams, what happened in chapter 4 and by having a godly man like Daniel placed at his right hand for a witness. This is why I believe (based on his letter and confession in chapter 4) that Nebuchadnezzar became a believer and worshiper of the God of Israel.

People always ask: "What about the heathen who've never heard?" This is one of those passages that shows you the heathen know more than you think they know.

If God had such a prophecy to give, why not just give it directly to Daniel?

1. Nebuchadnezzar would not have believed such a prophecy as this if it had been given to a prophet from a captured and conquered people.
2. Giving the dream to Nebuchadnezzar served as a way to get Daniel noticed by Nebuchadnezzar, in the light of the failure of the "wise men" to interpret that dream.
3. "But before we consider the "Dream" and its interpretation, it would be well to inquire as to why Nebuchadnezzar was chosen to receive the "Revelation" that it conveyed. The "Revelation" could have been made to Daniel or some other prophet. We often read of the "Divine Right" of kings. If there ever was a king who had a "Divine Right" to rule it was Nebuchadnezzar. He did not assume it, but was directly given it by God…From this Scripture we see that Nebuchadnezzar was Divinely chosen for his work. Whether he knew it or not, we are not told. We do know, however. that he was greatly puffed up by his greatness. For we read that as he walked in his palace one day he exclaimed – "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?" Dan. 4:29-30. It seemed meet and proper therefore that he should have the "Dream," which, with its interpretation, would disclose to him that his greatness was not the result of his own ability apart from God. and that the glories of his Empire would soon pass away."[19]

    A. Jeremiahs 27:4-8, **Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: thus shall ye say unto your masters: I have made the earth. the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the King of Babylon,**

19 Clarence Larkin, *The Book of Daniel*, pages 28-29.

my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son and his son's son, until the very time of his land come: and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass, that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the King of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the King of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand.

"We must distinguish between dreams and visions. Dreams occur in the transition stage between loss of "waking consciousness" and "sound sleep." Between the two there is what is called a state of "sleeping consciousness," during which we may dream but never know it. The dreams that we have and remember occurring when we are waking, and if not of a vivid character they fade as we try to recall them. Visions occur in our wakeful moments when our mind is absorbed on some thought, so that we are unconscious as to what is going on about us. Visions are an ocular phenomenon and are seen when the eyelids are closed."[20]

2:2 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.

"**magicians...astrologers...sorcerers...Chaldeans**..."These four classes of people represent all of the Babylonian and occult knowledge available in Babylon at this time- and it failed Nebuchadnezzar since God was not in it nor was He consulted. Daniel was not among this group. As a foreign exile who may not have been very advanced in his Chaldean studies (yet), he probably did not rank very high in their hierarchy and standing to represent them before the king. When you stand before the king, you bring out your "top guns" and "heavy hitters" who enjoy getting "face time" before the king, not the rookies or junior varsity squad.

"Chaldean" The term "Chaldean" has two meanings in Daniel. It deals with the Chaldeans in a racial/national context, like calling someone an American or a Canadian. Here, it describes a special class of astrologers and priests that emerged from the ethnic Chaldeans. They may have been priests in the Babylonian religion, concerned with the temples and their rituals. They were the guardians of the sacred traditional lore developed and preserved in Babylon over the centuries, covering natural history, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, and so on. The word denotes a special, privileged class, the chief of the five classes of wise men of Babylon.

2:3 And the king said unto them, I have dreamed a dream, and my spirit was troubled to know the dream.

Dreams were a favorite way for God to relay prophetic information. Below is the Biblical unfolding of dreams.

1. God speaks to non-believers in dreams.
    A. Abimelech, in warning
        i. Genesis 20:3,6 **"But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken; for she is a man's wife…. And God said unto him in a dream,**

20 Clarence Larkin, *The Book of Daniel*, page 30.

Yea, I know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her."

B. Pharaoh in prophecy

i. Genesis 41:1 **"And it came to pass at the end of two full years, that Pharaoh dreamed: and, behold, he stood by the river."**

C. Laban in warning

i. Genesis 31:24 "**And God came to Laban the Syrian in a dream by night, and said unto him, Take heed that thou speak not to Jacob either good or bad**."

D. The Egyptian baker and butler

i. Genesis 40:8-16

E. Midianite soldiers

i. Judges 7:13 "**And when Gideon was come, behold, there was a man that told a dream unto his fellow, and said, Behold, I dreamed a dream, and, lo, a cake of barley bread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came unto a tent, and smote it that it fell, and overturned it, that the tent lay along."**

F. Nebuchadnezzar

i. Daniel 2

ii. Daniel 4

G. Pontius Pilate's wife

i. Matthew 27:19 "**When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him**."

2. God speaks to his people in dreams

A. Jacob

i. Genesis 31:10,11 "**And it came to pass at the time that the cattle conceived, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the rams which leaped upon the cattle were ringstraked, speckled, and grisled. And the angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying, Jacob: And I said, Here am I.**"

B. Joseph

i. Genesis 37:5-10 "**And Joseph dreamed a dream, and he told it his brethren: and they hated him yet the more. And he said unto them, Hear, I pray you, this dream which I have dreamed: For, behold, we were binding sheaves in the field, and, lo, my sheaf arose, and also stood upright; and, behold, your sheaves stood round about, and made obeisance to my sheaf. And his brethren said to him, Shalt thou indeed reign over us? or shalt thou indeed have dominion over us? And they hated him yet the more for his dreams, and for his words. And he dreamed yet another dream, and told it his brethren, and said, Behold, I have dreamed a dream more; and, behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me. And he told it to his father, and to his brethren: and his father rebuked him, and said unto him, What is this dream that thou hast dreamed? Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?"**

C. Solomon

i. 1 Kings 3:5-14

D. Daniel

i. Daniel 7:1 **"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."

E. "Old men"

i. Joel 2:28 "**And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions:"**

ii. Acts 2:17 "**And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:"**

F. Joseph

i. Matthew 1:20 **"But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."**

ii. Matthew 2:13,19,22 **"And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him….But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt,… But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judaea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee:"**

G. The Magi

i. Matthew 2:12 "**And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way."**

3. Dreams often have a meaning and can be interpreted

A. Joseph

i. He interprets the dreams of the butler and baker.

a. Genesis 40:8-16

ii. He interprets Pharaoh's dream.

a. Genesis 41:25ff

B. Daniel

i. Daniel 2,4

C. Some dreams are very difficult to interpret, and the interpretation must be given by God

i. The Egyptian wise men

a. Genesis 41:8 "**And it came to pass in the morning that his spirit was troubled; and he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream; but there was none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh."**

ii. The Babylonian wise men

a. Daniel 2,4:7

iii. Daniel 2:28 "**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;"**

a. Daniel was given this gift by God.

(i). Daniel 1:17 "**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."**

(ii). Daniel 5:12 "**Forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting of dreams, and shewing 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 shew the interpretation."**

4., God speaks to prophets in dreams

A. Numbers 12:6 "**And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the LORD will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream**."

5. Warning against false prophets who claim to have dreams

A. Deuteronomy 13:1-5 "**If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, And the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him. And that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams, shall be put to death; because he hath spoken to turn you away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to thrust thee out of the way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walk in. So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee."**

i. The death penalty was proscribed for such a false prophet who tried to lure people away from worshipping God, based on his claim to have dreams.

B. Jeremiah 23:32 **"Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the LORD, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the LORD."**

C. Jude 8 (called "**filthy dreamers**")

6. God refused to answer Saul by any means, including dreams.

A. 1 Samuel 28:6,15 "**And when Saul enquired of the LORD, the LORD answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets…And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up? And Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do."**

7. Job spoke of nightmares

A. Job 7:14 "**Then thou scarest me with dreams, and terrifiest me through visions**:"

2:4 Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriack, O king, live for ever: tell thy servants the dream, and we will shew the interpretation.

AV	ESV	LSV
4 Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in **Syriack**, O king, live for ever: tell thy servants the dream, and we will shew the interpretation.	4 Then the Chaldeans said to the king in Aramaic, “O king, live forever! Tell your servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation.”	4 Then the Chaldeans spoke to the king in Aramaic: “O king, live forever! Say the dream to your servants, and we will declare the interpretation.”

“**Syriack**” The ESV and LSV have “Aramaic”. Here, the text is in Syriack, or Western Aramaic, through Daniel 7:28. The reason for the shift in language is because this section may have come from the official Babylonian governmental records or may have been placed there later. This section of Daniel that deals with God’s dealings with Gentile nations is written in a Gentile tongue. Aramaic was a second language to the Hebrews because Isaac and Jacob got their wives from Syria so they had much contact with that area, culture and language.

These Chaldeans had something like books on the interpretation of dreams. You can still buy such books even today. These books consisted of various types of dreams, categorized by type and content for easy reference and interpretation. Because such books had to try to cover every possible type of dream, they became very large and only experts could find his way through them. But even the “experts” needed some beginning point to start their research and Nebuchadnezzar would not even give them that much. He did not want a “ready-made, boilerplate” answer- he wanted an original interpretation through genuinely supernatural means. He would not get it from this crowd.

2:5 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.

AV	ESV	LSV
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 **dunghil**l.	5 The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, “The word from me is firm: if you do not make known to me the dream and its interpretation, you shall be torn limb from limb, and your houses shall be laid in ruins.	5 The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, “The word from me is firm: if you do not make known to me the dream and its interpretation, you will be torn limb from limb, and your houses will be made a rubbish heap.

“**The thing is gone from me**” Both the ESV and LSV have “The word from me is firm.” What in the world is that supposed to mean? Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten the dream, but the LSV has to copy from the ESV to obscure this clear meaning. Both versions make the same error in Daniel 2:8.
“**dunghill**” The Authorized Version is stronger than both the ESV and LSV.

Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten the dream but still wanted these "wise men" to tell him what it was as well as the interpretation. This forgetting of dreams is not so unusual, as we have all had dreams, even strong or disturbing dreams that we soon forget. We are still mentally bothered by them, yet we cannot recall them. That's not unusual. But Nebuchadnezzar's request is. He figured that if these wise men were genuine, then they would be able to get this

information from whatever supernatural sources they had access to. But there is a problem with that. Their supernatural sources were demonic and Satanic. And Satan is not omniscient. He cannot read thoughts and thus, he has no way of knowing what this dream was that God sent to Nebuchadnezzar, so there was nowhere they could go for this revelation since they did not know the God of Israel.

Some commentators think Nebuchadnezzar really didn't forget his dream but was testing these wise men to expose them either as genuine or frauds. He really did remember the dream but wanted the wise men to tell him what it was without him declaring any details of that dream. These type of "wise men" tended to be nothing more than "boot licking yes-men" who excelled at playing politics before the king (and holding on to their cushy jobs and nice pensions). Also, with Nebuchadnezzar still being somewhat young, these wise men were probably "hold-overs" from his father's kingdom who may have had limited loyalty to the new king. This would be a good excuse for Nebuchadnezzar to "clean house" if they couldn't reveal the dream. But I still think that Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten the dream, for it would have been a greater miracle to reveal the details of a dream that Nebuchadnezzar himself could not remember.

"**dunghill**" The penalty for fraud in this case is death and having your house plowed under for a latrine or a garbage dump- the ultimate humiliation. These Oriental kings had absolute power and they could do practically anything they wanted.

2:6 But if ye shew the dream, and the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honor: therefore shew me the dream, and the interpretation thereof.

First the stick, then the carrot. He was also playing both "good cop" and "bad cop" at the same time. They'll either cash in, or they'll cash out. They'll either be made rich and famous, or they'll be chopped into little bits and their houses turned into dung piles. There is no middle ground.

2:7 They answered again and said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will shew the interpretation of it.

2:8 The king answered and said, I know of certainty that ye would gain the time, because ye see the thing is gone from me.

It seems Nebuchadnezzar was beginning to see through these wise men. No doubt they were good politicians and "yes men" who told the king what he wanted to hear and used flattering words to do it, in order to stay on his good side. Nebuchadnezzar was getting tired of it or maybe he was starting to wise up to their act, so he throws the ultimate test at them to see if they are genuine or if they are frauds. These "wise men" were very adept in asking questions and drawing out enough information from the subject to form a shrewd and clever interpretation that would usually satisfy the subject. The problem here was the Nebuchadnezzar was not offering any such tidbits of information, thus, they had nothing they could say to him.

"gain the time" or "You're stalling!"

2:9 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 shew me the interpretation thereof.

No more hot air, flattery or lying words in the guise of prophecy. Nebuchadnezzar simply wants the dream interpreted without all the song and dance that he usually got from these wise men- or else. He also wants these "wise men" to prove themselves to be genuine and not just political fakirs and yes-men.

2:10 The Chaldeans answered before the king, and said, There is not a man upon the earth that can shew the king's matter: therefore *there is* no king, lord, nor ruler, *that* asked such things at any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean.

In this sense, they were correct. No man could possibly answer Nebuchadnezzar's challenge. This was a hopeless thing for mere men who had no contact or relationship with the divine. When we remember the pretension and arrogance of these wise men of Babylon, the request does not appear so outrageous. If they really had the wisdom and divine contacts that they claimed, they should be able to interpret the dream even without the king remembering it or describing it.

2:11 And *it is* a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh.

"**a rare thing**..." Such a thing has never been asked before- tell me the dream that I have dreamed although I have forgotten it! In short, tell me what I'm thinking right now.

The Babylonian wise men admit their failure and correctly notice that only God could provide the king with what he demands. Their occultic arts are of no value here and Satan could not (or would not) help them. God had them and their demonic spirits buffaloed. Divine revelation is needed, something they do not have access to. They thus confess themselves to be little better than frauds. Didn't they claim to be able to contact the gods? Didn't they claim to have supernatural contacts and knowledge? Yet now, they confess that they really were not able to access this source of information and revelation that they claimed to be able to do.

2:12 For this cause the king was angry and very furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon.

Why not? Nebuchadnezzar is now convinced that all these so-called "wise men" are frauds and fakes who have strung him along long enough now. It's time to clean house and do away with them. If they can't do something like tell and interpret his dream, then what good are they? But these men represented a lot of power and authority in Babylon, and to destroy them would have weakened the empire, unless that was Nebuchadnezzar's plan all along, to weaken the Babylonian nobility and thus make himself even more powerful.

2:13 And the decree went forth that the wise *men* should be slain; and they sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain.

Daniel and his friends were considered to be wise men. Daniel was probably considered as a "Chaldean", a mixture of a scientist and a philosopher.

It appears that there was going to be a public and general execution of these men and that they were not hunted down one by one and killed, as Daniel has the time to ask questions and to

pray and act. The execution may have been scheduled for the next day, which gave Daniel enough time that evening to act.

2:14 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:

Daniel didn't fly off the handle in a panic, but responded calmly, with dignity and discretion.

"**king's guard**" "Chief of the king's executioners or slaughter men. Margin, rab tabachaiya, chief of the butchers, he that took off the heads of those whom the king ordered to be slain, because they had in any case displeased him. "Go and bring me the head of Giaffer." The honorable butcher went and brought the head in a bag on a dish. It was Herod's chief butcher that brought the head of John the Baptist in a dish to the delicate daughter of Herodias. This was the custom of the country. No law, no judge, no jury. The will or caprice of the king governed all things."[21]

2:15 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.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	15 He declared to Arioch, the king's captain, "Why is the decree of the king so urgent?" Then Arioch made the matter known to Daniel.	15 he answered and said to Arioch, a powerful official for the king, "For what reason is the law from the king *so* urgent?" Then Arioch made the matter known to Daniel.

"hasty" is better in this context than "urgent".

"hasty" in the sense that not all the wise men have been heard from, as Daniel was not consulted about the king's dream. Since the king had not sought out all the wise men, why is he going to kill them all? Nebuchadnezzar figured they were all crooks, without exception.

2:16 Then Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him time, and that he would shew the king the interpretation.

The passage is a perfect illustration of Proverbs 16:14, "**The wrath of a king is as messengers of death: but a wise man will pacify it."** Daniel arranges an appointment with Nebuchadnezzar before he has any word or revelation from God. . He sends word to the king that he will tell the king the dream as well as the interpretation. Daniel really had nothing to lose by putting himself on the line, as he would have been killed whether he did this or not. The point is, Daniel knew that God would tell the dream as well as the interpretation of it since God gave the dream in the first place. Since Daniel knew God, he was confident that God would reveal the dream if Daniel prayed about it, reminding God that he was a dead man if God would not respond and answer this prayer. But Daniel had the faith that He would if asked.

2:17 Then Daniel went to his house, and made the thing known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his companions:

21 Adam Clarke.

United prayer can often have more results than individual prayer, and Daniel certainly wanted as much help in this prayer meeting as he could get. There is certainly power in numbers when it comes to prayer.

2:18 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.

What a prayer meeting this must have been, as they were literally praying for their life! As Samuel Johnson once said, "When a man knows he is about to be hung in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully."

2:19 Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven.

God always seems to do his deepest and strongest works in the heart of man during the night seasons.

1. Job 4:13 "**In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men**,"
2. Psalm 16:7 **"I will bless the LORD, who hath given me counsel: my reins also instruct me in the night seasons."**
3. Psalm 17:3 "**Thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night; thou hast tried me, and shalt find nothing; I am purposed that my mouth shall not transgress**."

Daniel's education (both Hebrew and Babylonian) availed him nothing here. The answer came directly from God because Daniel and his friends prayed and sought God for the interpretation, not because of the level of their education or what school they went to. Simply because a man went to a Bible College or Christian university and has an earned degree (even a doctorate) does not automatically mean that he knows anything about the Scripture. The opening of the Scriptures is done by God, not by some Bible college professor. College degrees mean little. It is the individual application of study, a willingness to be taught, humility and following the leading by the Spirit- and believe what you read- that leads to true knowledge of the Scriptures.

"God of Heaven" "The reference to "the God of heaven" or literally "of the heavens" is an obvious contrast to the religious superstitions of the Babylonians who worshiped the starry heaven. Daniel's God was the God of the heavens, not heaven itself. Abraham first used this term in Genesis 24:7, and it is found frequently later in the Bible (Ezra 1:2; 6:10; 7:12, 21; Nehemiah 1:5; 2:4; Psalm 136:26)."[22]

2:20 Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his:

God is the sole source of both, for wisdom is discerning dreams and revelation, as Daniel needed, and the might to set up a monarch such as Nebuchadnezzar, a lesson he would learn in chapter 4.

"Blessed be the name…" Daniel may have composed this hymn of praise "on the spot" after God revealed the dream. Who knows but if Daniel might now have actually sung verses 20-23 out loud? What does God do in this "Psalm of Daniel?"

22 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation.*

1. His name is blessed forever, 2:20
2. Wisdom is His, 2:20. God is the only source of true wisdom.
3. Might is His, 2:20. Only God has power as none can withstand Him or hope to defeat Him or His will.
4. He changes times and seasons, 2:21. This is because of His sovereignty, as He can do what He wills, when He wills, as He wills.
5. He removes kings and sets up kings, 2:21. This is another facet of His sovereignty, even over the kings during the times of the Gentile world powers. The political set up and situation in Daniel's day, and in our day, is due to God moving the chess pieces around on the board as it serves Him and His long-term plan for the ages, leading up to the establishment of the Millennial kingdom.
6. He gives wisdom to the wise, 2:21
7. He gives knowledge to the understanding, 2:21
8. He reveals deep and secret things, 2:22. He is the only One Who can. Many try to gain access to such knowledge by means of occultic methods (Ouija boards, crystal balls, horoscopes, etc…) but only God has the knowledge that Daniel is referring to and that Nebuchadnezzar is seeking and He will dispense to whom and when He sees fit, if He chooses to do so at all.
9. Light dwells with Him, 2:22

"**for wisdom and might are his**" Daniel ascribes to God "wisdom and might." Nebuchadnezzar had a measure of might but lacked wisdom; the Chaldeans had a measure of wisdom but no Might."[23]

2:21 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:

"he changeth the times and the seasons" God certainly can do as He desires. He created time and is its Master. He appointed the days and nights of creation, the 7-day week and the Sabbath, the prophetic time table starting in Genesis 3. He will establish the 70 weeks and stop the clock after 69 weeks (as we will see in chapter 9) and then re-start the clock at His own discretion. The times and seasons of the rapture and second coming are in His hands, as well as was the time of the birth and death of Christ, the birth of the Church and all yet-unfulfilled prophetic events. He can also exempt the Gentiles from Sabbath observance that was binding on Israel and give the Church Sunday instead as a day of worship.

God did this in Exodus 12:1,2 when He established a new calendar for the nation of Israel, just before the Exodus ("**And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.**"). In Daniel 9, He stopped the 70-week countdown at the 69th week and we do not know specifically when He will re-start it.

The Antichrist, in his delusion that he is God, will also think to do this in Daniel 7:25 ("**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**."). It is interesting that there have been many who have tried this, such as the demonic leaders behind the French Revolution, or the dictators in North Korea. They attempt to re-start the calendar from some man-made event, such as the "start of the revolution" or the birth of some tyrant. The French Revolution even thought about

23 Hamilton Smith, *The Book of Daniel, An Expository Outline.*

re-designing the week from seven days to ten days (re-doing the calendar into the metric system, based on a decimal system).

"**removeth kinds and setteth up kings**..." The sovereignty of God in the political and governmental affairs of men is clearly seen. Kings are not on their thrones due to themselves or their power, despite the self-delusion of such men. God sets up kings and puts them down according to His will and pleasure. This shows that God is no deist but is intently interested and active in all the affairs of man.

2:22 He revealeth the deep and secret things: he knoweth what *is* in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him.

The reason why the Babylonian wise men and astrologers failed was because they did not have access to the divine knowledge that Daniel did, nor was God going to reveal anything to them. The knowledge of the deep and secret things belong to God alone (Deuteronomy 29:29 "**The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.**"). They cannot be discerned or learned from occultic sources. God alone knows that knowledge that cannot be discerned or known by man. These deep and secret things belong to God He will reveal them when and if He sees fit and to His chosen messengers and interpreters.

2:23 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.

A good prayer of thanksgiving, something Daniel was very good at doing, as we see in chapter 9.

2:24 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 shew unto the king the interpretation.

2:25 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.

"**in haste**" Lives are on the line, so haste is required.

"**I have found**..." Arioch takes the credit for finding Daniel, where, in reality, Daniel found Arioch! But Arioch sees a chance to score some points with the king. Of course, if Daniel doesn't come through, it will not make Arioch look very good, but it seems he had quite a bit of faith in Daniel to give and interpret the dream, so Arioch hitches his star to Daniel's. Motto- always go with the godly man.

What Arioch did not recognize is that he did not "find" Daniel, but God had placed Daniel here at this time for such an event as this, as a witness and a testimony.

2:26 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?

2:27 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, shew unto the king;

Daniel is careful to remind the king about the failure of his own heathen occults, soothsayers and astrologers. He will contrast his divine knowledge and insight to their failure, and glorify God in the process.

AV	ESV	LSV
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**, shew unto the king;	27 Daniel answered the king and said, “No wise men, enchanters, magicians, or astrologers can show to the king the mystery that the king has asked,	27 Daniel answered before the king and said, “As for the mystery about which the king is asking, neither wise men, conjurers, magicians, *nor* diviners are able to declare *it* to the king.

“soothsayers” A new class of “wise man” is added here. The ESV omits it and the LSV has “diviners”.

2:28 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;

"**God in heaven**..." To distinguish Him from all of these false Babylonian gods.

Daniel is very careful and deliberate to make sure Nebuchadnezzar understands exactly where these revelations and interpretations come from- the God of Israel. Daniel, when introduced into the presence of the king, is not elated; he conceals himself, so to speak, behind the glory of God.

The eschatological term "**latter days**" in this context includes the times of the Gentiles, from the present time to the end of the Tribulation period, which will usher in the Jewish millennial kingdom as well as the end of Gentile world domination. God would reveal this prophetic information to the current head and most powerful element of this Gentile world domination through this vision. Thus, the dream was prophetic, describing the "**times of the Gentiles**" (Luke 21:24). This "times of the Gentiles" started at the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and would end at the Second Coming of Revelation 19.

Biblical unfolding of the term “latter days”:
1. Balaam would show Balak what could take place in the latter days, with respect to Israel.
    A. Numbers 24:14 “**And now, behold, I go unto my people: come *therefore, and* I will advertise thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days**.”
2. Israel would be in tribulation in the latter days.

A. Deuteronomy 4:30 "**When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, *even* in the latter days, if thou turn to the LORD thy God, and shalt be obedient unto his voice;"**

B. Deuteronomy 31:29 "**For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt *yourselves,* and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befall you in the latter days; because ye will do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke him to anger through the work of your hands**."

i. This tribulation would be a result of Israel's apostasy.

3. It is associated with God's anger.

A. Jeremiah 23:20 "**The anger of the LORD shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the thoughts of his heart: in the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly."**

B. Jeremiah 30:24 "**The fierce anger of the LORD shall not return, until he have done *it,* and until he have performed the intents of his heart: in the latter days ye shall consider it."**

4. Moab would be judged in the latter days.

A. Jeremiah 48:47 "**Yet will I bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days, saith the LORD. Thus far *is* the judgment of Moab**."

5. Elam would be judged in the latter days.

A. Jeremiah 49:39 "**But it shall come to pass in the latter days, *that* I will bring again the captivity of Elam, saith the LORD**."

6. Gog would be judged in the latter days as God would bring him into Israel to be destroyed.

A. Ezekiel 38:16 "**And thou shalt come up against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes**."

7. God revealed to Nebuchadnezzar, through Daniel, events in the latter days, in a Gentile perspective.

A. Daniel 2:28 "**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**;"

8. God revealed to Daniel what would happen to Israel in the latter days.

A. Daniel 10:14 "**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**."

9. A millennial use of the term.

A. Hosea 3:5 "**Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days."**

The "latter days" would then stretch from Daniel's day all the way into the Millennium. Instead of a specific "day" or "time period", the term could be used to describe the events and prophetic unfolding leading up to the Millennial kingdom.

Isn't it interesting how the Mormon cult styles itself as "latter day saints", as if God was using that false system to reveal and recover truth that was supposedly lost?

2:29 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.

Only the Giver of Secrets can give the true and correct definition and interpretation of secrets

and mysteries. To look to the occult for this information is folly. God had given this dream and there was something in it He wanted this king to know, and He would not communicate the interpretation directly to Nebuchadnezzar but would use a Hebrew exile to explain it to the king. Not only would the necessary revelation get out but it would allow Daniel to be promoted to a place of great authority and influence for good with this heathen empire. God would have a mouthpiece in a strategic place to these Gentiles.

2:30 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.

Daniel does not take credit for coming up with the revelation and interpretation and he is very careful to emphasize this point. Daniel saw a chance to glorify the God of Israel before this heathen king and he took it. How uncharismatic of him! Most "prophets" (so-called) today are very quick to promote themselves as they give their "prophecies" that they supposedly receive from God.

"**but for their sakes**" For the sake of the occultists- to save their skin and to magnify the God of Daniel before them as well.

2:31 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.

"**terrible**" Frightening, awe-inspiring, causing terror.

Nebuchadnezzar had recently returned from Egypt. What more natural then than having seen the gigantic statues of Egypt, erected by the Kings of Egypt to commemorate their memory, These images were still fresh in his memory. Nebuchadnezzar before he fell asleep had been thinking of such a method of preserving his own memory. But the difference was that the "Image" that Nebuchadnezzar saw was of metal, while the images of Egypt were of stone.

2:32 This image's head *was* of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass,

Nebuchadnezzar's image was that of a man. It could rightly be said that Nebuchadnezzar saw an image of humanism, man's attempts at government without God, which is the distinguishing mark of Gentile world power. This also represents the elevation, exaltation and even deification of man as he rules the world apart from God.

Gold- silver- brass- iron- iron/clay mix. As we progress down the image, from head to feet, the metals become less valuable, less refined and harder, with the exception of the iron/clay combination. The image is top heavy and weak in the feet as the gold would be heavier than the metals below it. As Gentile world domination continues down through the centuries, it will become less precious and valuable (gold to iron/clay) but it will get stronger, as seen in the iron, which is used for despotic and authoritarian governments. Rome was the least precious or refined of the empires but it was the strongest and most despotic. Thus, the Second Law of Thermodynamics is seen politically in world politics and government- as time passes, the character and quality of the empires degrade.

"The preciousness of the metal deteriorates from the top or gold to the clay of the feet, and there is a corresponding lower specific gravity; that is, the gold is much heavier than the

silver, the silver than the brass, the brass than the iron, and the clay in the feet is the lightest material of all. The approximate specific gravity of gold is 19, silver 11, brass 8.5, and iron 7.8. The gold head has twice the weight of similar amounts of the other metals. The weight of brass varies according to the amount of tin or zinc which is added to the copper. While the materials decrease in weight, they increase in hardness with the notable exception of the clay in the feet. The image is obviously top heavy and weak in its feet … The descending value of the metals, however, permits their ascending strength, which suggests increased military might during the times of the Gentiles, leading to the final world conflict of Revelation 16 and 19 to which Daniel refers (11:36-45)."[24] Thus, we see that the image was doomed from the start to fall because it was so top heavy, with a foundation of clay, a victim of its own instability. Human governments always are.

The head was not just of "gold", but "fine gold", of the highest quality. Since the golden head answers to Nebuchadnezzar, it shows that his kingdom was the greatest and most refined of those Daniel discusses.

With the order and the composition of the metals, the image is top-heavy and not very stable. Such it is with Gentile world governments, as none of them are as steady and stable as they all like to claim. Hitler's "Thousand Year Reich" conquered Europe but it eventually lasted only 12 years. Communist Russia terrorized the whole earth but it only lasted 70 years before it collapsed.

"Verses 32-33 are Darwin in reverse; they present the history of the Gentile nations as 100 percent degeneration The metals decline in value and in weight, making the image top heavy. The specific gravity of gold is 19.3, of silver 10.4, of brass 8.4, of iron 7.03, of clay 1.8. Interestingly enough, the decline in value of the image's metals matches the devaluation of American currency in the. 20th Century. The coins went from gold (Woodrow Wilson), to silver (FDR), to brass and copper (Lyndon Johnson), and then to nickel and zinc (Reagan)."[25]

AV	ESV	LSV
32 This image's head *was* of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of **brass**,	32 The head of this image was of fine gold, its chest and arms of silver, its middle and thighs of bronze,	32 "The head of that image *was made* of fine gold, its breast and its arms of silver, its belly and its thighs of bronze,

"**brass**" The modern versions persist in their age-old error that "brass" was really "bronze" and that the people of the ancient world were too stupid or primitive to produce brass. We will see them persist in this error through the entire book of Daniel.

2:33 His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay.

24 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*.
25 Peter Ruckman, *Ruckman Reference Bible*.

2:34 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.

A stone cut out without the aid or means of human instrumentality, suggesting that God cut this stone out. Since the Stone refers to Christ, His being "cut out without hands" or human instrumentality would also be a reference to His Virgin Birth, since He was born without the agency of a human father.

2:35 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 threshingfloors; 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.

The clay is not reckoned as a separate empire.

The stone not only destroyed the image, but it literally ground it to powder. The allusion to Christ is clear from Genesis 49:24 ("**But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:**)"); Matthew 21:44 ("**And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder**.") and Luke

20:18 ("**Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder**."). Christ is obviously this stone that will crush anyone (individual or nation) that will not submit to Him, just as this stone cut out without hands will destroy this image of the Gentile world empires that will not submit themselves to Christ.

This stone started off small but eventually grew to fill the whole earth. What a picture of the growth and spread of the Church, which started off with 120 in an upper room to eventually fill the whole earth. It also reminds us of the parable of the mustard seed in Matthew 13:31,32, about how such a small seed could grow to become the greatest of the herbs. This "filling the whole earth" eventually speaks to the Millennial Reign of Christ, which comes on the heels of Christ destroying the Antichrist's (who has his own image in Revelation 13!) image of Humanism in Revelation 19. After Christ destroys the Image, His kingdom goes to fill the whole earth.

2:36 This *is* the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king.

You can almost see Nebuchadnezzar remembering his dream as Daniel describes it to him, as if he was saying "Yes...yes! That's right! That's it! *Now* I remember!" Thus, there was no way Daniel could have been making this up or faking it, because once Daniel jogged his memory, the king would have been able to remember the forgotten dream.

"**the interpretation**" We must always remember that the Bible is its own, best interpreter. We always use Scripture with Scripture where possible and allow the Bible to interpret itself. We must never rely upon the uninspired theological writings and theological systems of man to replace the interpretative ministry of the Holy Spirit for us.

2:37 Thou, O king, *art* a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory.

"**King of kings**" is a term used for Christ in Revelation 17:14 ("**These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.**") and Revelation 19:16 ("**And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS**."). In this context, it deals with the fact that Nebuchadnezzar was the greatest human king of his day and probably, the greatest one ever, since his kingdom was the head of gold- the top of the image, made out of the most precious metal. Ezekiel also uses this term for Nebuchadnezzar in Ezekiel 26:7 ("**For thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people**."). But he is "a" king of king, not "the" King of Kings. No man can attain to that divine title as it belongs to Christ alone.

"Nebuchadnezzar is addressed as "king of kings," which position of power Daniel assigns as a gift from "the God of heaven"; and therefore, his kingdom is one of power, strength, and glory. Critics have seized upon this as not a suitable reference to the king of Babylon. Young points out that there is not sufficient evidence to support such a criticism, especially in view of the fact that the inscription of the Persian king Ariyaramna (610-580 B.C.) is called "king of kings." Although there is no clear evidence how such a king as Nebuchadnezzar would be addressed by his subject, there is no contrary evidence that such a title would not be fitting. As a matter of fact, it was quite accurate, for Nebuchadnezzar was actually a supreme monarch who was

above all the kings of his generation. Interestingly, Ezekiel gives exactly the same title to Nebuchadnezzar in Ezekiel 26:7."[26]

"**hath given thee**..." God gave Nebuchadnezzar his kingdom and glory. He did not earn it himself. This is a necessary yet unpopular truth in politics, that the powers that be are ordained of God and that God sets up kings and brings them down according to His own will. This is what is sometimes called "speaking truth to power". It could have been a dangerous declaration to suggest to the most mighty man on the planet that he sat on that throne not because of his own glory, might or accomplishments but because the God of a people whom he had conquered had put him there and that he would only stay on that throne for as long as that God desired him to be there and not one minute longer. Daniel would make it clear in chapter 4 that God could remove him from the throne anytime He wanted. But if any king ever could claim a "divine right" to rule as a king, Nebuchadnezzar had it.

2:38 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.

Nebuchadnezzar's dominion sounds very much like the dominion Adam was given in Genesis 1:28 "**And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."**

"**head of gold"** Thus, Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is the head of gold on the image, the greatest and most refined of these world empires.

Daniel reminds Nebuchadnezzar that it was God that set him up and made him the mightiest man on the planet. There is a hidden warning in this observation that the God that set him up could very easily take him down, as God did in Daniel 4, a warning Nebuchadnezzar did not heed when Daniel reminded him of this.

2:39 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 died in 561 B.C.. His son, Evil-Merodach, came to the throne. He was assassinated two years by his brother-in-law. Neriglissar, who seized the throne. He died four years later, in 556 B.C. in battle. He was succeeded by his imbecile son Laborosoarched, who reigned nine months before being beaten to death. Then Nabonidus, another son-in-law to Nebuchadnezzar, came to the throne. He reigned for 17 years. The Medes and Persians were a constant threat during his reign. While Nabonidus was away on a military expedition, he set up his son, Belshazzar, as ruler in his stead. But we can see that the Babylonian rulers were certainly inferior after Nebuchadnezzar.

"**another kingdom...inferior to thee**..." This would be the empire of the Medes and Persians, which overthrew Babylon in Daniel 5 and that is in power in Daniel 6. This is the next Gentile world empire, but it is inferior to Babylon as silver is inferior to gold. Media-Persia is not as strong or refined as Babylon was. The authority of the kings was also weaker, as they could not revoke a law once they had decreed it (Daniel 6:8,12 **"Now, O king, establish the decree, and**

26 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*.

sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not… 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.”). But in one way, the Medo-Persian Empire was superior to the Babylonian as it did cover more area. As the quality of the empires diminish, the amount of area they controlled increase, as Rome controlled more territory than all of them.

This principle of diminishing quality through time continues through history with the law of entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics, that all things (including human governments and political systems) will get weaker and more inferior as time progresses. Even our United States could not even hope to compare with Rome or Greece or Babylon in terms of power and refinement. Whatever countries arise from the ashes of the United States when we finally dissolve as the Soviet Union did in 1991 will be weaker and inferior to the United States. As we progress in time, the quality and greatness diminish. This is de-evolution. Things are getting worse through time, not better.

“The metals decline in value: gold to silver, silver to brass, brass to iron, iron to an iron-clay mixture. They decline in function: they go from the intellectual function of the brain in the head, to the vital functions of the heart and lungs in the chest, to the digestive and reproductive functions in the belly and thighs area, to the means of locomotion in the legs, and wind up with man’s contact with the dirt at the toes. And finally, they decline in weight. The “specific gravities” of the metals—i.e., the weight of a substance in ratio to the weight of an equal volume of water—as given by Clarence Larkin are: gold, 19.5; silver, 10.47; brass, 8.0; iron, 5.0; and iron-clay, 1.93. If you look on the Internet, you will get different numbers, but the results will still be the same: the metals decline in weight, making the image top heavy and unstable.

This image is a typical illustration of all human history. All views of origins and the future can be summed up by three simple diagrams. The first is a line that starts out at the bottom and gradually goes up at about a fifteen-degree angle. That is the view of Darwin, Haeckel, and Huxley: things start out simple and gradually progress. The second is a series of spirals that proceed along the same inclination. That is the view of Bateson, DeVries, and Goldschmidt: evolution is by random mutations of genes. The third is a maze of lines going helter skelter, crisscrossing themselves any number of times, with no progress or regress one way or another. That is the view of Einstein, Heisenberg, Frankl, and Sartre. It is complete anarchy and chaos, with no goal or purpose to existence other than one’s own whims.

The fourth line is the Biblical view of history. The line starts out at the top and plummets down. Then it shoots back up, but not quite as high as before and then plummets down again. That cycle repeats itself over and over again until finally the line shoots back up to where it was originally and stays there. That is God starting man up at the top in the Garden of Eden and then man falling into sin. God reaches down and puts man back on his feet with a way to get his sins forgiven and a promise of complete redemption, and man blows it again until God wipes out everyone but Noah and his family in the Flood. Noah steps out into a clean world only for his great grandson, Nimrod, to unite his followers in rebellion against God at the Tower of Babel. God busts up the whole thing by confusing the languages, and then He calls out Abraham to be a blessing to all the **“families of the earth”** (Gen. 12:3). Abraham’s descendants wind up as slaves down in Egypt, so God calls them out and gives them the Ten Commandments.”[27]

"**third kingdom of brass**" Historically, this would be the Greek-Macedonian empire under Alexander the Great which overthrew the Medo-Persian empire. But Macedonia was inferior to

27 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer’s Commentary on Daniel*, pages 43-46.

the Medes and Persians as brass is inferior to silver. While Alexander established a world empire, it could not compare to the gold of Babylon or the silver of Media-Persia. But it was of a stronger metal, brass. While not as refined, Alexander's empire was stronger and, in many ways, more long-lasting and had a greater impact on culture, religion and language than Babylon or Media-Persia ever had. It was largely through Alexander's imposition of Greek language and culture of his conquered empire do we have Greek as the de-facto universal language at the time of Christ and is why the New Testament was written in Greek.

"**brass**" Brass is the only composite metal mentioned, as gold, silver and iron are elements. Brass is an alloy of copper and zinc. Is there any significance that Alexander's empire is the only one made up of a combination of two metals?

2:40 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.

"**fourth kingdom**" Historically, this fourth kingdom would be Rome. Interesting that the legs represent Rome, and the legs take up half the image, showing that Rome's reign would be the longest of the four. And the two legs signify the division of the Roman empire into Eastern and Western sections in A. D. 364.

"**iron**" Rome is pictured as iron. It was nowhere near as refined or beautiful as Babylon or Media-Persia, but it was the strongest and most powerful of them all, as iron is stronger than gold, silver or brass.

Iron does not have a good presentation in Scripture. There was nothing of iron in the construction of Noah's ark (Genesis 6:14 "**Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch**."), and no "tool of iron" was allowed by Solomon in building the Temple (1 Kings 6:7 "**And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building**."). Christ must rule with a rod of iron in Psalm 2. The name Cain means "iron spear", like Goliath's spear head (1 Samuel 17:7 "**And the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam; and his spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron: and one bearing a shield went before him**.").

"**break in pieces and bruise**" There is a violence associated with Roman rule that is not associated with the other kingdoms. We see some of this iron being swung in Rome's persecution of the Church and how it ruled its kingdom with an iron fist.

If "Daniel" was written in the 2nd century A.D., as the unbelieving critics claim, then how do they explain the accurate prophecy of Rome? A 2nd century writer might be able to describe Babylon, Media-Persia and Greece in retrospect, but Rome had not yet ascended. So you still have highly accurate prophecy, even if the destructive critics are right (which, of course, they are not)! They will sometimes split the Medes and Persians into two empires to make four, putting Greece as the iron legs, but they dig their own prophetic hole when they try that as there is no way that interpretation can work. Rome was "on the move" by this time but who would have guessed that she would span the known world as she did and then split in two (western [and later the so-called Holy Roman Empire] and eastern empires in the 4th century A.D.) as she did?

2:41 And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's 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.

"**clay...iron**" A weakening of the iron by mixing it with clay. As Rome passed its Golden Age, it became weaker and weaker on all fronts- militarily, socially, morally. Yet the strength of iron remains, even as it becomes weaker. Even in a weakened state, Rome was still powerful enough to maintain her empire and fend off all challengers- until the Germanic tribes finally brought down the Western Empire.

The division of the Roman Empire into Eastern and Western sections are depicted by the "two legs" of the image.

We also notice that each succeeding empire is less unified through time:

1. Babylon- a single head of gold
2. Media-Persia, two empires of silver
3. Alexander's empire of brass was divided into 4 empires after his death
4. Rome winds up with 10 toes (or kings) toward the end.

2:42 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.

Chronologically, the toes would put us at the end of the Roman Empire.

2:43 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.

"**mingle themselves**" Sounds like the Roman empire was weakened through the heavy immigration and influx of non-Roman immigrants, who brought with them their non-Roman languages, customs and religions. In other words, Rome diluted herself by attempting to assimilate everyone into the Roman system. These peoples that came into the Roman Empire in its latter days just were not compatible with each other. There were too many conflicts and disagreements among them. They did not consider themselves to be Roman, but Roman-whatever, hyphenated Romans. They could not cleave together so they fragmented, thus fragmenting the empire right along with them. Multiculturalism helped bring down Rome, which is a clear historical warning to the United States and European countries, who are going down the same path of destruction as Rome did. The lessons of history should be clear- multiculturalism and failure to assimilate immigrants will destroy any nation, even one as powerful as Rome. Every country needs three things (secularly-speaking) to survive- borders, language and culture. We would naturally add in a fourth ingredient- God. Rome never had God and then lost the other three which led to her downfall.

AV	ESV	LSV
43 And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall **mingle themselves with the seed of men**: but they shall not	43 As you saw the iron mixed with soft clay, so they will mix with one another in marriage, but they will not	43 "And in that you saw the iron mixed with common clay; they will combine with one another in the seed of men; but they will not cling to one

cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.	hold together, just as iron does not mix with clay.	another, even as iron does not combine with clay.

"**mingle themselves with the seed of men**" The ESV assumes this to involve marriage, but the meaning is far broader than that.

2:44 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 for ever.

Daniel does something interesting. He jumps at least 1600 years from verse 43 to 44. Verse 43 clearly deals with the old historical Roman Empire. But verse 44 is clearly future and prophetic because this kingdom has obviously not been set up yet. Daniel here is describing the yet-future Millennial Kingdom of Christ and gives the following description of it:

1. It is set up by God
2. It comes at the end of the Roman Empire. In the prophetic context, it must be a yet-future revived Roman Empire under the political control of the Antichrist.
3. This kingdom shall never be destroyed.
4. It shall not be left to other people but shall be controlled by God Himself.
5. It shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms. This is what the stone cut out without hands does in Daniel 2:34,35. At the Second Coming, Christ shall destroy the empire of the Antichrist and shall take lordship and authority over all the surviving governments of man, and they shall be subject to Him.
6. Christ's kingdom shall last forever. Unlike boastful human empires that claim that they will never fall (or that they would last a thousand years like Hitler's so-called "Thousand Year Reich" that only lasted a dozen years),[28] Christ's empire truly will last forever. America is just as arrogant. Why is there no provision in the Constitution to deal with a peaceful dissolution of the United States when (not if!) that day should come? Because the Founding Fathers couldn't imagine a time when their creation of the "United States" would ever "go out of business". Yet the general corporate law of every state and most countries have provisions of how to dissolve or shut down a corporation in a proper and legal fashion. If companies do it, why not governments? Most governments believe themselves anointed by God or something similar and they simply cannot conceive of a time or a circumstance when they would cease to exist.

2:45 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.

"stone was cut out of the mountain without hands" Compare with Daniel 8:25 ("**And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the**

28 Even the heathen accept an idea of a "millennium", just not the one presented in Scripture. Every political and economic system promises a "golden age" if we would only put them in charge. Even the current administration of Donald Trump (in 2025) is promising a restoration of an "American Golden Age". But how can that "Golden Age" be brought in with secular methods and without an acknowledgment of God and His laws? It's impossible.

Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.") and even Genesis 49:24 ("**But his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel:**)"). Christ is often pictured as a stone, as the stone that the Church was built upon and the Stone of Stumbling and the Rock of Offense.

"**certain**" What is certain?

1. That there will be 4 world empires
2. The last one will be the strongest, but it will be divided
3. Christ shall destroy all Gentile world empires
4. Christ's kingdom shall fill the earth at the expense of these Gentile world empires

Daniel had no doubts at all in his mind as to the reliability of this dream, since it was God Himself who gave the interpretation of it.

"the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure." Notice Daniel's confidence and certainty in the divine interpretation he received. Most modern commentators and Bible critics would say "the dream is uncertain, and the interpretation is highly figurative and allegorical". Such is the standard response when you don't believe the Book and have no final authority in your interpretation.

To summarize the image:

1. Gold- Babylon
2. Silver- Media Persia
3. Brass- Macedonia-Greek
4. Iron- Roman

That's it- only 4 world empires on the prophetic stage (although we will see Babylon and Rome again the Tribulation). There have been countless attempts to erect a 5th world empire (like Napoleon, Hitler or Lenin and Stalin) but there have been and will only be four.

AV	ESV	LSV
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**.	45 just as you saw that a stone was cut from a mountain by no human hand, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold. A great God has made known to the king what shall be after this. The dream is certain, and its interpretation sure."	45 "Inasmuch as you saw that a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands and that it crushed the iron, the bronze, the clay, the silver, and the gold, the great God has made known to the king what will happen in the future; so the dream is certain, and its interpretation is trustworthy."

"**sure**" is better than "trustworthy" as the LSV reads.

2:46 Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odors unto him.

"**worshipped Daniel**" This verse has always bothered me. Nebuchadnezzar was obviously

very impressed with Daniel and his interpretation, so much so that he commanded oblations and incense be offered to him. Nebuchadnezzar himself fell on his face before Daniel. Problem- why is there no mention of Daniel rebuking the king for doing this? Because Daniel knew better than to rebuke the king? Because it really was not worship? Or was it the Babylonian way of thinking that you honor and worship a God through that God's priests and representatives, and thus, if Nebuchadnezzar wanted to honor Daniel's God, he would have to do it through Daniel instead of directly? Remember, Nebuchadnezzar knows little or nothing about true worship, so he probably relied on the old Babylonian way of worship. But Daniel would have known better than to allow this, so why did he allow it? All the commentators[29] just assume that Daniel did not accept the worship and he probably did not, but it is not a healthy thing to rebuke the most powerful man on the planet. Or this "worship" may not have been the same kind of adoration given to the gods, but rather simply a way to honor a great man. Daniel probably could not get away with Peter's rebuke to Cornelius in Acts 10:26 ("**But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man**."). Cornelius was only a Roman centurion; Nebuchadnezzar was the most powerful man on the planet!

But then again, as Hoffman observed (cited above), all men have feet of clay!

Even if Daniel did accept worship from Nebuchadnezzar, why would he have done it?

1. From fear of offending the most powerful man on the planet.
2. Consider- Daniel is standing before the man who invaded his country, destroyed Jerusalem, (probably) murdered his parents, dragged him into exile in a foreign country and made him a eunuch. What man wouldn't draw some fleshly satisfaction from seeing such a man worshipping him as a form of payback?

We also have to notice that Nebuchadnezzar doesn't praise Daniel in the same way that he praises Daniel's God. He certainly had a lot of praise for Daniel, but Nebuchadnezzar is extolling Daniel's God, not Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar praises no other gods here but Daniel's.

Josephus refers to an incident when Alexander the Great bowed down before the Jewish High Priest. When asked why, especially since Alexander was the sovereign of the world at the time, Alexander responded "I don't bow down to him, but rather, to the God whom he has the privilege to serve as high priest." Nebuchadnezzar was probably doing the same thing, not in worshipping Daniel personally but honoring the God who gave Daniel such knowledge.

2:47 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.

This got the desired reaction out of Nebuchadnezzar- he confessed the greatness of the God of Daniel, although he still had a long way to go before he would absolutely submit to Him. He knew Daniel couldn't have made this up and thus was impressed and awed by what he heard.

2:48 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.

Daniel is promoted to prime minister over the entire kingdom.

---

29 Except Peter Ruckman and David Hoffman in the *Common Man's Reference Bible*, page 1292, say Daniel sinned here.

2:49 Then Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon: but Daniel *sat* in the gate of the king.

"**affairs**" Does this have the impression of overseeing of some of the religious activity in the province?

I like it that Daniel did not forget his friends who prayed with him in getting the answer to Nebuchadnezzar's dream. They are also promoted to high governmental positions in Nebuchadnezzar's empire.

"**province of Babylon**" The empire was divided into an unknown number of provinces, each with its own governor. We also see this political division with the Persian Empire in Esther 1:1 **("Now it came to pass in the days of Ahasuerus, (this is Ahasuerus which reigned, from India even unto Ethiopia, over an hundred and seven and twenty provinces**:)"), where that empire was divided into 127 provinces from India to Ethiopia.

"**gate of the king**" the highest place of honor.

Daniel's Empire Visions[30]

Daniel 2	**Daniel 7**	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Gold	Lion		Babylon
Silver	Bear	Ram	Medo-Persian
Brass	Leopard	He-Goat	Greece
Iron	Non-descript		Rome

30 From H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture*, page 119.

Daniel Chapter 3

"The principles are given us in the first six chapters, and the details in the remaining six. The first thing which the civil power sets up is idolatry, with the object of establishing a religious unity, but always in separating the people from the true God, and in putting something in His place. This circumstance serves as an occasion for trying the faithfulness of God's people and the manner of it. Nebuchadnezzar commands the people, yea, even all the nations (for there were many under his dominion) to worship a statue. This is idolatry. (Consult Dan. 3: 4-7 for the words of the proclamation.) This is not an unusual way with Satan; he excites in the civil power the desire of unity; and there is no more powerful motive for the mass than the influence of religion.* Satan impels the civil powers to establish unity, in order that everything under their authority should be well ordered and regulated. It was thus with Nebuchadnezzar: he sets up this image in the province of Babylon, and demands the assent of all the governors to its reception and worship.

"I repeat, that such a religious act is a powerful means of influencing the mass, and of holding them in submission, united in one community, and bound to the civil power, which is the centre of such religion, or at all events supports it, and is identified with it. But whenever this is the case, there must be persecution-it may be more or less violent-but persecution there will be. We see it in the present case. Nebuchadnezzar's alternative is, "Whoso falleth not down and worshippeth, shall be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."[31]

Clarence Larkin says the events of chapter 3 took place 23 years after chapter 2.

4. Nebuchadnezzar's Image 3:1-30

3:1 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.

Nebuchadnezzar's dream of Daniel 2, and the favorable interpretation of it by Daniel (favorable to Nebuchadnezzar), may have prompted the construction of this image, although this description does not match Daniel's description of chapter 2. We also do not know the gap in time between chapters 2 and 3, although it may have been as long as 20 years.

Since Daniel equated Nebuchadnezzar with the head of gold in Daniel 2, Nebuchadnezzar must have interpreted that as meaning that God had personally put him on his throne and that he was God's regent on the earth. Based on the interpretation of the dream, Nebuchadnezzar would not hesitate to invoke divine approval of him and his rule, so to oppose him was to oppose God. Yet no one bothered to mention that Nebuchadnezzar was hardly a faithful follower of the laws of that God who had put him on the throne, and that made Nebuchadnezzar an unfaithful minister of civil rule, that had been given him by God. If Nebuchadnezzar had a copy of the book of Romans, he would have invoked Romans 13 and claimed divine right to rule. And there would be plenty of ignorant "clergy" who would agree and tell their congregations to fall into lockstep with the State, since the State is ordained by God, and we must obey it in all its commands. Yet what no one mentions is that if that Civil-Minister

31 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, pages 128-129.

is unfaithful to the laws and to the will of God who set it up, then they become unfaithful ministers and cease to be able to claim divine approval. This was Nebuchadnezzar's position. He would claim some variant of Romans 13 and demand all obey him as they would obey God. Yet he was not faithful to God at all, and that willful disobedience would cancel out any claim he would have to divine privilege to rule. It would then be lawful for any believer to disobey, citing "**we ought to obey God rather than men**" (Acts 5:29). That is why there is no divine condemnation to the three Hebrew boys in their opposition to Nebuchadnezzar's command, because to obey him would be to disobey God in the matter of worshipping an idol. This is also true for Daniel's actions in Daniel 6, where he deliberately broke the law in order to obey God.

Was the image of solid gold or covered with gold? For the image to be made of solid gold would have required a lot of gold for something this size.

Going by the 18-inch cubit, we get 90 feet high by 9 feet wide, or about the height of a 10-story building. The Colossus of Rhodes stood 70 cubits (105 feet) high astride the entrance to that ancient port. Herodotus, in his *History of the Persian Wars* (1:183), described a statue of Bel made of 800 talents (22 tons) of gold, but Nebuchadnezzar's image would have outdone that.

But we have 60-by-6 cubits. Notices the "sixes"- the number of man, one short of the divine number of seven. Man can never quite reach God, number-wise. But these sixes show that this image is an image of humanism, or the worship of a man, a religion based on the worship of a man, which will culminate in the worship of the Antichrist in the tribulation period.

"**Dura**" The province that contained the city of Babylon- the heart of the empire.

"A state religion must be, above all else, one that suits the natural man. To attain this end it must be of extreme simplicity, appealing to the senses, making no great demand upon the intellect, and leaving the conscience untouched. It must take up little time and require no particular sacrifice of money or goods. All these conditions were admirably met by the state religion devised by Nebuchadnezzar..From man's point of view, this was a very simple religion. All it demanded was a simple act of prostration before an image, and then the matter was at an end. Such a religion was admirably suited to man's fallen nature - a magnificent image to appeal to the sight, beautiful music to charm the ear, one single act of prostration that was over in a moment, that made no demand upon the purse, and raised no question of sins to make the conscience uncomfortable. The drastic penalties attached to noncompliance would hardly trouble the natural man, who would be quite ready to obey an edict which made such small demands."[32]

3:2 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

Daniel, who lived during this time and was very familiar with the structure of the Babylonian government, would have had no trouble with the names of these various offices. But if an unknown Jew wrote it 300 years after the fact as liberals claim, how could he have known about these titles and offices in such detail?

32 Hamilton Smith, *The Book of Daniel, An Expository Outline*.

All the politicians and civil servants were summoned to this dedication. None would be exempt from this loyalty test. That is to be expected by the State. Those who work for and serve the State must participate in its religious activities and ceremonies. Today, these activities are not so much religious as they are patriotic, which, in reality, is a kind of civil religion. This was a very common practice among ancient Eastern kings, to call all governmental officials to a ceremony like this, especially after some great military victory or for some great political event.

John Walvoord, on page 83 of his commentary *Daniel, The Key to Prophetic Revelation*, gives the modern meanings for some of these officials:

"princes"- satraps, administrators, guardians, watchers, the chief representatives of the king
"governors"- prefect, commanders or military chiefs, ruler of a province
"captains"- governor, presidents or governors of civil government
"judges"- counselor, counselors of government or chief arbitrators
"treasurers"- treasurer, superintendents of the public treasury
"counselors"- law official, judge, lawyers
"sheriffs"- magistrate, judges

AV	ESV	LSV
2 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the **princes**, the **governors**, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.	2 Then King Nebuchadnezzar sent to gather the satraps, the prefects, and the governors, the counselors, the treasurers, the justices, the magistrates, and all the officials of the provinces to come to the dedication of the image that King Nebuchadnezzar had set up.	2 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent *word* to assemble the satraps, the prefects and the governors, the counselors, the treasurers, the judges, the magistrates and all the rulers of the provinces to come to the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

"**princes, governots"** The ESV and LSV do not clarify the matter by using "satraps" and "prefects".

3:3 Then the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, 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.

3:4 Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages,

"**people, nations, languages**…" In other words, everyone. The State would demand 100% participation in this religious activity, by its employees, by its citizens and by the strangers living within its borders.

3:5 *That* at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of musick, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up:

Notice how Nebuchadnezzar uses music to advance his religious system. Music has always served as a tool to promote either true worship (through godly music) or false worship (through worldly and contemporary music). Today, we have Nebuchadnezzar's Image of Humanism being erected by Satan and he is using Southern Gospel Music, Praise and Worship, Christian Contemporary Music, "Heavenly Hip-Hop" and other forms of worldly music to call everyone to fall and bow down to this image. None of these styles of music are Biblical, thus, they serve the apostasy. Biblical music forms are those that do not serve the apostasy and that do not promote the flesh, such as the English hymn form and the classical expressions of the Psalter. Babylon had an advanced musical culture as well.

The Antichrist will also require a similar universal worship of his image in the tribulation period, as seen in Revelation 13:3-18.

We also see an example of sacralist religion.[33] Sacralism is defined as a situation where a group or nation are bound together by a common religion, usually through a State Church or an established religion. In these sacralist societies, everyone is expected to participate in the common religion and worship of the group, upon pain of death (usually). These are state church set-ups, where alternate religions are not tolerated. And the only "unpardonable sin" in these situations is failure to conform to the common religion. There is no room for toleration, rival religious or freedom of conscience for those who do not wish to participate. The Roman Catholic Church is sacral. How can a Catholic like Ted Kennedy remain in good graces with the Church of Rome when he is pro-socialist, pro-feminist and pro-abortion? That sort of dissent is tolerated in sacralism, as long as Kennedy remains faithful to the Church otherwise. But if he ever left Rome or attacked the authority of the Church, watch out! Then he'd be in trouble. Protestant churches also tend to be sacral. See Calvin's Geneva or the Biblical Commonwealth of Massachusetts under the Pilgrims in the 17th century for examples. Roman Catholic countries would also be good examples. These societies tend to be very repressive, and they frequently persecute all who dare to oppose it. Baptist people have been anti-sacral from the apostolic age until now. We opposed Augustine and Constantine in the person of the Donatists. We opposed the Church of Rome during the Dark Ages through the Albigensians and Waldensians. We opposed the Reformation through the Anabaptists. And we still plead to keep Church and State separate and against Established Churches.

We can also see some political. patriotic overtones here, as this would not be too unlike saluting the flag, except you could be killed if you weren't patriotic enough! This would sort of remind us of Nazi Germany or Communist Russia, where you could get into serious trouble if you didn't pay the proper respect to the Father/Motherland. The United States is heading down that same road, as we do have a secular religion (Americanism) with a pantheon (Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Franklin…) with a holy city (Washington D.C.) and temples (the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, even "National Cathedrals").

"**worship**" No oral profession was required, only the act of devotion.

Six instruments are mentioned by name, in addition to "all manner of musick". Six is the number of man and the 666 is the number of the name of the Beast, so these instruments are being used for a Satanic purpose. No doubt music (even so-called "Christian music", like Southern Gospel Music and Christian Contemporary Music) will figure prominently into the tribulation worship of the One World Church under the Antichrist. These styles of apostate music have

33 A very good treatment of sacralism is in *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren* by Leonard Verduin.

rightly been called the soundtrack of the last-days apostasy.

AV	ESV	LSV
5 *That* at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of musick, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up:	5 that when you hear the sound of the horn, pipe, lyre, trigon, harp, bagpipe, and every kind of music, you are to fall down and worship the golden image that King Nebuchadnezzar has set up.	5 that at the time you hear the sound of the horn, flute, lyre, trigon, psaltery, bagpipe, and all kinds of music, you are to fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king has set up.

What is a "**trigon**"? And "bagpipes"? Was Nebuchadnezzar Scottish?

3:6 And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.

No trial or chance for appeal. You were to be executed on the spot. Punishment would be swift and severe. The State can be very cruel when crossed, opposed or disobeyed, especially if it is an absolute monarchy. It not only demands obedience and submission, but that it be done quickly and joyfully. The State set up a sort of "hell on earth" for these vile sinners who would not participate in or recognize the religion of the State by the establishment of the fiery furnace. The State then counterfeits the judgment of the true God in this case.

Why was Nebuchadnezzar so dogmatic about this image? At the end of chapter 2, Daniel (reluctantly) allowed Nebuchadnezzar to worship him. If Daniel, a true man of God, allowed that, Nebuchadnezzar may have reasoned that this image, which was probably based on the dream that Daniel interpreted in chapter 2 was approved by God, hence the requirement for everyone to honor it and worship it.

3:7 Therefore at that time, when all the people heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of musick, all the people, the nations, and the languages, fell down *and* worshipped the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

We would assume that Nebuchadnezzar had almost a 100% acceptance rate. Most people didn't really care about any State religion as long as they had food and housing and as long as the requirements weren't too burdensome. Most probably feared the furnace if they disobeyed so they cooperated to save their skin.
*

3:8 Wherefore at that time certain Chaldeans came near, and accused the Jews.

Leave it to God's true remnant people to upset a sacralist apple-cart! Of course, the Baptists have been doing it since the days of the Donatists and Constantine and through the Dark Ages with the Church of Rome, the sacralism of the Reformers and the Established Churches of the American colonial period. And it was those were in submission to the State who blew the whistle on those who dared to oppose this god walking on earth. These Hebrew boys would have made excellent Baptists.

There was probably also some resentment on the part of the native Babylonians against the Jews for their rapid advancement and influence within Nebuchadnezzar's administration, so they used any opportunity to attack the Jews and to diminish their influence. They probably had an inkling that the Jews would not cooperate in this state worship, and they kept their eyes on them- just in case. There may have also been a hope of personal advancement for them if they could eliminate these Jews. They could then be promoted into their offices.

3:9 They spake and said to the king Nebuchadnezzar, O king, live for ever.

3:10 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 musick, shall fall down and worship the golden image:

3:11 And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth, *that* he should be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.

Whoever would not submit and conform would be cast into this man-made, state-sanctioned, artificial "hell". Such was the decree of the king that these "tattletales" reminded the officials regarding. To refuse to honor the gods of the State or to participate in State-sanctioned worship was viewed as an attack upon the State itself, and the King.

3:12 There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.

"Jews" the term was usually used as one of derision.

"**whom thou hast set**" This almost sounds like an accusation. Were these Chaldeans jealous that these Jews were promoted over them? Here they saw a chance to bring them down. But we also wonder- how did they know that the Hebrews did not bow down? If they were on their faces, how did they know that the Hebrews were not? It is like accusing one person "You didn't close your eyes when we prayed!" and they respond, "How do you know?"

"which thou hast set up" It must not be much of a religion if man must "set it up" and maintain it through force and intimidation. If man can "set it up" then he can also "tear it down". These snitches also make it personal with Nebuchadnezzar- "thy gods", "which thou hast set up", framing the disobedience of these Jews as a personal insult to Nebuchadnezzar.

The obvious question is where is Daniel? Did he bow down? That's unlikely. He was probably not in attendance at this gathering for some reason. Maybe he was out of town on governmental business. Or maybe Nebuchadnezzar waited until Daniel was out of town to pull this stunt, to protect him from the punishment for not obeying, since Nebuchadnezzar knew that Daniel would not bow to his gods in this fashion. But knowing the kind of man he was, we cannot imagine that Daniel would bow down and compromise in this circumstance. I see no reason to assume that Daniel compromised and bowed down, for there is no indication in chapter 3 that he did so. Daniel may have compromised in Daniel 2, but he may have

determined not to do it again in chapter 3.[34]

3:13 Then Nebuchadnezzar in *his* rage and fury commanded to bring Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Then they brought these men before the king.

Nebuchadnezzar took this defiance personally. The State, and those who embody it, usually do. After all, it was his idol and his religious commands that were being challenged. These oppositions are the one thing that will get the promoter of a sacral system madder than anything else. Besides, didn't Daniel interpret the dream of Daniel 2 to be that Nebuchadnezzar was the "head of gold?" Therefore, to the Babylonian mind, Daniel's God invested Nebuchadnezzar with a certain degree of divinity. And so, for these Hebrews to defy Nebuchadnezzar was to defy their own God. But obviously, Nebuchadnezzar misunderstood Daniel's interpretation. All Daniel said was that Nebuchadnezzar's empire was part of God's plan for the time of the Gentiles and that it was the finest and most cultured of these world empires. But Daniel said nothing that would give Nebuchadnezzar any license for these actions.

Hit a man in his wallet or insult his religion and watch him fly off in a rage. You can insult his mother, wife, favorite sports team, and he may get angry, but not as angry as when you insult his religion. For an example, speak against the pope or Mary to the next Roman Catholic you see, or insult John Calvin or Augustine the next time you talk to a Calvinist and watch the fur fly! More wars and strife start over religion than anything else.

3:14 Nebuchadnezzar spake and said unto them, *Is it* true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?

Why do some people get so angry when you refuse to convert to their religion or serve their gods? Why did Roman Catholics and Protestants persecute Baptist people in the Reformation over some theological differences? Why do Moslems still offer the choice of "convert or die?" If I witness to you about the gospel and you turn it down, that's too bad and I feel very sorry for you, but I am not going to start frothing at the mouth and pull a gun on you and demand you convert. Baptists believe in soul liberty, that every man has a right to believe (or not believe) what he will, and that me must face the consequences if he makes the wrong choice. But nowhere in Scripture is there any warrant to force men to convert or believe. Our "force" goes no farther than persuasion and prayer. There is also no Scriptural authority for anyone to persecute anyone simply because they don't believe or practice in a certain way.

You can apply this to the culture wars today. The sodomites, lesbians, sexual perverts and transgenders DEMAND you accept them, recognize them and celebrate them. If anyone simply states (even in mild tones) "I don't want to" or "I don't agree with that" they are immediately hounded as bigots, hate-filled, and worse. These people DEMAND you not only recognize their god but that you also bow down and worship it. These is religious and political intolerance at its worse and it gets people killed.

There is no doubt that this will be the attitude and practice in the Tribulation under the domination of the Antichrist. You WILL accept him. You WILL bow down to him. You WILL believe every word he says. You WILL obey every command he gives, and you WILL believe

34 This is Peter Ruckman's position. Ruckman says that since Daniel compromised in chapter 2 in accepting worship from Nebuchadnezzar that he couldn't say or do anything in chapter 3 without being a hypocrite. I don't accept that reasoning.

that he is “God”. If you refuse, you will be killed, probably by beheading. The Antichrist will set up an image for all the world to worship in the tribulation. He may bring this image into the rebuilt tribulation temple, thus defiling it in the Abomination of Desolation. It may be an image of the Antichrist himself, or at least an image of a man as we see here. The Jews will not worship it or acknowledge it, which sets off the persecution of the Jews in the tribulation.

Many of the exiled Jews probably bowed down. They did so out of fear or to avoid the death penalty. Some of the Jews may have been so acclimated to Babylonianism that they may have bowed down willingly, If we can project this forward into the tribulation, many Jews may accept the Antichrist while a remnant opposes him. Many Jews are spiritually blind as well as politically blind. How many Jews will vote for anti-Semitic political parties like the Democrat Party? How many Jews support abortion or sexual perversion? How many are Socialists and Communists? Many Jews have been lousy when it comes to discernment. Many tribulation Jews may bow down to the image of the Antichrist, thinking that they will be safe from the threat of persecution and financial ruin. But compromising with the Antichrist will not save them.

Israel has always been susceptible to idolatry. The “mixed multitude” that came out of Egypt in the Exodus were not Gentiles but Jews that had adopted Egyptian religion in varying degrees. Where do you think the idea of worshipping a golden calf in Exodus 32 came from? From the Jewish mixed multitude who brought such concepts out of Egypt. There has always been such an element in Judaism, and it will survive into the tribulation. Even if a Jew doesn’t accept the Antichrist, he still may find a way to incorporate tribulation religious philosophies into Judaism.[35]

It is possible that some compromising Jews will persecute the faithful Jewish remnant under the authority of the Antichrist. It happened in the Egyptian bondage in Exodus 5:14 (**And the officers of the children of Israel, which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten, and demanded, Wherefore have ye not fulfilled your task in making brick both yesterday and to day, as heretofore?**). There will always be some who will sell out their own people for promises of protection and better treatment. But as we said, this will not protect these compromising Jews. A Jew is a Jew, even one who compromises with the Antichrist. They must all be destroyed to overthrow the covenants of God.

3:15 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 musick, 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?

Nebuchadnezzar didn’t require the Hebrews to renounce their God or their religion, but only to acknowledge his false god and his false religion. But that is also unacceptable to a believer, to recognize a lie or to equate a false god to the true God.

Since none of Nebuchadnezzar’s men or even his gods could deliver these boys out of his hand, he does not expect the God of the Hebrews to do any better. Here is where Nebuchadnezzar needs to be taken down a few notches for thinking that he is more powerful than God, or any god for that matter. The Lord takes care of this pressing matter in Daniel 4. But this almost sounds like a challenge to their God: “Let’s see your God deliver you out of my hand!” It is as if Nebuchadnezzar thought he was more powerful than any God.

But why this change in attitude from chapter 2? In chapter 2, Nebuchadnezzar

35 1 The Jews have a LOT of paganism and occult teachings incorporated into their religion, as seen in the Talmud and Kabbala.

acknowledges and extols Daniel's God but here, he is challenging that same God. We must remember that Chapter 3 does not necessarily come right after chapter 2. Some commentaries think that as much as 20 years could separate these chapters, easily explaining the two different attitudes Nebuchadnezzar displays toward the God of Israel. Besides, Nebuchadnezzar, as most men, probably did not have the most stable or consistent of personalites!

We can summarize this verse as "Now boys, you're young. You're far from home. Maybe you didn't understand. Or maybe you didn't hear the music. Tell you what- I'll give you a second chance to fall down and worship my image. I like you boys. I think you're special. So we'll just get the band to go through their praise and worship concert again so you can bow down!"

This is where we get our saying about "face the music".

"**who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands**?" "This is impiety-that principle of blasphemy which characterises the beast under all times and circumstances. His thought is of the power which he (the beast) possesses and holds. May we remember that it is God who has given it, and who overrules it! (Compare Hab. 1 : II, 15-17.) Impiety, in forgetting the source of power, would arrogate to itself all its rights in spite of God Himself. Now, if unity be maintained, when God's own rights are set aside, it immediately becomes idolatry; for we fall into the hands of the enemy when we are at a distance from the true God. And when the civil power endeavours to establish this unity, it puts aside not only the rights of conscience, but the rights of God Himself. This applies in an especial manner to the word of God."[36]

3:16 Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we *are* not careful to answer thee in this matter.

They did not address him as "O King" (although they do in Daniel 3:17) and none of that "live forever" stuff, either. They would give Nebuchadnezzar the respect he deserved as king, but nothing else.

In the light of Nebuchadnezzar's beautiful enticement for them to sin in verse 15, these boys respond something like "We understood it the first time. We don't even want to hear the music again! We knew what we were doing, as well as the consequences. But we would rather die under your hand than to violate the Second Commandment. How can we do this great wickedness and sin against our God? (Genesis 39:9)"

3:17 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.

Nebuchadnezzar would not be able to express such a confidence in any god that he served or acknowledged.

3:18 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.

"I will not comply". These are four words but if you utter them in certain situations, you will be put to death.

36 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, pages 129-130.

Even if God didn't deliver them, it would not change their minds. They would still utterly refuse to compromise their beliefs and convictions. God may deliver them (and He ultimately does), but even if He doesn't, it changes nothing. Sometimes, God will not deliver us. He will allow us to seal our testimony with our blood. Think of the millions of martyrs whom God did not deliver. They died, despite the fact that God chose not to deliver them. It mattered nothing to them if God did deliver or if God would allow them to gain the martyr's crown.

Here is where these three young men would be a good type of the Jewish remnant in the Tribulation, persecuted by the Antichrist (Nebuchadnezzar) for failing to acknowledge his religious system and to worship his image (Revelation 13:14-18 "**And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six**."). But God will protect them and deliver them from this furnace.

There is no room for compromise, dialogue or "talking it all over", just a flat-out "no". This dogmatism is what irritates people more than anything else. "What makes you think you are right and everyone else is wrong?" is the usual line of attack or defense. They would echo Peter's declaration "**We ought to obey God rather than man**" from Acts 5:29.

3:19 Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego: *therefore* he spake, and commanded that they should heat the furnace seven times more than it was wont to be heated.

Nebuchadnezzar was taking this slight personally. It was his image and his sacral religious system that was being challenged and rejected. Nebuchadnezzar didn't want to just kill them, he wanted to hurt them, make them suffer. It is possible that the furnace was heated to several thousand degrees if it was heated seven times hotter than usual. Nebuchadnezzar would use the horrible execution of these three young men as a warning to anyone else who might defy him and his religion.

3:20 And he commanded the most mighty men that *were* in his army to bind Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, *and* to cast *them* into the burning fiery furnace.

No doubt they were roughly treated and manhandled in this process.

3:21 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.

"**hosen**" a kind of stocking that went up to the thigh.

"**hats**" = turbans.

3:22 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 Abednego.

I wonder who was left to throw them into the furnace, or how was it done without killing the additional men who did the actual casting in?

3:23 And these three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.

This gives you a sense of the helplessness of their situation, that they could defend themselves or help themselves in any way. And no one was about to give them any help or encouragement, either.

3:24 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonied, and rose up in haste, *and* spake, and said unto his counsellors, Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king.

"**astonied**" This is an obsolete word for "astonished". "Astonied is a form of 'astony' from the verb 'astone; derived from the French 'estoner', meaning 'to stun'. To be astonied is to be astonished, astounded, amazed, surprised or startled. The base form 'astone' is very descriptive for it indicates that someone astonied would be like a stone."[37] Wouldn't you be? In a fire of several thousand degrees that just killed several of your best soldiers, these three Hebrews are walking around in the fire totally unharmed. And who is that fourth man in the fire with them (see next verse)? Isaiah 43:2 is fulfilled here: "...**when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee**." Hebrews 11:34 also refers to this, where they "**quenched the violence of fire**" through faith.

The Chaldeans worshipped fire, but here, God overruled the divine fire and protected His servants from it.

3:25 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.

It is very obvious who this fourth man in the fire is- a pre-incarnate appearance of Christ. Even the heathen Nebuchadnezzar could see that, as he calls Him "**like the Son of God**". These unsaved heathens were quite a bit smarter than modern scholars give them credit for. These Hebrew boys, as a reward for their faithfulness and willingness to adopt martyrdom, got a visit from the second person of the godhead, not to mention the supernatural protection from the fire.

AV	ESV	LSV
25 He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt;	25 He answered and said, "But I see four men unbound, walking in the midst of the fire, and they are not hurt; and the appearance of the	25 He answered and said, "Look! I see four men loosed *and* walking about in the midst of the fire without harm, and the appearance of the

37 Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version,* page 23.

and the form of the fourth is like **the Son of God**.	fourth is like a son of the gods."	fourth is like a son of *the* gods!"

"the Son of God" We just knew that the modern versions couldn't leave this alone but how to diminish this reference to a pre-incarnate appearance of Chrust.

We can see several applications here:

1. **Christ will be with us when we are in the fires of persecution, and testing**. We never go through them alone but also have someone with us, to encourage us, help us and strengthen us while we are in the crucible.
2. **We often will only receive such visits as this while we are in the fire**. The armchair Christian or the "health and wealth" Charismatic who thinks all suffering is from the devil will never receive such visitations. Only those who choose the sufferings of the cross will be rewarded with such visits. These Hebrews would never have seen the Lord if they had compromised or if they had chosen an easy, suffering-free, socially-acceptable way out of their situation.
3. **God often draws very close to us in such times**. We will often sense the Lord's presence in ways while we are in the fire that we never would while we are in the sunshine.
4. **God will not always deliver us from the fire but He will always deliver us through them**. He does this for a deliberate reason, which He does not always reveal to us. God never told Job why he went through the sufferings that he did- never. Job had to learn to trust in the goodness of God, though He slay him. That is the attitude of a mature believer.
5. **God will always glorify Himself in the fire, and not to us only.** Look at the testimony of the power of the God of Israel that Nebuchadnezzar got here. If the Hebrews had compromised or it God had prevented them from going into the furnace, Nebuchadnezzar never would have seen the power of God, nor would he have ever made his testimony as he does in Daniel 3:28,29. God can do some mighty powerful preaching to the lost if you glorify God in the fire. The unsaved are watching to see how you react to these circumstances. Do you whine, grumble and complain like the lost do? Then what is the difference between your religion and that of the lost? But a Christian can sing in the flames and can make quite an impression on the unsaved at the same time.
6. There will be a miraculous deliverance of Israel from the persecution by the Antichrist in the tribulation, otherwise the nation would be destroyed.

I'm not going to make this event a type of Israel in the Tribulation, although a good case can be made for it. Israel is persecuted by the Antichrist Nebuchadnezzar for refusing to worship the image (Revelation 13). For that, they are cast into the furnace of the Antichrist's persecution but are supernaturally delivered from it, although 2/3rds of the nation will die under the hand of the Antichrist (Zechariah 13:8,9 "**And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the LORD, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The LORD is my God**."). The three boys were all saved but not all Israel will make it through the tribulation, although everyone that does make it through shall be saved at the end. But there is one problem- the appearance of the Lord to the Hebrews in the midst of the furnace. As far as we know, the Lord does appear to Israel until after the Tribulation, at the Second Coming in Revelation 19. Or will there be an undocumented appearance of the Lord to Israel in the tribulation period? If these two points could be resolved,

this would be an acceptable type of the tribulation sufferings and deliverance of Israel.

3:26 Then Nebuchadnezzar came near to the mouth of the burning fiery furnace, *and* spake, and said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, ye servants of the most high God, come forth, and come *hither*. Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, came forth of the midst of the fire.

But that "Fourth Man" did not come out of the furnace!

3:27 And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counsellors, 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.

You can be sure these men closely examined these Hebrews! What kind of men are these that could survive a blast furnace, without even the smell of smoke on them!

"**fire had no power**…" There was not any evidence of their ordeal was left upon them. You would never have known they were in a super-heated furnace.

3:28 *Then* Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, 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.

This is why God allowed the Hebrew boys to go into the furnace- to testify to Nebuchadnezzar about the greatness of the God of Israel. If God had delivered the boys from having to go into the fire, Nebuchadnezzar would never have gotten this witness, nor would he have made such as confession as he does in Daniel 3:28,29.

"**changed the king's word**…" Yes, God has the power and authority to change any human word or decree. The king's word is indeed powerful, but God's Word trumps it. Even if Nebuchadnezzar thought of himself as a god, or close to one, he realized that the God of Israel is more powerful than he is and can undo any word or decree that he might issue. The teaching in Babylonian religion and politics was that the king's word was absolute and could not be appealed, but God demonstrates that He holds such words and decrees of men with very low regard. God's Word always trumps the word of a king and God can change the word, or command, of any king, since He is King of Kings. It took a while for Nebuchadnezzar to realize and admit that there was a King who was higher than he was. He would finally submit to such a truth at the end of Daniel 4. Nebuchadnezzar's power to cancel one of his laws and replace it with another is an evidence of the might of his personal power. Rulers of the Medo-Persian Empire could not do this; it was impossible for them to override a previously written law.

1. Daniel 6:8,12,15 **"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…. 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… 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."
2. Esther 1:19 **"If it please the king, let there go a royal commandment from him, and let it be written among the laws of the Persians and the Medes, that it be not altered, That Vashti come no more before king Ahasuerus; and let the king give her royal estate unto another that is better than she."**

3:29 Therefore I make a decree, That every people, nation, and language, which speak any thing amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, 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.

"**houses shall be made a dunghill**" This seemed to be a favorite punishment for Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 2:5).

No American president would have ever dared to make such a decree, even if he had the power to do so. The decree is often reversed in totalitarian counties. If you worship the God of the Bible, then often you are cut in pieces and your house is made a dunghill.

Nebuchadnezzar did not command the worship of Jehovah. That would not be any better than his sacralistic demands to worship this image. Unlike the Babylonian religion of the State, Nebuchadnezzar does not command anyone to worship the God of Israel, only to respect Him and not to speak against Him. He does not force anyone to worship Jehovah, nor does he put the Jewish priests who were in exile on the state payroll. These would be practices that later Christianity would lapse into in the Reformed Churches and in the Church of Rome, but that was vigorously fought by the Baptists. Nebuchadnezzar still may have thought that the Babylonian state religion was superior to the worship of Jehovah, as there is no decree reversing the forced bowing before the image. Or is it that the Babylonian state religion was so impotent, powerless and unfulfilling that they only way anyone would pay attention to it would be through force and threats of death? By contrast, the true worship of the God of Israel needs no such force or threat to gain worshippers. Who would not worship such a God freely? If you have to force people to worship your god, what sort of god do you serve and just how true is such a religion that is built on compulsion?

Nebuchadnezzar's decree would give Judaism some degree of recognition and tolerance in the Babylonian Empire. This edict may have been largely responsible for the fairly comfortable conditions under which the Israelites lived in Babylonian exile.

"**deliver after this sort**" A God who cannot deliver you from the fires, tribulation and trouble is no god at all and is not worth 3 minutes of your time.

3:30 Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, in the province of Babylon.

Here is a secular promotion for spiritual faithfulness. As Daniel went up the ladder in the Babylonian government because he had the favor of God upon him, so did these three young companions of his.

AV	ESV	LSV
30 Then the king **promoted** Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, in the province of Babylon.	30 Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the province of Babylon.	30 Then the king caused Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego to succeed in the province of Babylon.

How is the LSV reading of “the king caused (them)…to succeed” better than “**promoted”**?

Daniel Chapter 4

This chapter reads like an official state document from the archives of the Babylonian Empire. Nebuchadnezzar wants to record these events and make sure that all those in his domain are aware of what happened to him- and why. The chapter is written in the first person, so Nebuchadnezzar is giving his testimony of God's dealings with him.

4:1 Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you.

This salutation almost reads like the opening of one of Paul's epistles. "Peace be unto you" sound strange coming from a pagan king who shed much blood, unless Nebuchadnezzar had a heart change as a result of the events of this chapter.

How different is this "decree" to "all people, nations and languages" from the earlier ones he had sent!

4:2 I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me.

It is clear that God took a very unusual interest in this heathen king, with the dreams of Daniel 2 and 4 and the miracle of Daniel 3 and the judgment and restoration of Daniel 4, along with the fact that God put Daniel, that godly statesman, at his right hand for a continual witness.

4:3 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.

"**How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders**!" Better than anything the Babylonian gods could do!

"**His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom**" Unlike Babylon. She lasted a long time but she is not everlasting. Only God's kingdom is. This is quite an admission by a heathen king. Also see Psalm 145:13, **Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.**

"**dominion**" Nebuchadnezzar realized that God's dominion far exceeded his, even if Nebuchadnezzar was the most powerful man on the earth at the time.

"**generation to generation**" Kingdoms may last a number of generations, like Babylon or Rome, but only God's kingdom will last for an infinite number of generations, for all generations, since His is an eternal kingdom.

4:4 I Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in mine house, and flourishing in my palace:

With all of his enemies defeated and no immediate threats on the horizon, either domestically or militarily. Nebuchadnezzar was "at rest", as David was in his kingdom before his sin with Bathsheba, or as Solomon was before his apostasy. God will often give a godly ruler this kind of political and military rest while He will plague a wicked ruler with trouble, turmoil and threats. But it was this period of peace, rest and prosperity that God Nebuchadnezzar in trouble.

4:5 I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the visions of my head troubled me.

"**a dream**" Just like in Daniel 2. God used dreams to communicate these visions and revelations to Nebuchadnezzar, but did not provide the interpretations. God used Daniel for that.

AV	ESV	LSV
5 I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the **thoughts** upon my bed and the visions of my head troubled me.	5 I saw a dream that made me afraid. As I lay in bed the fancies and the visions of my head alarmed me.	5 "I saw a dream, and it made me fearful; and *these* fantasies *as I lay* on my bed and the visions in my head kept alarming me.

"**thoughts**" The ESV uses "fancies" and the LSV had "fantasies". Why such weird interpretations?

4:6 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.

Nebuchadnezzar again went to these wise men first, instead of going to Daniel, for the interpretation.

4:7 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.

This same crew failed Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 2 and they fail him yet again here. They don't have a very good track record. God doesn't have any trouble in giving dreams and visions that the natural man cannot reveal. But Daniel, to whom God gave the interpretation, had no difficultly in providing the interpretations.

"Chaldeans" those persons considered the wisest in the land.

4:8 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*,

Daniel probably waited until all the wise men came in and tried their hand first, to demonstrate again to Nebuchadnezzar that they cannot interpret a God-sent revelation.

"**name of my god**" Bel-Merodach, whom Nebuchadnezzar still worshiped at the beginning of this chapter. At this point, Nebuchadnezzar was still worshipping the Babylonian gods. If he did recognize the God of Daniel, he had elevated his gods about the God of Daniel.

"in whom *is* the spirit of the holy gods" An Old Testament infilling by the Holy Spirit. Those who teach that the Holy Spirit did not indwell or infill men in the Old Testament have serious troubles with verses like this one.

4:9 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.

"master of the magicians" Daniel was given this position in Daniel 2:48 and still held it. He was the greatest and the wisest of the wise men of Babylon, thanks to the endowment of wisdom and understanding by God. These gifts were given to Daniel so he could serve and witness of the God of Israel in Babylon and to Nebuchadnezzar.

"**holy gods**" Holiness was not a characteristic of pagan and heathen gods, the Babylonian gods being no exception. But the God of Israel was depicted as a holy God, and Nebuchadnezzar obviously had enough exposure to the truth about the God of Israel from Daniel and his friends to know that there was a difference in holiness between the gods of Babylon and the God of Israel. This, the "spirit of the holy gods" has reference to the God of Israel, not the Babylonian gods.

4:10 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.

Great men and princes are often represented as trees.

1. Psalm 1:3 "**And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."**
2. Psalm 92:12 **"The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree: he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon."**
3. Ezekiel 17:5,6 "**He took also of the seed of the land, and planted it in a fruitful field; he placed it by great waters, and set it as a willow tree. And it grew, and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned toward him, and the roots thereof were under him: so it became a vine, and brought forth branches, and shot forth sprigs**."
4. Ezekiel 31:3 "**Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs."**

4:11 The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth:

This speaks to the extent of Nebuchadnezzar's dominion.

The entire world could see this tree, showing the universal extent of Nebuchadnezzar's reign at this time.

4:12 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.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	12 Its leaves were beautiful and its fruit abundant, and in it was food for all. The beasts of the field found shade under it, and the birds of the heavens lived in its branches, and all flesh was fed from it.	12 'Its foliage *was* beautiful and its fruit abundant, And in it *was* food for all. The beasts of the field found shade under it, And the birds of the sky inhabited its branches, And all flesh fed itself from it.

"**leaves"** The LSV uses the more difficult word "foliage". Also in Daniel 4:14.

4:13 I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a watcher and a holy one came down from heaven;

This signifies angelic interest in Nebuchadnezzar's activities. **Watchers and Holy Ones** are always beholding the affairs of men and nations. Not only are their heavenly beings who act as God's messengers (angels) or guardians of His holiness and worship (cherubim and seraphim) but there would seem to be another class of heavenly being who seem to simply watch and record the affairs of men. Daniel is the only Biblical writer who uses this term, and we have no other information regarding them than we have here.

The exact identity of these Watchers is not given. The closest cross-reference would be Jeremiah 4:16 "**Make ye mention to the nations; behold, publish against Jerusalem, that watchers come from a far country, and give out their voice against the cities of Judah."**

4:14 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:

"cut off his branches" Take away his provinces, each of the parts of his dominion, from him.

"shake off his leaves" Cause his deputy governors to shake off their allegiance to him.

"scatter his fruit" the revenues of his vast empire, and let others take them.

4:15 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:

"leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass," This would preserve and protect the stump from decay. This shows the divine protection of Nebuchadnezzar and his throne, even in the midst of this severe judgment. John Gill also suggests the allusion is to his distracted condition afterwards related; it being usual to bind madmen with chains of iron or brass, to keep them from hurting themselves and others, as in Mark 5:4, **Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him.**

Nebuchadnezzar would go from the palace to the field. Instead of royal dainties,

Nebuchadnezzar would eat grass like an animal.

There is a parallel here with Revelation 13 and the two beasts. Nebuchadnezzar can be a type of Satan. Authority is given to both of them to rule under the supervision of God. If they rule well, their domains and authorities continue. But when they begin to get proud and ambitious, both are reduced to "beasts".

AV	ESV	LSV
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:	15 But leave the stump of its roots in the earth, bound with a band of iron and bronze, amid the tender grass of the field. Let him be wet with the dew of heaven. Let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth.	15 "Yet leave the stump with its roots in the earth, But with a band of iron and bronze *around it* In the new grass of the field; And let him be drenched with the dew of heaven, And let him share with the beasts in the grass of the earth.

"**brass**" The ESV and LSV err again by using "bronze" instead of "brass".

4:16 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

"**seven times**" or seven years, as "times" refers to years, as seen in Daniel 7:25. We assume the "times" are "years" (that would match the seven years of the tribulation period) but we are not told. It could be 7 days (unlikely- it would have to be much longer than this) or 7 weeks or 7 months…or 7 years, which is the most likely interpretation.

"The inscriptions state that there were several years in which Nebuchadnezzar did nothing."[38] This might be dated around 582-575 B.C.

4:17 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.

This is one of the primary themes of Daniel. And it took Nebuchadnezzar a long time to learn it, needed some very drastic actions on God's part to literally beat this truth into his head. God is sovereign in the affairs of men and rules over all. Man may imagine himself that he is the master of his own political fate and that his word and will are sovereign in the earth, but God has a way of reminding these small men who really is over this thing.

"setteth up over it the basest of men." Modern politics is a perfect example of this, as God will often give nations inferior leaders in judgment, as He prepares to bring them down. Good and godly leaders are a blessing from God, but wicked rulers are a curse and a judgment from Him. Politics attracts the worst of men, who desire to rule over other men.

38 Ethelbert Bullinger, *The Companion Bible*, page 1186.

4:18 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.

"for the spirit of the holy gods *is* in thee" See notes under Daniel 4:8.

4:19 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.

The dream was trouble- a warning of judgment for Nebuchadnezzar, a man whom Daniel had come to respect. Daniel truly respected Nebuchadnezzar and did not want to inform the king of this heavy burden, because Daniel knew that he would not repent and humble himself before God. Better it be applied to my king's enemies than to my king himself! Nebuchadnezzar's enemies would delight in this dream, if its interpretation was made public.

Notice the respect these two men had for each other. Nebuchadnezzar had great respect for Daniel and Daniel greatly honored this king. It was this great respect he had for Daniel that ultimately led to the salvation (in the Old Testament context), of Nebuchadnezzar.

"**astonied"** Old English for "astonished", to sit like a stone.

4:20 The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, whose height reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth;

Now comes the interpretation. This is the only interpretation that is permitted since it came straight from God through Daniel.

The tree is Nebuchadnezzar and his empire (Daniel 4:22).

"height reached unto the heaven..." The glory, power, strength and geographical domination of the Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadnezzar.

4:21 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:

"leaves were fair" The beauty, refinement and culture of the empire.

"meat for all..." The economic nourishment of the earth by the strength and power of the empire.

4:22 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.

4:23 And whereas the king saw a watcher and a 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;

"**destroy it**" Ruin it, but do not annihilate it. You can cut down a tree, but as long as you leave the roots in the ground, there is always the hope that the tree can re-grow (Job 14:7 "**For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease**."). If the roots were pulled out, there would be no hope that the tree could ever re-grow. Nebuchadnezzar was going to be cut down and removed from the throne, but his roots would be left in the earth, thus, preserving a hope that in the future, he could be restored to his throne, which he was, seven years after the start of his judgment.

"beasts of the field" As we see later in the chapter, Nebuchadnezzar would be stricken with a mental illness that made him think he was an animal, and he would live like one.

"seven times" = seven years. Nebuchadnezzar's judgment would last for 7 years.

4:24 This *is* the interpretation, O king, and this *is* the decree of the most High, which is come upon my lord the king:

"This is the interpretation" We have the interpretation. Like a good expository preacher, Daniel will now make the application.

"most High" A higher King than Nebuchadnezzar has decreed this.

4:25 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.

"they shall drive thee from men" Nebuchadnezzar will not be fit to live in civilized, human company during the years of his judgment.

Nebuchadnezzar was stricken with some mental disorder. It may have been a form of "lycanthropy" but probably not, since that is usually defined as one believing he is a wolf. Another possibility is zoanthropy, where the affect thinks himself to be a generic type of an animal. Boanthropy is where the affected believes himself to be an ox. What sort of animal Nebuchadnezzar believed himself to be is not told.

"seven times" Would it take Nebuchadnezzar seven years to learn such a lesson? How proud, stubborn and haughty he must have been!

4:26 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.

"thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee" Nebuchadnezzar would be restored to the throne and his judgment would not be a permanent one. The God who could remove him from his throne would also restore him to it. You would think that after being off the throne for 7 years, Nebuchadnezzar would never get it back, but God promised to keep his seat warm and restore him once he learned his lesson and had been sufficiently humbled. But Nebuchadnezzar's son, Evil-Merodach, reigned as regent during the time of his father's illness.

4:27 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.

Now Daniel will preach a pretty good sermon to Nebuchadnezzar, which he will not heed.

"by righteousness" Since we are in the Old Testament, before Christ imputed His righteousness for salvation to anybody, and since Habakkuk 2:4 says that in the Old Testament, the "**just shall live by his own faith**", we assume that Daniel is stressing for Nebuchadnezzar to break off his own sins by his own efforts, by his own righteousness. In the New Testament, we would never think of telling that to a sinner, since we depend upon the imputed righteousness of Christ on the basis of Isaiah 64:6 **("But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away**."), but there is a dispensational difference here. Of course, Nebuchadnezzar could not save himself by self-reformation, but it is clear that the Old Testament saint had to do more good works on his own in order to obtain that saving righteousness, just like Abraham (Genesis 15:6 "**And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness**.") and Noah (Genesis 6:8 "**But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD**."). It is vital to note these dispensational differences in Old and New Testament salvation, since they are not identical.

Daniel basically told Nebuchadnezzar to "Repent! Stop your arrogance and meanness! Turn over a new leaf and do right! Notice that Daniel is urging works for Nebuchadnezzar, not "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ", as Daniel had no such revelation of New Testament salvation. Nebuchadnezzar did need a heart change and Daniel was urging him to change his attitudes by doing good works instead of what he was currently doing. The Old Testament revelation is "**The just shall live by his faith**" in Habakkuk 2:4. In the Old Testament, you had to live by whatever faith you could generate within yourself, unlike in the New Testament where we live by the imputed faith of Jesus Christ at salvation, since the "his" is missing from all New Testament quotes of Habakkuk 2:4. In a sense, Nebuchadnezzar needed saving, but he has to do most of it himself by humbling himself and by submitting himself to the power of God. This is not the New Testament plan of salvation, but that's okay, since dispensationally, we are not in the New Testament at this point.

No one usually would dare to tell a king that he had better "straighten up and fly right- or else!" without fearing to lose his head. But Daniel used that special relationship he had with Nebuchadnezzar to press the point, and the king respected Daniel enough to seriously listen, although he did not obey.

Could "**the poor"** have reference to the Jewish captivity currently in Babylon, a plea to treat the conquered Jews with kindness? It could also mean that Nebuchadnezzar ruled with a heavy hand and exhibited no special mercy to the poor and the weak.

"a lengthening of thy tranquility" The secret to a long and happy political life is submission to

God.

4:28 All this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar.

This came at the time prophesied, and despite Daniel's pleadings. God's Word was fulfilled at the intended time.

4:29 At the end of twelve months he walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon.

A whole year passed. It seems Nebuchadnezzar forgot the dream or thought that since God had not fulfilled it after a year that He was not going to, or that he somehow had gotten off the hook. But if Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten about the dream, God had not.

4:30 The king spoke, 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?

"Is not this great Babylon, that I have built" Nebuchadnezzar was probably speaking to himself.

"I have built" This is Emphatic. The pronouns did him in, as he was again boasting on himself and taking the credit for building up Babylon, without giving any recognition to God.

"that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power," Nebuchadnezzar's error- doing what he did for his own glory instead of for the glory of God. God will always bomb such a project.

Babylon was a magnificent city, with the Hanging Gardens being counted as one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient world. "

According to Herodotus, the city, which lay in a great plain, was square in its plan and measured 120 furlongs (*stadia*) each way - 480 in all. Each side was therefore about 14 miles long, making a circuit of nearly 56 miles, and an area of nearly 196 square miles. As the space enclosed is so great, and traces of the walls would seem to be wanting, these figures may be regarded as open to question. Around the city, Herodotus says, there was a deep and broad moat full of water, and then came a wall 50 royal cubits thick and 200 cubits high, pierced by 100 gateways with brazen gates and lintels. Reckoning the cubit at 18 2/3 inches, this would mean that Babylon's walls were no less than 311 ft. high; and regarding the royal cubit as being equal to 21 inches, their thickness would be something like 87 ft. Notwithstanding that Babylon has been the quarry of the neighboring builders for two millenniums, it is surprising that such extensive masses of brickwork should have disappeared without leaving at least a few recognizable traces. The city was built on both sides of the Euphrates, and at the point where the wall met the river there was a return-wall running along its banks, forming a rampart. The houses of Babylon were of 3 and 4 stories. The roads which ran through the city were straight, and apparently intersected each other at right angles, like the great cities of America. The river-end of each of the streets leading to the river was guarded by a brazen gate. Within the great outer wall was another, not much weaker, but enclosing a smaller space. Each division of the city contained a great building, the one being the king's palace, strongly fortified around, and the other the temple of Zeus Boles - an erection with brazen gates measuring two furlongs each way. Within this sacred precinct was a solid tower measuring a furlong each way, and

surmounted by other towers to the number of eight. An ascent ran around these towers, with a stopping-place about the middle where the visitor might rest. Thus, Nebuchadnezzar, in his pride, exclaimed "Is not this great Babylon, which I have built?" (Daniel 4:30), was, according to his own records and the Greek writers, enormous, and the claim he made fully justified. But if he boasts of the work he did, he is just in attributing much to his father Nabopolassar; though in connection with this it is to be noted that his ascribing the building of the walls of Babylon to his father is not to be taken literally in all probability he only restored them, though he may have added supplementary defenses, as Nebuchadnezzar himself did."[39] A very great city indeed!

Nebuchadnezzar, after his accession, completed the two great walls, lined the ditches with brick, and increased the thickness of the two walls which his father had built. He also built a wall, traces of which are apparently extant, on the West side of Babylon (he apparently refers to what may be called the "city", in contradistinction to "greater Babylon"), and raised the level of *Aa-ibur-s4?abuˆ?* from the "holy gate" to the gate of Nan; together with the gateways (in consequence of the higher level of the pathway) through which it passed. The gates themselves were constructed of cedar overlaid with copper (bronze), most likely in the same manner as the gates of Imgur-Bêl (Balawât) in Assyria (reign of Shalmaneser II, circa 850 B.C.). Probably none of Babylon's gates were of solid bronze, notwithstanding the statements of Herodotus; but the thresholds were wholly of that metal, stone being very rare, and perhaps less durable. These gates were guarded by images of bulls and giant serpents or composite dragons of the same metal. Nebuchadnezzar also built a wall on the East bank of the river, 4,000 cubits distant, "high like a mountain", to prevent the approach of an enemy. This wall also had cedar gates covered with copper. An additional defense made by him was an enormous lake, "like unto the broad sea to cross", which was kept in by embankments.

The royal palaces next claimed the great king's attention. The palace in which Nabopolassar had lived, and wherein, in all probability, Nebuchadnezzar had passed his younger days, had suffered from the floods when the river was high. The foundations of this extensive edifice, which extended from the wall called Imgur-Enlil to Lîbil-hêgala, the eastern canal, and from the banks of the Euphrates to *Aa-ibur-s4?abuˆ?*, the festival-street, were thoroughly repaired with burnt brick and bitumen, and the doorways, which had become too low in consequence of the raising of that street, were raised to a suitable height. He caused the whole to tower aloft, as he has it, "mountainlike" (suggesting a building more than one story high). The roof of this palace was built of cedar, and the doors were of the same wood covered with bronze. Their thresholds, as in other cases, were bronze, and the interior of the palace was decorated with gold, silver, precious stones and other costly material.

Four hundred and ninety cubits from Nmitti-Enlil lay, as the king says, the principal wall, Imgur-Enlil, and in order to guarantee the former against attack, he built two strong embankments, and an outer wall "like a mountain", with a great building between which served both as a fortress and a palace, and attached to the old palace built by his father. According to Nebuchadnezzar's account, which is confirmed by Berosus (as quoted by Josephus and Eusebius), all this work was completed in 15 days. The decorations were like those of the other palace, and blocks of alabaster, brought, apparently, from Assyria, strengthened the battlements. Other defenses surrounded this stronghold.

"for the honor of my majesty" But what is man's majesty compared to God's? How could Nebuchadnezzar ever hope to compete with God? God is going to build a city (New Jerusalem, Revelation 21,22) that will make Babylon look like a woodshed. Man, at his altogether best state, is still vanity (Psalm 39:5).

39 International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.

4:31 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.

"a voice..." Probably from that "Watcher and Holy One".

"the kingdom is departed" Despite all of Nebuchadnezzar's "power", "might" or "majesty". He could not deal with or cope with the will of God. It happened "just like that"- no additional warning, no debate, no appeal. None of Nebuchadnezzar's honor, glory or majesty could deliver him from this judgment.

4:32 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.

The main burden and theme of the Book of Daniel is that God is over the affairs of men- including his political activities.

4:33 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*.

"the same hour" Although it was 12 months in coming, when the axe fell, it fell quickly. This "one hour" also reminds us of how quickly Mystery Babylon the Great fell in Revelation 18:10,17,19. There was no time for Nebuchadnezzar to prepare for this judgment or to get his affairs in order. He had a whole year to do so and had squandered his opportunity. The most powerful man on the planet (and probably the proudest) fell the farthest in one mere hour- from the king of the most powerful empire on Earth to eating grass like an ox. They probably kept Nebuchadnezzar in some sort of royal park, and did not drive him into the wild. He was kept safe under royal supervision, but away from human contact. Daniel may have overseen his treatment and kept him safe and protected while helping to administer the kingdom.

Not only did he suffer from insanity, where Nebuchadnezzar lost all his reason and intelligence and believed himself to be an animal, but there were some physical changes that went along with the mental judgment. This is consistent with lycanthropy and/or its associated conditions.

"A great many doctors spend an entire, busy professional career without once encountering an instance of the kind of monomania described in the book of Daniel. The present writer, therefore, considers himself particularly fortunate to have actually observed a clinical case of boanthropy in a British mental institution in 1946. The patient was in his early 20's, who reportedly had been hospitalized for about five years. His symptoms were well-developed on admission, and diagnosis was immediate and conclusive. He was of average height and weight with good physique, and was in excellent bodily health. His mental symptoms included pronounced anti-social tendencies, and because of this he spent the entire day from dawn to dusk outdoors, in the grounds of the institution … His daily routine consisted of wandering around the magnificent lawns with which the otherwise dingy hospital situation was graced, and it was his custom to pluck up and eat handfuls of the grass as he went along. On observation he was seen to discriminate carefully between grass and weeds, and on inquiry

from the attendant the writer was told the diet of this patient consisted exclusively of grass from hospital lawns. He never ate institutional food with the other inmates, and his only drink was water… The writer was able to examine him cursorily, and the only physical abnormality noted consisted of a lengthening of the hair and a coarse, thickened condition of the finger-nails. Without institutional care, the patient would have manifested precisely the same physical conditions as those mentioned in Daniel 4:33… From the foregoing it seems evident that the author of the fourth chapter of Daniel was describing accurately an attestable, if rather rare, mental affliction."[40]

Nebuchadnezzar then becomes a beast, or a human/beast hybrid. Since Nebuchadnezzar is a type of the Antichrist, this has a parallel to Revelation 13 and the "beast from the sea" (Antichrist) and the "beast from the earth" (the False Prophet). He was in this condition for 7 years, as long as the duration of the tribulation period and the public activity of the Antichrist.

4:34 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:

Ethelbert Bullinger dates this verse at 454 B.C., just after Artaxerxes issued the decree to rebuild Jerusalem. This would make Daniel about 59 years old."[41]

"end of the days" At the end of the 7 years.

4:35 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?

"army of heaven" The same idea as the hosts of heaven?

"none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" This is a good definition of the sovereignty of God. God, being God, can do what He wishes without explaining His motivations, and no one has the authority to question Him or challenge Him regarding it. Look at the Book of Job. God never told Job why He allowed Satan to attack him, or even what had transpired in the heavens in Job 1 and 2 that prompted Job's troubles. Job wanted to know and understand and asked God, but God never explained it to Job, nor did God ever try to justify His actions to Job. And this definition came from a heathen king! But Nebuchadnezzar, as a king, would have a good understanding of sovereignty, both in heaven and on earth.

4:36 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.

"mine honor and brightness" His political and human glory as king of Babylon.

"sought unto me" They sought Nebuchadnezzar out, seemingly eager to restore the kingdom

40 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation.*
41 *The Companion Bible*, page 1187.

back to Nebuchadnezzar. With God's decree behind him, Nebuchadnezzar had no trouble in re-establishing himself as King.

"I was established in my kingdom" A political miracle. Power politics being what it is, there are many ambitious men waiting like buzzards for the current ruler to be removed from power. When Nebuchadnezzar went down, under natural circumstances, there would have been a power struggle for his throne. And after seven years, whoever won that power struggle would have secured his kingdom. And why not just kill Nebuchadnezzar? That way, even if he did recover from his illness, he would not be able to challenge for his throne again. But when Nebuchadnezzar was recovered of his illness, God have him back his throne and re-established him. This again proves and demonstrates that God sets up who He wills, regardless of the circumstances. For Nebuchadnezzar to go insane for 7 years and yet not lose his throne can only be explained by recognizing the hand of God in Babylonian politics. Nebuchadnezzar's son, Evil-Merodach would have probably reigned during the time of Nebuchadnezzar's illness. What role did Daniel play during these years to maintain Nebuchadnezzar's throne? He would have informed the nobles that this was a temporary judgment of God and that the king would ultimately be restored to the throne by God, which may have discouraged any thoughts of usurpation.

4:37 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.

"king of heaven" Nebuchadnezzar is now extolling and praising a higher king than himself. It seems like he has now learned his lesson.

"those that walk in pride he is able to abase" Aptly demonstrated in this chapter and something Nebuchadnezzar could testify to in person. And the Lord can do this even to the proudest and most powerful of men without even breaking out in a sweat.

The question this arises, was Nebuchadnezzar "saved" in the Old Testament sense of the word? I believe so. Look at all this very unusual interest that God too in him, with giving him two powerful dreams, the miracle of Daniel 3, the severe judgment and restoration of Daniel 4, and his response to all this, and you would have to conclude that Nebuchadnezzar ended his life as a believer in the God of Daniel. Add to that the fact that God put such a godly man like Daniel at the right hand of Nebuchadnezzar for a continual witness and you have even more reason to believe that Nebuchadnezzar was a believer, as we see him here for the last time.

Daniel Chapter 5

These events took place about 60 years after the events in chapter 1, which would have made Daniel to be in his 80s.

6. Belshazzar's Feast 5:1-29

5:1 Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.

"Belshazzar" According to Daniel 5:30, he was the Chaldean king under whom Babylon was taken by Darius the Mede. The Babylonian monuments speak a number of times of a *Bel-shar-us-ur* who was the firstborn son, the offspring of the heart of Nabunaid, the last king of the Babylonian empire, that had been founded by Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, at the time of the death of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, in 626 B.C. Belshazzar was acting as king of Babylon as his father Nabonidus was in virtual retirement and took little interest in the affairs of state. Belshazzar had his own house in Babylon, where he seems to have been engaged in the woolen or clothing trade. He owned also estates from which he made large gifts to the gods. His father joins his name with his own in some of his prayers to the gods, and apparently appointed him commander of the army of Accad, whose special duty it was to defend the city of Babylon against the attacks of the armies of Media and Persia. Belshazzar was *de facto* king of the Babylonian empire, all that was left of it, from the 4th to the 8th month of the 17th year of the reign of his father Nabunaid, and that he died on the night in which Babylon was taken by Darius the Mede.

Belshazzar threw this feast while the city of Babylon was besieged and surrounded by the armies of the Medes and Persians, who would eventually take the city at the end of the chapter. This would date this account at 539 B.C. Why throw such a party as this when you are staring down the barrel of a loaded gun? There are several possibilities:

1. To boost morale among Belshazzar's lords.
2. To send a message to the Medes and Persians that Belshazzar was not afraid of their siege and that he was confident that he could survive it. The invading Medes and Persians, led by Ugbaru, commander of the Persian army, would have already taken the surrounding countryside. The city of Babylon itself had not fallen to an invading army for 1,000 years because of its strong fortifications. According to the Greek historian Herodotus, Babylon occupied about 14 square miles with a double wall system with a moat between the walls. The outer wall was 87 feet thick, which was wide enough for four chariots to drive abreast. The wall was 350 feet high with 100 gates, plus hundreds more towers reaching another 100 feet above the walls. Belshazzar's confidence in the security of his capital is evident in his banqueting and getting drunk while his enemy was at his door.

"Banquets the size described in this verse…drew the attack of critics. Yet the ancient historian Ktesias wrote that Persian kings frequently dined daily with 15,000 people (cf. Esther 1)."[42]

If Nero fiddled while Rome burned, then Belshazzar partied while Babylon fell.

42 Thomas Constable, Notes on Daniel, page 56.

5:2 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.

"his father" Really, his grandfather. The word here can refer to either "father" or any male descendent. There is no Chaldee word for "grandfather". We use the same language when we talk about the "faith of our fathers" or "the God of my fathers". We simply do not mean our biological father but all of our ancestors.

"might drink therein" Showing absolutely no respect for the God of Israel whom his grandfather came to know. I think Belshazzar had to know the background of those vessels and about the God to whom they were dedicated. But a drunken fool will often do things as foolish as this.

As they used to say, Belshazzar and his crew were living "high on the hog and low on the chicken".

5:3 Then they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem; and the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank in them.

They drank to excess and drunkenness.

5:4 They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

They were praising anything and everything except the One True God. Maybe they were also praying to these idols for deliverance from the besieging Medo-Persian army?

AV	ESV	LSV
4 They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of **brass**, of iron, of wood, and of stone.	4 They drank wine and praised the gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone.	4 They drank the wine and praised the gods of gold and silver, of bronze, iron, wood and stone.

Brass drinking vessels would be much more attractive and desirable than bronze drinking vessels.

"The head of the Gentiles vaunts himself, and, because God has thus delivered up the Jews, he glorifies his false gods, exalts them, and dishonours God. It will be the same with the king of Babylon at the end-open blasphemy. It will not be the principle of idolatry only, neither will it be alone that pride of heart which says" I have built." These things will assuredly characterise him, for he is man; but it will be an immediate outrageous act which will dishonour the true God-that God who delivers His people into the hands of the wicked for their chastisement. It will be an act against the God of the Jews."[43]

43 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, page 133.

5:5 In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace: and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote.

Here's where we get the phrase "the handwriting is on the wall" when we speak of imminent doom or judgment.

5:6 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.

There is nothing like a little visitation from God to throw cold water on an orgy. Where was Belshazzar's boastings now? Now where is his big mouth and swaggering disposition?

"his knees smote one against another." The classic example of one's knees knocking together in fear, so common in cartoons.

"countenance was changed" The facial expression or the mood of the king could mean life or death and when it changed for the worse, like it did here, everyone was upset and troubled. No one could be secure if the king was troubled. It's like the old saying, "If mamma ain't happy, then ain't no one happy!"

5:7 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 shew 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.

Belshazzar consulted the same, failed “professionals” that Nebuchadnezzar had consulted, with the same disappointing results.

"shall be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom." Quite a motivation and reward, but Belshazzar was quite desperate to know the meaning of the writing, so he promises to practically give away the store to the man who can decipher it for him.

Joseph also was given a chain of gold around his neck in Genesis 41:42,43.

Why **third ruler**? Why not second? Because Nabonidus, the real king, was the First Ruler, and his son and co-regent, Belshazzar, was Second Ruler. The promise was to reward the man who could interpret the writing by making him prime minister of Babylon. This was the best offer Belshazzar could make. But what was that worth, with the city besieged by the Medes and Persians? This "third ruler" thus fulfills Jeremiah 27:7, about all nations serving Nebuchadnezzar, his son and his son's son.

5:8 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.

Again, showing their failure and that God does not have to try very hard to confound even the wisest and most learned of men. They could read it but could not interpret it.

Why wasn't Daniel called? Was he out of imperial favor at this time? Or did Belshazzar even know of him? It appears that Belshazzar did not know about Daniel based on verses 11-13. Since Daniel was up in his 80s by this time, was he retired from public life? Or maybe there was some racism in Belshazzar in that he didn't want any Jews in his government.

5:9 Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonied.

"**astonied**"

"The word first appeared around 1350, Middle English 'astony', 'astone' from the Old French 'estoner' (to stun), from the Latin 'extonare', (to be thunder-struck).

'Astonied' means 'having received a severe personal devastation, and not being able to protect from it or even correct it'. All 10 occurrences of the word in the Bible deal with some negative event."[44]

5:10 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 for ever: let not thy thoughts trouble thee, nor let thy countenance be changed:

"the queen" Unsure if this is Belshazzar's wife or mother.

5:11 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.

Either Belshazzar was ignorant of Daniel or just had ignored him or Daniel was out of favor with Belshazzar. It is possible that Daniel was retired and was not active in the day-to-day running of the government as he once was.

"in whom is the spirit of the holy gods" An Old Testament infilling and indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

"thy father" Grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar.

5:12 Forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting of dreams, and shewing 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 shew the interpretation.

5:13 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?

"my father" Grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar.

44 Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language*, volume 1, pages 124-125.

5:14 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.

"I have even heard of thee" From the queen in Daniel 5:11,12.

"spirit of the gods" Belshazzar leaves out the **"holy"** from Daniel 5:11. He seems to have been an irreligious man, even for a heathen.

5:15 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 shew the interpretation of the thing:

This seems to be a constant refrain in Daniel, the inability of the worldly wise men to be of any real help when such help is needed the most, yet one man who knew God was able to out-class them all.

5:16 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.

"third ruler" Daniel had already been in this position under Nebuchadnezzar, so the promise of returning to that office probably didn't appeal too much to him. The value of the honor depends upon who is giving it.

When Joseph interpreted Pharaoh's dream, he was made second ruler in the kingdom, thus becoming a type of Christ, Who is second in the Godhead. Here, Daniel would be made third ruler, a type of the Holy Spirit.[45]

5:17 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.

Daniel gives no royal preamble to Belshazzar, such as "O King, live forever!" Daniel had no respect for this man, cared not for his welfare and had no interest in complimenting him in any way. Daniel did not fear him either, as he knew that Belshazzar would be dead by the end of that night.

Daniel did not want any gifts or promotions from Belshazzar, although he did accept them from Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel respected Nebuchadnezzar but he had no time or use for this boy, as Daniel did not like or respect Belshazzar. This also showed that the promised rewards would not influence Daniel's interpretation.

Daniel had received the prophecies that he would record in chapter 7 (he received them in the time between chapters 4 and 5), so he already knew Babylon and Belshazzar were doomed. Any gifts Belshazzar had to offer would be like upgrading your cabin on the *Titanic* to a luxury suite.

Before Daniel gives the interpretation, he is going to use this once-in-a-lifetime chance to do some preaching at Belshazzar and his court.

---

45 David Allen Hoffman, *The Common Man's Reference Bible*, page 1298.

5:18 O thou king, the most high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honor:

"thy father" Grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar.

5:19 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.

There is a good definition of sovereignty in this verse. Nebuchadnezzar literally had the power of life and death over his subjects.

Daniel "hints" that Belshazzar was much inferior to Nebuchadnezzar since Belshazzar was ruling over a dying and doomed kingdom instead of over the whole known world. Daniel also implies that no one would fear or respect him as they did Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuchadnezzar made the whole world tremble. Belshazzar probably made the whole world laugh.

5:20 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:

Daniel recounts the events of chapter 4.

"But when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride" A proud heart and a hardened mind always go together. It is interesting that the verb is in the passive participle here, showing that someone else elevated Nebuchadnezzar's heart and that did not necessarily do it himself. The question then is "who did it?" Satan? Or was it even the Lord, setting Nebuchadnezzar up for his fall so that He might humble him for greater usefulness to the divine plan later?

5:21 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.

Belshazzar knew all this (as seen in Daniel 5:22) yet learned nothing from it. The judgment his grandfather had experienced made no impression upon him, and he had yet to learn that God is sovereign, not man. But Belshazzar would learn this truth the hard way at the end of this chapter.

5:22 And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this;

"his son" Grandson, Nebuchadnezzar.

Belshazzar did indeed know this but dismissed it, probably thinking “That might have happened to grandpa, but it would never happen to me!” Such is the folly and arrogance of youth. No

doubt Belshazzar was also a very immature and spoiled young man, unworthy to sit on any throne, especially the one his grandfather Nebuchadnezzar established.

5:23 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:

Belshazzar's crimes (probably just a small sample!):

1. Idolatry
2. Misuse of the vessels that belonged to God and that were sanctified for His use and worship
3. Pride
4. Refusal to glorify God

Compare Daniel' description of the folly of idolatry with Psalm 115:4-8 "**Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands. They have mouths, but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not: They have ears, but they hear not: noses have they, but they smell not: They have hands, but they handle not: feet have they, but they walk not: neither speak they through their throat. They that make them are like unto them; so is every one that trusteth in them."**

"**the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone"** idols made out of these materials.

"the God in whose hand thy breath is" Reminding Belshazzar that although he is a king, he is not even sovereign over his own body in that he cannot control when and how he would die.

5:24 Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written.

5:25 And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN.

There are Chaldee words. The wise men could read the words, but they could figure out what they meant. "The words all referred to measures of weight. Daniel interpreted the consonants by adding vowels, which are absent in Aramaic, as in Hebrew, and made each word a passive participle. The Aramaic word *mene* means "mena," or with different vowels, *menah*, "numbered." Daniel understood this word to signify that the number of years that God had prescribed for the Neo-Babylonian Empire had expired. Its repetition probably stressed the certainty of this point. *Tekel* (cognate with the Hebrew "shekel") when changed to *tekal* means "weighed." God had weighed Belshazzar and had found him deficient; he was not the ruler that he should have been because of his flagrant refusal to acknowledge the Most High God's sovereignty (v. 22). *Uparsin* means "and half-shekels." *Peras* means "broken in two" or "divided" and relates to the division of Belshazzar's kingdom into two parts, one part for the Medes and the other for the Persians. However, *paras* means "Persia." Persia was the dominant kingdom in the Medo-Persian alliance. Thus *prs* had a triple meaning…The meaning of these words describing various weights would have been unintelligible to the Chaldean wise men. Even if they had supplied the vowels that Daniel did and came up with the words "numbered,"

"weighed," and "divided" they would have been meaningless without a context. (Thomas Constable, *Notes on Daniel*, page 60)."

"Upharsin" The "u-" prefix has the idea of "and..."

We can summarize the words as meaning "Numbered! Numbered! Weighed! Divided!"

5:26 This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it.

"Mene" Repeated twice, thus establishing a thing by a double mention, or by two witnesses. God has judged Belshazzar's empire thoroughly and completely and has found it lacking for truth, virtue and usefulness. Therefore, the days of the Kingdom of Babylon were at an end.

5:27 TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.

Weighed in the scales of God's judgment and found wanting. Belshazzar was vain, light and empty, with nothing of substance to balance that scale. He did not measure 12 inches to the foot not 16 ounces to the pound. He was weighed and found wanting, was measured and came up short. He may have been "king" but he was no man.

5:28 PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.

"Peres" The plural of **Upharsin.** The Kingdom is divided in two and given to two of Babylon's enemies, Media-Persia.

5:29 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.

At least Belshazzar kept his word, you have to at least say that much about him. But these worldly honors only lasted for a few hours, at most, as the riches of this world are often of a short duration before they are destroyed by judgment.

Third ruler in a doomed kingdom is like being the first officer of the *Titanic*.

7. Babylon's Fall 5:30,31

5:30 In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain.

"In that night" This reminds us of how quickly Mystery Babylon the Great will fall in Revelation 18- in one day, even in one hour (Revelation 18:8,10,17). The historians say the Medo-Persian army diverted the Euphrates River from under the city wall and managed to enter through the dried riverbed.

"Belshazzar...slain" Xenophon says, he was dispatched by two lords, Gadatas and Gobrias, who went over to Cyrus, to avenge themselves of certain wrongs which Belshazzar had done them."[46]

46 Adam Clarke.

Prophecy dealing with the fall of Babylon is found in both Isaiah and Jeremiah. Both men prophesied that Babylon would fall to the Medes on just such a night of revelry as Daniel records here, as in Isaiah 13:17-22; 21:1-10.

5:31 And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.

"Darius" A title, not a proper name. His real name was Astyages. His son was Cyrus, who was 40 years old at this time and who was co-regent. "The name of three or four kings mentioned in the Old Testament. In the original Persian it is spelled "Darayavaush"; in Babylonian, usually "Dariamush"; in Susian(?), "Tariyamaush"; in Egyptian "Antaryuash"... in Latin, "Darius". In meaning it is probably connected with the new Persian word *Dara*, "king." Herodotus says it means in Greek, "restrainer," "compeller," "commander."

Darius the Mede was the son of *Ahasuerus* (Xerxes) of the seed of the Medes. He received the government of Belshazzar the Chaldean upon the death of that prince, and was made king over the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

From Daniel 6:28 we may infer that Darius was king contemporaneously with Cyrus. Outside of the Book of Daniel there is no mention of Darius the Mede by name, though there are good reasons for identifying him with Gubaru, or Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium, who is said in the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle to have been appointed by Cyrus as his governor of Babylon after its capture from the Chaldeans....Since Daniel never calls Darius the Mede king of Media, or king of Persia, it is immaterial what his title or position may have been before he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. Since the realm of the Chaldeans never included either Media or Persia, there is absolutely no evidence in the Book of Daniel that its author ever meant to imply that Darius the Mede ever ruled over either Media or Persia."[47]

"**about threescore and two years old.**" 62 years old.

Summarizing Jeremiah's prophecy about the fall of Babylon:

1. Babylon would be attacked from the north (1:3,9,41) by "the kings of the Medes" (51:11,28).
2. The city would be well-provisioned (51:26).
3. The city would trust in its enormous walls, towers and high gates (51:53,58).
4. The city would be taken by a clever strategy; it would be "caught in a snare".
5. The successful strategy would be linked to the city's water supply. Specifically, God would dry up her "fountain" (51:36)."
6. The scheme would be Connecticut with the flow of the Euphrates through Babylon. The "passages" (ferries) would be taken by surprise and the reeds would be set on fire (51:32).
7. At the critical time, a feast would be in progress at which all of the nobles and notables would be in attendance.
8. The drunkenness of these people would lead to their slaughter (51:57).[48]

47 International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.
48 John Phillips, *Exploring the Book of Daniel*, page 84.

Daniel Chapter 6

8. Daniel in the Lion's Den 6:1-28

6:1 It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty princes, which should be over the whole kingdom;

"Darius" Ethelbert Bullinger identifies Darius as Artaxerxes of Nehemiah 2:1 and Ezra 6:14 and the Ahasuerus of Esther 1:1.[49] These names refer to the same person.

"a hundred and twenty princes" Compare with the 127 provinces mentioned in Esther 1:1. No doubt there was a continual re-organization of the government and its administration.

"princes" Think of them like state governors. Persian kings were not absolute monarchs as were the Babylonian kings. They had a larger and more influential bureaucracy they had to answer to.

AV	ESV	LSV
1 It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred and twenty **princes**, which should be over the whole kingdom;	1 It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom 120 satraps, to be throughout the whole kingdom;	1 It seemed good to Darius that he set 120 satraps over the kingdom, that they would be in charge of the whole kingdom,

"princes" The use of "satrap" in both the ESV and LSV is no improvement at all.

6:2 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.

Daniel was Prime Minister of Babylon at this time, second only to the King.

"the king should have no damage" Daniel would run "interference" for the King and deal with the problems and issues involving the governance of these provinces so that the King would not have to deal with it and that he would be shielded from the associated problems in such administration. Daniel was responsible to see to it that the king would lose no revenue or other damage from revolts, tax evasion, fraud or any other reason.

6:3 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.

Darius obviously had big plans for Daniel since Daniel had such a good character and reputation. Daniel had a lot of influence over Darius, even to the point to encouraging Darius and later, Cyrus, to allow the Jews to return to Israel, rebuild the temple with Medo-Persian money and securing the return of the temple vessels and furniture that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from Jerusalem. God had placed Daniel in just such an important and influential position and Daniel proved himself faithful in that position.

---

49 *The Companion Bible*, page 1191.

6:4 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.

This is based on jealousy and hatred. They could not stand the thought of a foreigner, "that Jew" being promoted over them. Daniel's righteous character also rubbed them the wrong way, as sinners tend to react this way to a godly man who is promoted to a position of power and authority over them. There was also a lot of corruption in such governments and these "presidents and princes" probably expected to operate in a similar manner under this new administration as they had during previous ones- by bribes, blackmails and other forms of political intrigue. This is what happens in Washington D.C. and in your state capital 24 hours a day and it is standard operating procedures. But Daniel would not "pay to play" and he had too much character to be bought, bribed or bullied. He stood as a hindrance to these political operatives and had to be removed.

"they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he *was* faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him." What a testimony! Daniel was not sinless but he was blameless. His enemies couldn't find anything in his life that they could use against him to ruin him. What a sterling character he must have had. No wonder the Scripture speaks so highly of Daniel. What a great and godly man he was, full of character and conviction.

6:5 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.

The only way to ruin Daniel would be through his devotion to God. He had no carnal vices or carnal ambitions that could be exploited, and he had no skeletons in his closet, nor any embarrassing pictures taken of him when he was in college that could be used for blackmail purposes. Would to God all Christians, especially those in positions of leadership, would live like that!

6:6 Then these presidents and princes assembled together to the king, and said thus unto him, King Darius, live forever.

6:7 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.

"All..." I really doubt "all" of them consulted together like this- possible but improbable. In other words, they lied to Darius to make him think that Daniel was involved in the formulation of this request, which, of course, he was not. These men were obviously men of power and influence to move (or threaten) Darius to agree to this.

"whosoever, shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king" Ancient kings were often worshipped as gods, so such a request would not be that unusual or outlandish. This would serve to bolster Darius' ego to let him think that for this 30-day period, he alone was the voice of God and the intermediary of God and that all men would have to go through the King as a divine intercessor, instead of praying directly to their God.

"It was a stupid decree! Carried to its extreme, it would mean that a boy at home could not even ask his mother for a second helping of meat pie! Think, too, of the way the decree crippled the nation's business in all endeavors on all levels of political, financial, and social intercourse."[50]

6:8 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.

No doubt Darius was under some pressure from his nobles to comply with their request. Unlike the Babylonian kings, Darius was not an absolute ruler and he had to take into account the desires and policies of these presidents and princes. If they all (supposedly) had agreed with this policy, it would not be wise for Darius to refuse them.

"according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." Here is one way how the Medo-Persian Empire was inferior to the Babylonian. A Babylonian king was absolute- he could do as he wished and could make, change, amend or end any law he wished at any time. But the Medo-Persian King could not. Once a law was established, it could not be reversed or overruled. To do so, another law would have to be passed, as was done in Esther 8:8ff. Also see Esther 1:19 for an example of how a royal edict could not be revoked.

"The rigidity of the Medo-Persian law was not always a bad thing. In the days in Ezra, the adversaries of Judah wrote letters to Ahasuerus, slandering the Jews and endeavoring to have a decree signed to prevent the Jews from continuing with the work of reconstruction. They succeeded (Ezra 4:1-24). Later, the decree of Cyrus was found, the original document that led to the repatriation of the Jews. That changed the whole picture. The original decree had to stand…Then Darius threw the weight of his administration behind the original decree and added clauses that greatly helped the continuation of the work in Israel (Ezra 5:1-6,15)."[51]

6:9 Wherefore king Darius signed the writing and the decree.

Darius was obviously completely unaware that this was a plot aimed at the destruction of Daniel.

"The right interpretation of the subject-matter and of the foundation of the law which was sanctioned by the king, sets aside the objection that the prohibition was a senseless 'bedlamite' law, which instead of regulating could only break up all society. The law would be senseless only if the prohibition had related to every petition in common life in the intercourse of civil society. But it only referred to the religious sphere of prayer, as an evidence of worshipping God; and if the king was venerated as an incarnation of the deity, then it was altogether reasonable in its character. And if we consider that the intention of the law, which they concealed from the king, was only to effect Daniel's overthrow, the law cannot be regarded as designed to press Parsism or the Zend religion on all the nations of the kingdom, or to put an end to religious freedom, or to make Parsism the world-religion. Rather, as Kliefoth has clearly and justly shown, The object of the law was only to bring about the general recognition of the principle that the king was the living manifestation of all the gods, not only of the Median and Persian, but also of the Babylonian and Lydian, and all the gods of the conquered nations. It is therefore also not correct that the king should be represented as the incarnation of Ormuzd. The matter is to be explained not from Parsism alone, but from heathenism in general. According to

50 John Phillips, *Exploring the Book of Daniel*, page 101.
51 John Phillips, *Exploring the Book of Daniel*, page 103.

the general fundamental principle of heathenism, the ruler is the son, the representative, the living manifestation of the people's gods, and the world-ruler thus the manifestation of all the gods of the nations that were subject to him. Therefore all heathen world-rulers demanded from the heathen nations subdued by them, that religious homage should be rendered to them in the manner peculiar to each nation. Now that is what was here sought. All the nations subjected to the Medo-Persian kingdom were required not to abandon their own special worship rendered to their gods, but in fact to acknowledge that the Medo-Persian world-ruler Darius was also the son and representative of their national gods. For this purpose they must for the space of thirty days present their petitions to their national gods only in him as their manifestation. And the heathen nations could all do this without violating their consciences; for since in their own manner they served the Median king as the son of their gods, they served their gods in him. The Jews, however, were not in the condition of being able to regard the king as a manifestation of Jehovah, and thus for them there was involved in the law truly a religious persecution, although the heathen king and his satraps did not thereby intend religious persecution but regarded such disobedience as only culpable obstinacy and political rebellion."[52]

6:10 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 formerly.

What Daniel did here was not done in ignorance but in full knowledge of the law and its consequences. He probably also realized who had enacted it and why. Yet he was not about to let his enemies deter him from his devotions or service to God. Here is a man who would not stop praying. He would allow nothing to deter him from his devotions with God. Without such a habit of prayer, Daniel would have been just another Jew in the captivity, not having accomplished anything significant.

Daniel's practice of personal devotions:

1. **He opened the windows of his chamber (office? bedroom? study?) toward Jerusalem**. We would have no reason to do this today, since we have no continuing holy city here on Earth today to pray towards. Nor was such a practice ever commanded. It was simply Daniel's habit.
2. **He assumed a kneeling position**. A specific position in prayer is never commanded, but a kneeling position was usually understood to be one of reverence and submission of an inferior to a superior and it is a good practice and posture for prayer.
3. **He prayed three times a day, probably morning, noon and night** (Psalm 55:16,17). Again, no set numbers of prayers a day or set times of prayer are ever commanded in Scripture. But this is a good principle to follow. As we eat three times a day to sustain the body, why not pray three times a day to sustain the soul? He knew once a day was not enough. Even with his very busy schedule, he found time for God three times a day.
    - A. Consider Roman Catholic religious, mainly priests, monks and nuns. They are required by canon law to practice the “daily hours”, also known as the “liturgy of the hours”. This requires prayer seven times as day, using a book known as the “liturgy” or ”breviary” that contains readings, psalms, prayers and hymns.
    - B. The Jews would praying at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, and at midnight.
    - C. Divisions for the daily office:

52 Keil and Delitsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*.

i. 3 a.m. – Lauds
ii. 6 a.m. – Prime
iii. 9 a.m. – Terce
iv. Noon – Sext
v. 3 p.m. – None
vi. 6 p.m. (Evening Prayer) – Vespers
vii. 9 p.m. (Night Prayer) – Compline
viii. Midnight – Matins

D. Prayer times:

i. Seven times a day

a. Psalm 55:17, **Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray, and cry aloud: and he shall hear my voice.**

b. Psalm 119:164, **Seven times a day do I praise thee because of thy righteous judgments.**

ii. Three times a day

a. Daniel 6:10

iii. Morning prayer

a. Psalm 5:3, **My voice shalt thou hear in the morning, O LORD; in the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee, and will look up.**

b. Psalm 88:13**, But unto thee have I cried, O LORD; and in the morning shall my prayer prevent thee.**

c. Psalm 119:147**, I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried: I hoped in thy word.**

d. Mark 1:35**, And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed.**

iv. Night prayer

a. Psalm 63:6, **When I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches.**

b. Psalm 119:55**, I have remembered thy name, O LORD, in the night, and have kept thy law.**

c. Isaiah 26:9, **With my soul have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit within me will I seek thee early: for when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.**

4. **Daniel gave thanksgiving to God in his prayers.** He still praised and gave thanks to God, although he knew that certain death would await him if he did. Daniel's enemies tried to make Daniel fear but they only succeeded in strengthening his faith.

For the text of one of his prayers, refer to Daniel 9.

Obviously, this is one of those instances where disobedience to a law is justified. Resistance to the State is justifiable if obeying such a law would harm one's service, obedience or worship of God. Such laws are illegitimate, and believers are under no obligations to obey such ungodly laws.

The custom of praying toward the temple in Jerusalem was started by Solomon (2 Chronicles 6:34-39). Prayer three times daily is mentioned in a Psalm 55:16,17 "**As for me, I will call upon God; and the LORD shall save me. Evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray, and cry aloud: and he shall hear my voice."**

6:11 Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God.

You know they would have Daniel under constant watch, looking for just sort of an exercise that they knew he would engage in. Why not just close the windows and pray in secret? That would give his enemies a victory. Besides, Daniel was not the sort of man to knuckle under such pressure or to hide his devotion to God.

There is a bit of a difference between "prayer" and "supplication" here:

1. "prayer" to ask, the general act
2. "supplication" to entreat, ask for mercy or favor

"Supplication" is a more narrowly-defined word that involves the idea of prayer, but specifies it to asking for mercy or favor, especially in regards to forgiveness of sins.

6:12 Then they came near, and spoke 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.

6:13 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.

You can almost hear the contempt in their voice, "*That* Daniel...That *Jew*....That *foreigner from Judah, a mere prisoner of war and exile from a defeated and beaten nation*…"

"nor regardeth thee" A lie. Daniel did regard and respect the King. It was this crowd and their law that he despised.

6:14 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.

The plan worked and now Darius is forced to kill his most trusted advisor. Darius realized he had been suckered. He kicked and cursed himself for being so weak or vain or proud for allowing himself to be duped like this. But there was no legal way Darius could help Daniel, despite consulting with every lawyer and every law book in the palace. The trap was perfect, with all avenues of escape blocked.

6:15 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.

It sounds like they were almost taunting Darius.

6:16 Then the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast *him* into the den of lions. *Now* the king spoke and said unto Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee.

Darius is beaten and he knows it. Since he cannot help Daniel, he commits Daniel into the care of his God.

6:17 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.

"den of lions" "Either this was the royal menagerie, like that place in the Tower of London, where wild beasts are kept for the king's pleasure, and the public amusement; or they were kept for the purpose of devouring certain criminals, which the laws might consign to that kind of death. This is most likely, from the case before us."[53] "Keil gives an interesting account of a lions' den such as has been found in more modern times…"We have no account by the ancients of the construction of lions' dens. Ge. Host, in his work on *Fez and Morocco,* p. 77, describes the lions' dens as they have been found in Morocco. According to his account, they consist of a large square cavern under the earth, having a partition-wall in the middle of it, which is furnished with a door, which the keeper can open and close from above. By throwing in food, they can entice the lions from one chamber into the other, and then, having shut the door, they enter the vacant space for the purpose of cleaning it. The cavern is open above, its mouth being surrounded by a wall of a yard and a half high, over which one can look down into the den. This description agrees perfectly with that which is here given in the text regarding the lions' den." Keil goes on to explain that there was a door in the wall surrounding the cavern through which both the keepers and the lions could enter except when the stone was in place. This accounts for the fact that Darius was able to converse freely with Daniel before the stone was removed from the door."[54]

"sealed it with his own signet, and with the signet of his lords; that the purpose might not be changed concerning Daniel" This would prevent any attempts to rescue Daniel, and also provide proof that no one tried to enter the den or tried to open the door.

The execution of the sentence was carried out, according to Oriental custom, on the evening of the day in which the accusation was made.

"What course does the child of God pursue? He does not maintain himself by leaning upon the civil power; he acts according to his conscience, and seeks only the will of God; at the same time he submits, and in so doing yields up his body; for his conscience is submissive to no one but the Lord: he cannot serve two masters."[55]

6:18 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.

Of course he couldn't sleep. He was forced to condemn an innocent and a righteous man to death. Darius, as most kings, sentenced people to death all the time but they were usually

53 Adam Clarke.
54 John Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*.
55 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, page 135.

criminals or rebels. This was different as Daniel did nothing to deserve death. In light of his statement in Daniel 6:16, why was Darius so upset? Did he believe that Daniel's God could or would deliver Daniel or not? His activities during the night do not match up with his good statement of faith in verse 16. But we can't be too hard on Darius- he wasn't really a believer in Daniel's God after all. He didn't do too badly for a sinner in this situation. All he could do was toss and turn on his bed. He couldn't even watch TV or read a book, as he was so upset.

6:19 Then the king arose very early in the morning, and went in haste unto the den of lions.

The law probably stated the victim had to spend all night in the den of lions. As soon as the first rays of the morning sun were seen, Darius was at the door to the den (how could he lie in bed and sleep in such a circumstance?), ready to release Daniel- if he survived.

6:20 And when he came to the den, he cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel: *and* the king spoke 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?

"**O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually**, **able to deliver thee from the lions?** As if Darius didn't expect Daniel to answer.

6:21 Then said Daniel unto the king, O king, live forever.

The answer is an emphatic YES! Daniel's God was able to deliver him from the lion's den! No problems at all!

6:22 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.

"his angel" Who is this? A Christophany? A pre-incarnate visitation of Christ to Daniel among the lions? The same one seen in the fiery furnace of Daniel 3:25-28? Or it very well could have been a literal, "regular" angel.

"innocency was found in me" God honored Daniel's decision to disobey that unjust law and delivered him because Daniel put God's law first, above the corrupt laws of sinful man.

"**before thee, O king, have I done no hurt"** Daniel manifests no ill-will toward the king for his part in this. I think Daniel understood the situation that forced Darius into this course of action.

6:23 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.

"exceedingly glad" But you can be sure that the men who were responsible for putting Daniel in the lion's den were anything but **"exceedingly glad".**

"because he believed in his God" Hebrews 11:33 "**Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions**,"

6:24 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 broke all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den.

The general principle of Biblical criminal justice is that if you attempt to wrongly inflict some punishment on someone, then when the innocent party is vindicated, you suffer the penalty you sought to inflict on your enemy. These men tried to have Daniel killed in the lion's den. They were unsuccessful. Thus, they suffer the fate they sought to impose upon Daniel. This is a *lex talionis,* or a law or retaliation, that a false accuser would suffer the same fate as he sought to have inflicted upon whom he unjustly accused.

"their children, and their wives" The Bible records this. It does not necessarily mean that God approved of it. It was simply the way things were done in the Medo-Persian empire, ordered by Darius, who was furious at these men. Unfortunately, their families suffered for their sins. It is likely that their families were fully supportive of the plots hatched by these men. "How righteous are God's statutes above those of the nations! for God commanded that the children should not die for the fathers' crimes, (Deuteronomy 24:16). Yet they were put to death in extraordinary cases, as those of Achan, and Saul, and Haman."[56] This would show that Hebrew law would have been superior to and more merciful than Persian law in this case. But we would not have expected the Medo-Persians to have any respect of Deuteronomy 24:16 or anything else in the Law of Moses.

"they cast" with some violence apparently, roughly treating these condemned ones.

"**and the lions had the mastery of them, and broke all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den.**" This shows the miracle of Daniel's preservation. It's not that the lions were not hungry or docile that Daniel was protected. God put the muzzle on them. But when God removed it, the lions reverted to form and destroyed these men even before they hit the bottom of the pit.

6:25 Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth Peace be multiplied unto you.

6:26 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.

Verse 26 sounds similar to Nebuchadnezzar's proclamation in Daniel 4:34-37. It is interesting what kind of praise God can get out of the heathen when He demonstrates His power and might to them.

"See his characters in this decree.

1. He is the living God, the Author and Giver of life; all others are dead gods.
2. He is steadfast for ever. All things change; but he is unchangeable.
3. He has a kingdom; for as he made all things, so he governs all things.

56 Matthew Henry.

4. His kingdom shall not be destroyed. No human power can prevail against it, because it is upheld by his omnipotence.
5. His dominion is without end. It is an everlasting dominion, under an everlasting rule, by an everlasting God.
6. He delivereth them that are in danger and bondage.
7. He rescueth those who have fallen into the hands of their enemies, and implore his succor.
8. He worketh signs in the heavens.
9. And wonders upon earth; showing that both are under his sway, and are parts of his dominion.
10. And to complete all, He hath delivered Daniel. Before our own eyes he has given the fullest proof of his power and goodness, in rescuing his faithful servant from the teeth of the lions. What a fine eulogium on the great God and his faithful."[57]

6:27 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.

6:28 So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.

"prospered" Physically, spiritually and professionally.

"Cyrus the Persian" The son of Darius, the young Darius.

57 Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*.

Daniel Chapter 7

We move into the second half of Daniel, the prophetic section. Chapters 1-6 are historical; chapters 7-12 are prophetic. In chapters 7-12, we have no longer the interpretation of dreams made to Nebuchadnezzar, but the communications made to Daniel himself.

Daniel 2 is the companion chapter to this vision regarding the parallels between Nebuchadnezzar's Image and these four beasts.

" He was not a messenger to God's people, as, for example, Isaiah and Jeremiah were; but, like John in Patmos, he received revelations of the future for the guidance of God's people in all ages."[58]

9. Daniel's First Vision: The Four Beasts 7:1-28

7:1 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.

Daniel received this vision before the events of Daniel 5.

This was a night season vision, God's seemingly favorite method of giving such revelatory information (Psalm 17:3 "**Thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night; thou hast tried me, and shalt find nothing; I am purposed that my mouth shall not transgress**."). This is because we tend to be in a more relaxed and contemplative state in the night, as opposed to being consumed with the duties and activities of the day, when we may be too busy to receive and consider such visitations and relations from God. That this was a night season vision is repeated in verse 7.

7:2 Daniel spoke and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.

These great waters of the sea refer to the great mass of humanity. Revelation 17:15 uses similar language, referring to humanity as "**great waters**" (**And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues**.). This striving suggests the uncertainty and distress of the Times of the Gentiles, the context of the rise of these kingdoms. Human government apart from God has always been one of chaos. A look at the politics of the United States, Canada and the European Union today will confirm this. It is even worse in so-called "Third World" countries. As we get closer to the unveiling of the Antichrist, human consternation in politics, economics, religion and society will be at its peak and will appear to be unsolvable, until the Antichrist arises and manages to convince humanity that he has the answers to the problems of that generation. Anyone who puts his faith in secular politics will be disappointed!

7:3 And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.

58 Edward Dennett, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles*.

These are four different empires arising from the mass of Gentile humanity. Israel has no part in it.

It is interesting than human government is referred to as a "beast". Most human governments have been despotic, powerful, unmerciful, corrupt, and interested only in gaining and maintaining their power. None are a friend to God's people, whether it be Israel or the Church. It is folly to trust in politics or governments for anything as Christians. This is very clear today in looking at the governments of the nations. There is not a single Christian government anywhere on earth as I write these lines in 2025. All of them, including the United States, as power-hungry beasts, seeking dominion over the earth at the most, or over their own peoples and regions at the least. They will be as vicious as a wild beast in order to attain their goals, which is power against and over God.

7:4 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.

1. There were 4 beasts, 7:3
2. The beasts were "great", 7:3
3. The beasts came up from the sea, 7:3
4. The beasts were diverse one from another, 7:3
5. The First Beast- a lion, 7:4
    - A. Had eagle's wings, 7:4
        - i. The eagle wings signify royalty and magnificence.
    - B. The wings were plucked, 7:4
        - i. This is the humbling of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4. It was brought down low and was no longer able to rise and fly as in previous times.
    - C. Made to stand on his feet as a man, 7:4
    - D. A man's heart given to it, 7:4
        - i. A humanizing of this beast, again, in Daniel 4 after Nebuchadnezzar's judgment.
        - ii. I believe Nebuchadnezzar was saved after his judgment in Daniel 4 and this man who represented one beast empire of Babylon was "humanized" by God.'
        - Iii. How his reign went after Daniel 4 we are not told, so we do not know how much the character of his rule was affected after his insanity passed. He was still a tyrant and still ruled with an iron hand, but was there more compassion and humility in his reign after the events of Daniel 4?
    - E. Dominion was taken away yet its life was prolonged for a season and a time, 7:12
        - i. Its dominion is taken away, probably referring to the fall of Babylon as it was conquered by the Medo-Persians in Daniel 5.
    - F. Interpretation, 7:17
        - i. The beast is a king, 7:17
        - ii. They shall arise out of the earth, 7:17
        - iii. Babylonian Empire, the first of Daniel's empires.
            - a. This corresponds to Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar.
            - b. The lion is the king of the Beasts, as Nebuchadnezzar was a king of kings (Daniel 2:37) and headed up the greatest Gentile kingdom.

7:5 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.

6. The Second Beast, a Bear, 7:5
    A. Compared to a lion, a bear is slower, lumbering, stronger and can be very ferocious. A bear does not have the majesty of a lion. The bear gets what it wants by brute strength, which is a good description of the Medo-Persian empire. In terms of its military strength, it was more powerful than Babylon, sometimes fielding an army of two million men. They would overwhelm their enemy.
    B. Raised itself up on one side, 7:5
    C. Had three ribs in its mouth and between its teeth, 7:5
        i. We are not told what these ribs signify. The usage of "ribs" 7 times in Bible is no help here in comparing scripture with scripture (Genesis 2:21,22; 2 Samuel 2:23; 3:27; 4:6; 20:10; Daniel 7:5).
        ii. It may refer to three nations conquered by the Medes and Persians in their rise to power. But we cannot be as dogmatic as we would like to be.
        iii. Bears usually eat fruits, vegetables and roots but will attack animals and men and eat meat under certain conditions.
        iv. They could represent three countries conquered by the Medes and Persians. Babylon would be one, unsure what the other two countries would be, if that is what the ribs signify.
            a. John Phillips and Clarence Larkin[59] identify these three countries as Lydia, Babylon, and Egypt.
    D. Told to devour much flesh, 7:5
        i. Destroy many nations? Kill many people? Again, we cannot be dogmatic since the ribs are not interpreted.
        ii. This bear empire did have quite a feast of the lesser nations that it devoured during its rampage.
        iii. Who told the bear to do this? Who is speaking? The bear is the only one of the four given this “commission:
    E. Dominion was taken away yet its life was prolonged for a season and a time, 7:12
    F. Interpretation, 7:17
        i. The beast is a king, 7:17
        ii. They shall arise out of the earth, 7:17
        iii. This rather to the Medo-Persian empire, the silver of Nebuchadnezzar's image.

7:6 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.

7. Third Beast- a Leopard, 7:6
    A. Had 4 wings as of a fowl, 7:6
        i. The leopard is known for its great swiftness of conquest, as Alexander conquered the entire known world in only 12 years.
        ii. The 4 wings signify even more swiftness than is to be expected.
        iii. Leopards are fast enough, even without the wings, so how much faster is this

59 *The Book of Daniel*, page 122.

image!

a. Hitler's blitzkrieg ("lightening war") in 1939-1940 had nothing on Alexander.

iv. These are wings of a fowl, not an eagle, but there were four of them. What kind of fowl this is not noted but it would have slower than that of an eagle but the fact that there were four wings would make up for that.

iii. The lion in verse 4 had eagle wings, showing that the "lion" was more majestic and could move faster and better than the "leopard".

B. Had 4 heads, 7:6

i. Alexander's empire split into 4 parts at his death

a. Macedonia
b. Asia Minor
c. Egypt
d. Syria

C. Dominion was given to it, 7:6

D. Dominion was taken away yet its life was prolonged for a season and a time, 7:12

E. Interpretation, 7:17

i. The beast is a king, 7:17

ii. They shall arise out of the earth, 7:17

iii. This is the Macedonian Empire under Alexander the Great, corresponding to the brass of Nebuchadnezzar's image.

iv. The leopard shows the swiftness the spread of Alexander's empire.

7:7 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 broke 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.

8. The Fourth Beast, 7:7

A. Seen by Daniel in the night visions, 7:7

B. This beast was not defined or identified with an animal.

C. Dreadful and terrible, 7:7,19

i. Referring to the Roman Empire as being the strongest and "hardest", or cruelest of these empires.

D. Exceedingly strong, 7:7

E. Had great iron teeth, 7:7,19

i. The iron teeth answer to the iron legs of Daniel 2:33. This is an empire of iron, and iron in Scripture has a generally negative connotation.

F. Had nails of brass, 7:19

G. It devoured and broke in pieces, 7:7,19,23

i. It will devour the whole earth, 7:23

ii. Rome (as most countries) had no interest in raising the conquered nations to any high level of development. All her designs were imperial; let the nations be crushed and stamped underfoot. When the United States defeated a nation in war (Japan, Germany), we helped to rebuild that nation. Not so Rome, which would be more apt just to salt the defeated territory and keep it desolate.

H. It stamped down the residue with its feet, 7:7,19,23

I. Different from all the other beasts, 7:7,23

J. It had 10 horns

i. 10 horns are 10 kings that shall arise, 7:24

ii. Another shall arise after them, 7:24
(a). This is the little horn

K. Another "little horn" came up, 7:8,20, Daniel 8:9
i. It plucked up 3 horns by the roots, 7:8,20
(a). It subdues three kings, 7:24
ii. It had the eyes of a man, 7:8,20
iii. It had a mouth speaking great things, 7:8,20
(a). It speaks great words against the most High, 7:25
iv. It had a look that was more stout than its fellows, 7:20
v. It made war with the saints and prevailed against them, 7:21
(a). It did this until the Ancient of days came, 7:21
(b). It will wear out the saints of the most High, 7:25
vi. It arises after the 10 horns, 7:24
vii. It is diverse from the others, 7:24
viii. It will think to change times and laws, 7:25
(a). They shall be given into his hand for a time, times and the dividing of Time, 7:25
ix. His dominion shall be taken away in judgment, 7:26
(a). His dominion shall be consumed and destroyed, 7:26
(b). His dominion will be given to the saints of the most High, 7:27
x. These horns are kingdoms. These 10 Kingdoms make up this empire. The revelation about the Fourth Kingdom is historical to the old Roman Empire but is also prophetic to the revived Roman Empire of the Antichrist.

L. This beast was slain, 7:11
i. His body destroyed and given to the burning flame, 7:11

M. Interpretation, 7:17
i. The beast is a king, 7:17
ii. They shall arise out of the earth, 7:17
iii. This must refer to the Roman Empire, which was the strongest, cruelest and fiercest of all these empires.
a. It can answer to both historical Rome and prophetic Rome. The Antichrist's future kingdom will fulfill these characteristics as much as historic Rome did,

N. Shall be the fourth kingdom upon the earth, 7:23

O. Compare with Revelation 13:1,2 "**And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority."**

i. The lion, bear and leopard show up again in the person of the Beast (Antichrist) in Revelation 13:1,2, with a tribulation application.

ii. The Beast of Revelation 13 is a combination of all three animals, resulting in a unique beast. The Antichrist will combine all the characteristics of Babylon, Greece and Persia into himself.

iii. This beast is a clear type of the Antichrist, arising from the revived revived Roman Empire.

We can add a study of iron here:

1. Iron is first mentioned in relation to the line of Cain and Tubalcain

A. Genesis 4:22 And Zillah, she also bare Tubalcain, an instructer of every artificer in

brass and iron: and the sister of Tubalcain was Naamah.

2. When God refuses to hear prayer, he refers to the heavens as being iron
   A. Leviticus 26:19 And I will break the pride of your power; and I will make your heaven as iron, and your: earth as brass:
   B. Deuteronomy 28:23 And thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron.
3. Iron used as a weapon
   A. Numbers 35:16 And if he smite him with an instrument of iron, so that he die, he is a murderer: the murderer shall surely be put to death.
   B. Amos 1:3 Thus saith the LORD; For three transgressions of Damascus, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron:
4. Og, king of Bashan, slept on a bedstead of iron
   A. Deuteronomy 3:11 For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.
5. Egypt was referred to as an “iron furnace”
   A. Deuteronomy 4:20 But the LORD hath taken you, and brought you forth out of the iron furnace, even out of Egypt, to be unto him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day.
   B. 1 Kings 8:51 For they be thy people, and thine inheritance, which thou broughtest forth out of Egypt, from the midst of the furnace of iron:
   C. Jeremiah 11:4 Which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you: so shall ye be my people, and I will be your God:
6. No iron tool was to be used in building any altar
   A. Deuteronomy 27:5 And there shalt thou build an altar unto the LORD thy God, an altar of stones: thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them.
   B. Joshua 8:31 As Moses the servant of the LORD commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lift up any iron: and they offered thereon burnt offerings unto the LORD, and sacrificed peace offerings.
   C. No tool of iron was heard in the building of the temple
      i. 1 Kings 6:7 And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building.
      ii. Iron nails were used in the temple
         a. 1 Chronicles 22:3 And David prepared iron in abundance for the nails for the doors of the gates, and for the joinings; and brass in abundance without weight;
7. A yoke of iron
   A. Deuteronomy 28:48 Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the LORD shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things: and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee.
   B. Jeremiah 28:13 Go and tell Hananiah, saying, Thus saith the LORD; Thou hast broken the yokes of wood; but thou shalt make for them yokes of iron.
   C. Jeremiah 28:14 For thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; I have put a yoke of iron upon the neck of all these nations, that they may serve Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and they shall serve him: and I have given him the beasts of the field also.

8. Iron is used in a good way for endurance and strength
    A. Deuteronomy 33:25 Thy shoes shall be iron and brass; and as thy days, so shall thy strength be.
    B. Jeremiah 1:18 For, behold, I have made thee this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brasen walls against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land.
    C. Micah 4:13 Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many people: and I will consecrate their gain unto the LORD, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth.
9. Chariots of iron
    A. Joshua 17:16 And the children of Joseph said, The hill is not enough for us: and all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have chariots of iron, both they who are of Bethshean and her towns, and they who are of the valley of Jezreel.
    B. Joshua 17:18 But the mountain shall be thine; for it is a wood, and thou shalt cut it down: and the outgoings of it shall be thine: for thou shalt drive out the Canaanites, though they have iron chariots, and though they be strong.
    C. Judges 1:19 And the LORD was with Judah; and he drave out the inhabitants of the mountain; but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron.
    D. Judges 4:3 And the children of Israel cried unto the LORD: for he had nine hundred chariots of iron; and twenty years he mightily oppressed the children of Israel.
    E. Judges 4:13 And Sisera gathered together all his chariots, even nine hundred chariots of iron, and all the people that were with him, from Harosheth of the Gentiles unto the river of Kishon.
10. Horns of iron used by false prophets
    A. 1 Kings 22:11 And Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah made him horns of iron: and he said, Thus saith the LORD, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until thou have consumed them. (2 Chronicles 18:10)
11. God's enemies judged by iron
    A. 1 Chronicles 20:3 And he brought out the people that were in it, and cut them with saws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes. Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.
12. An iron pen signifies a decree that cannot be reversed and is eternal
    A. Job 19:24 That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!
    B. Jeremiah 17:1 The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond: it is graven upon the table of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars;
13. Behemoth (the beast from the earth) has bones like iron
    A. Job 40:18 His bones are as strong pieces of brass; his bones are like bars of iron.
14. Leviathan (the beast from the sea) has no fear or respect for iron
    A. Job 41:27 He esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood.
15. The rod of iron, used by Christ to enforce His rule over His enemies
    A. Psalm 2:9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.
    B. Revelation 2:27 And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father.
    C. Revelation 12:5 And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.
    D. Revelation 19:15 And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the

winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

16. Iron equated with affliction
    A. Psalm 107:10 Such as sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, being bound in affliction and iron;
17. Fetters of iron
    A. Psalm 149:8 To bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron;
18. Iron a type of stubbornness
    A. Isaiah 48:4 Because I knew that thou art obstinate, and thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy brow brass;
19. Iron used to describe worthless and apostate people
    A. Ezekiel 22:18 Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver.
20. Legs of iron in Daniel's image of a man
    A. Daniel 2:33 His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay.
21. Iron used to describe the strong fourth kingdom of Daniel's image
    A. Daniel 2:40 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.
22. Tree stumps were sometimes banded with a band of iron
    A. Daniel 4:15 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:
23. Idols of iron
    A. Daniel 5:4 They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.
24. Iron teeth of the fourth beast of Daniel 7
    A. Daniel 7:7 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. (Daniel 7:19)
25. A conscience seared with a hot iron
    A. 1 Timothy 4:2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;
26. Breastplates of iron
    A. Revelation 9:9 And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle.

7:8 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.

"horns" The horns are kingdoms. The 10 horns are 10 kingdoms.

"little horn" The Little Horn is the Antichrist. He also appears in Daniel 8:9. He is small and insignificant at first, but grows in power and stature. This "little horn" is known by various names. He is called:

1. "The Assyrian" (Isaiah 14:25)

2. “The prince that shall come" (Daniel 9:26)
3. “The "man of sin" (2 Thessalonians 2:3)
4. “A king of fierce countenance" (Daniel 8:23)
5. “A vile person" (Daniel 11:21)
6. “The willful king” (Daniel 11:36)
7. “That Wicked" or "the lawless one" (2 Thessalonians 2:8)
8. "A beast" (Revelation 13:1)
9. "Antichrist" (1 John 2:18).

More on the “little horn”:
1. He comes up from among the other horns- Daniel 7:8; 8:9
2. He is a “little” horn- Daniel 7:8; 8:9
    A. He has humble beginnings but grows into a major power.
3. Three other horns were plucked up by the roots- Daniel 7:8
    A. The Little Horn uproots 3 horns, or 3 kingdoms, in his ascent to power.
4. The little horn had the eyes of a man- Daniel 7:8
5. The little horn had a mouth speaking great things- Daniel 7:8
    A. The Little Horn has a mouth speaking great things in speaking blasphemies against God.
6. The little horn waxed exceeding great- Daniel 8:9
7. It waxed great toward the south, the east and toward the pleasant land- Daniel 8:9

7:9 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.

The vision now takes a major jump from the old Roman Empire to the future revived Roman Empire of the Antichrist, through the Tribulation and the Millennium to the Great White Throne Judgment of Revelation 20. Obviously, the material of this prophecy then is not given in chronological order. The second coming and the Millennium are skipped.

“thrones were cast down” At the second coming and into the Millennium, when the times of Gentile world powers will be ended by God.

“Ancient of Days” This is God the Father, not Christ, who seems to be distinguished from the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7:13. If so, it would appear that the Father is the One who would conduct the Great White Throne judgment.
1. The Ancient of Days did sit, 7:9
2. His garment was white as snow, 7:9
3. His hair was as pure wool, 7:9
4. His throne was like a fiery flame, 7:9
5. His wheels as burning fire, 7:9
6. A fiery stream came out from before him, 7:10
7. Thousand thousands ministered unto him, 7:10
    A. Angels? They are ministers.
8. Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, 7:10
    i. These could be saints.
9. Compare with Revelation 1:13-16 “**And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as**

white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp twoedged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength."

Notice all the white around the throne, showing that this is the Great White Throne judgment. This description does not match Judgment of the Nations or the Judgment Seat of Christ,[60] so the only judgment remaining is the Great White Throne. Clarence Larkin would identify this as the Judgment Seat of Christ, however.[61]

****

7:10 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.

"fiery stream" Fire usually depicts cleansing, purification[60] or judgment.[62]

"**ten thousand times ten thousand**" Not a matter of multiplication but a figure of speech to indicate an immense number that cannot be counted. The Bema Seat judgment of the Christian may be a solitary affair, but the Great White Throne judgment certainly will not be. These are probably Christians who are somehow involved in this judgment.

"ministered unto him" Probably both saints and angels are involved in this.

"the books were opened" The Great White Throne Judgment. These books include the Book of Life. See notes under Daniel 12:3.

7:11 I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spoke: I beheld *even* till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.

The destruction and final condemnation of the Antichrist, who is called "the beast" (Revelation 13) and the "little horn" here. He is clearly cast into the Lake of Fire at the Great White Throne along with the rest of the wicked dead.

"The problem with the prophets in general and Daniel in particular, is that they see prophetic events right together with no intervening time period. The Church Age itself is not revealed until the Apostle Paul (Gal. 1:11-16; Eph. 3:1-6); although some of God's dealings with the Jews during the Church are revealed. Here, Daniel skips from the Tribulation (vs. 8) to the Great White Throne Judgment (vs. 9), with no Armageddon or Millennium in between, (This explains the mess into which people like the Amillennialists and Marvin Rosenthal [The Pre-Wrath Rapture of the Church] get.) If "the beast" here is the Antichrist, then Daniel is jumping back to Revelation.19:20 which takes place 1,000 years before verses 9,10. If that is the case, then the "then" refers back to the Antichrist speaking in the Tribulation in verse 8. But Daniel could be

60 See 1 Corinthians 3:13.
61 *The Book of Revelation*, notes on Revelation 4:4.
62 See Matthew 3:11. This baptism with fire is NOT something to be sought for or desired as many Charismatics think!

seeing the Devil and the Antichrist together here (see Rev. 13:1-3) in which case, the verse is still a reference to the Great White Throne Judgment and Daniel is seeing the Devil speak there as the "prosecuting attorney." If that's the case, then "the burning flame" is a reference to Revelation 20:10, which would take place after Revelation 20:14 chronologically."[63]

7:12 As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.

This would be the Gentile kingdoms that survived the Tribulation and enter into the Millennium. They will still continue as nations, but no longer will they be sovereign, but under the control and domination of Christ and His Kingdom. But it is interesting that these kingdoms are also called "beasts", probably because they were willing confederates and allies of that great Political Beast, the Antichrist/Little Horn and his political kingdom. The Antichrist's primary activities are political while the False Prophet of Revelation 13, who is the third member of the Satanic trinity (answering to the Holy Spirit) undertakes the spiritual administration of the Antichrist's empire.

7:13 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.

"one like unto the Son of man" This is obviously Christ.

"**night visions**" God does His strongest work in His saints in the night seasons. God gives night season visions to describe the night season of human history in the tribulation period.

"clouds of heaven"

1. Acts 1:9-11, **And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven**."
2. Revelation 1:7, **Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen**.

There is no license to spiritualize these "clouds" away to make them refer to judgment, but it is clear that these are literal clouds.

"Ancient of Days" This is why I do not think the "Ancient of Days" is the same as the "Son of Man", or Christ, since there is a clear distinction between the Father and the Son here. This would also work as yet another proof of the Old Testament presentation of the Trinity, since we have two of those three members so clearly separated and named here. Since the Son is as much God as the Father is, this title can rightly be applied to both.

1. One like unto the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, 7:13
2. Another night vision, 7:13
3. Was brought near to the Ancient of days, 7:13
4. Dominion was given to him, 7:14

63 Peter Ruckman, *Ruckman Reference Bible*.

A. It was given to him, allowed by God.
B. It is everlasting, 7:14,27
i. Christ's kingdom goes into the Millennium and beyond.
C. It shall not pass away, 7:14
D. It shall not be destroyed, 7:14
5. Glory was given to him, 7:14
6. A kingdom was given to him, 7:14
7. He would be served and obeyed by all, 7:14,27
A. People
B. Nations
C. Languages

7:14 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.

This is clearly a Millennial verse. The Father gives the Millennial Kingdom to the Son.

"that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him"
1. Psalm 2:8, **Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.**

7:15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of *my* body, and the visions of my head troubled me.

"**grieved**" Such revelations from God would tend to upset us like this! The effect of these visions was to grieve the spirit of Daniel and trouble his mind. There must have been much in the that Daniel could not understand, but at least he realized that they foretold a time of trial and sorrow for his people.

"**my spirit in the midst of my body**" Unusual wording by Daniel but entirely Scriptural. Observations about the body and the spirit of man.
1. Man has a spirit. There is no indication that animals have spirits but they have souls.
2. The human spirit is different from the body. It is different from the soul.
A. 1 Thessalonians 5:23, **And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.**
3. It has a subsistence independent and separate of the body.
4. The spirit may exist independently of its body.

AV	ESV	LSV
15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of *my* body, and the visions of my head **troubled** me.	15 "As for me, Daniel, my spirit within me was anxious, and the visions of my head alarmed me.	15 "As for me, Daniel, my spirit was distressed within me, and the visions of my head kept alarming me.

I think "**troubled"** is better than "alarmed". To be alarmed is usually something of a short duration but to be troubled over something can involve a longer duration of time. The LSV does this again in Daniel 7:28.

7:16 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.

The interpretation runs from verses 16-28. This is important since Scripture is its own interpreter and thus, no other interpretations can be accepted, although the Bible does not give us the full and complete interpretation, such as the meaning of the ribs in the bear's mouth.

Apart from divine instruction, Daniel is no more able to interpret his own dreams than those of heathen kings. So he drew near to "one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this." He needed help in understanding the visions so Daniel inquires instead of running to his commentaries or guessing at it, which is always the proper thing to do when trying to interpret Scripture. We have an advantage over Daniel as we have the completed canon of Scripture so we can compare Scripture with Scripture, which is something Daniel did not have. Even after the visions were explained to him, he still struggled with the interpretations.

"them that stood by" The angels that were giving this prophecy.

7:17 These great beasts, which are four, *are* four kings, *which* shall arise out of the earth.

Four beats are four kingdoms, represented by four kings.

While each of these kingdoms may have been a part and a tool in the overall master plan of God for the ages, they are not directly created or raised up by God as the Millennial kingdom is, since these kingdoms arise of their own accord from the earth. They did not arise from God. Only the Millennial kingdom can make that claim. Thus, no Gentile nation has any right to claim that it is "ordained of God" or "approved of God" (except Israel) since there is only one such kingdom that will fit that bill. And this certainly includes the United States. In arrogance and ignorance do some Christians see a "magic ordination" of America by God, but America was never a Christian nation. She has always been a Masonic nation, from the first day of his existence. She has more Christians than any other nation on earth, but her rulers and "powers that be" are exceedingly corrupt and anti-Christian- and always have been and will be until the bitter end.

7:18 But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.

These four very powerful kingdoms may rise but they will be unable to thwart the overall plan of God to establish His Millennial kingdom with Christ at the head. Regardless of lions and leopards and bears, the saints will take the kingdom at the appointed time.

The dream of every politician and kingdom-maker is that his kingdom would be the "chosen one" that would last forever. Hitler boasted his Third Reich would last for 1000 years. It survived 12 years. Even the United States cannot foresee her end, for there is no language in the constitution to deal with that eventual day when she shall break up or otherwise cease to exist. Every corporation in the world (including churches) make such provision of how to dispose of assets in the event of dissolving the corporation. Yet nations, in their arrogance, believe themselves to have some divine right to continue forever. Yet there is only one eternal kingdom and that will be the one that is set up and ordained and maintained by the eternal God.

"**most High**" A title of God the Father, used 49 times in Scripture (7 x 7, with seven being the number of deity!). During all the events of the tribulation period and the reign of the Antichrist, Jehovah is still "most High" over it all. This is a title Satan can never attain.

The "**saints**" are not Church Age saints but (Jewish) tribulation saints.

"**forever, even forever and ever"** A "triple forever". You can't express the concept of eternity in much stronger language than this.

AV	**ESV**	**LSV**
18 But the saints of the **most High** shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.	18 But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, forever and ever.'	18 'But the saints of the Highest One will receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, for all ages to come.'

We are bothered to see the LSV use "the Highest One" for "**most High**". It is an unnecessary change that has its roots in New Age thought. Gail Riplinger documents this thoroughly in *New Age Bible Versions*, in chapter 5. Even the ESV does not go that far in this verse. The LSV does this again in 7:22,27. "God does not change, but new versions try to transfigure him as they translate. The NASV and other new versions "brings the end of Him" changing the words "he" and "Son" to "the One".[64]

7:19 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, broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet;

Daniel understood there was something very unusual, and very important about this fourth beast, thus, he makes a special inquiry.

7:20 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 spoke very great things, whose look *was* more stout than his fellows.

The beast itself is passed over as attention is paid to the horns of the beast, and this "little horn" instead.

"stout" Means "greater", used 15 times, "great" 9 times, "lord" once, "captain" once, "chief" once, "master" once, "stout" once.

7:21 I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them;

"saints" Jewish tribulation saints primarily, since the Church saints have been raptured by this time. The Gentile converts of the 144,000 Jewish tribulation witnesses will be persecuted during the first half of the tribulation, but the Antichrist will persecute the Jewish saints after they reject him after the Abomination of Desolation with such a furor that he will come very close to destroying the nation in just 42 months.

64 Page 76.

"prevailed" He will destroy 2/3rds of the nation of Israel

1. Zechariah 13:8,9, **And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the LORD, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The LORD is my God.**
2. Today, there are about 20 million Jews in the earth. If all 20 million went into the tribulation, about 14 million will due under the persecutions of the Antichrist.

7:22 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.

"**and judgment was given to the saints"** Which judgment is this? It is one that the saints execute, so that disqualifies the Great White Throne Judgment (Revelation 20) and the Judgment of the Nations (Matthew 25). It must be a judgment not described in Scripture.

"**saints possessed the kingdom.**" Millennial kingdom. The saints come into possession of it, as they will help Christ to rule and reign over the nations during this dispensation. It is given to them by God, regardless of what the kings of the earth may say about it. During the times of the Gentiles, men basically decide among themselves who rules what (within the will of God). But in the Kingdom, God rules, not man or the Gentiles, and He will decide who will do the ruling, which will be His saints. The high and mighty and powerful and arrogant of this world will have no say and they will submit to the rule of the saints.

7:23 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.

This really can't be said for the Old Roman Empire so must refer prophetically to the revived Roman Empire of the Antichrist.

7:24 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.

"**ten kings**" Who are they? The "standard" list is:

1. Nimrod, the King of Babel.
2. Pharaoh, the King of Egypt.
3. Sennacherib, the King of Assyria.
4. Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon.
5. Cyrus, the King of Persia.
6. Alexander, the King of Greece.
7. Caesar, the King of Rome.

8,9,10 Yet to come who shall be subdued.

"**another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first"** The Little Horn, the Antichrist.

"**he shall subdue three kings**" The Antichrist will destroy three kingdoms in his rise to political power. When the Antichrist shows up, he comes with ten Kings who rule with him. He knocks out three of those Kings to become the eighth King (Daniel 7:8,24).

7:25 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.

"The Antichrist is characterized by three things:

1. Blasphemy, "he shall speak great words against the most High."
2. Persecution, "and shall wear out the saints of the most High."
3. Lawlessness, "and think to change times and laws."[65]

"great words" Blasphemous words, great and terrible blasphemies. What arrogancy and impiety of the Gentile world powers, who will be culminated in the person of the Antichrist.

"wear out the saints" The Jewish tribulation remnant. Sustained persecution and hatred from your Beast-government will do that- it will wear you down physically and emotionally. Running from the Antichrist and just trying to stay alive could kill you just as surely as could the actual persecution.

"**think to change times**" A difficult verse, but it suggests that the Antichrist will attempt to alter the calendar in some way during his reign. It could involve re-numbering the years from 2025 A.D. or whatever to "Year 1" with the new calendar starting with the birth of the Antichrist or the start of his empire. We are seeing this even today with the introduction of "B.C.E." (Before Common Era) and "C.E." (Common Era) to replace "B.C." (Before Christ) and "A.D." (Anno Domini), trying to secularize our calendar. Theological liberals and secularists are (in)famous for this. But even that doesn't work. You may change from 2025 A.D. to 2025 C.E., but 2025 years from what? The secularists still have to start from the birth of Christ!

Seventh-Day Adventists and other Sabbath-keepers like to pounce on this verse to try to prove that the papacy is the Antichrist because the papacy (or Constantine) supposedly "changed the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday". Hardly. Ask any Jew. The Sabbath is still sundown Friday to sundown Saturday and always has been. Despite any and all papal bulls and imperial edicts, man cannot change the Sabbath. Constantine and the popes did manage to give Sunday more of a special status than it has ever enjoyed (which is rapidly disappearing today), but Sunday never has been the Sabbath and it is a theological error to suggest that it is, or to try to treat Sunday as a type of Sabbath.[66]

Who "changed the Sabbath?" This is a favorite tactic-question of the Seventh-Day Adventists to stir up trouble. The clear and plain answer was no one! The observance of Sunday was obviously approved of by God, as the early church started meeting on the first day of the week in Acts 20, and God never voiced His displeasure at the practice. But we must never refer to Sunday as the Sabbath since it is not. The Sabbath was never changed nor will it ever be. Sunday is the Lord's Day (so-called by the Church) and is not the same thing as the Sabbath. Sabbath restrictions and distinctives are not binding upon the Church in its

65 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*.

66 Many Reformed Christians do this with their invention of a "Christian Sabbath" which is supposed to be Sunday. The Bible uses no such terminology. Sunday is the day when the Church meets for worship and that day should be respected but the New Testament never equates Sunday with the Jewish sabbath and sabbath regulations are never imposed on Sunday or upon any Christian. Paul quotes nine of the ten commandments in his epistles, but he never quotes the Fourth Commandment for the Church to keep the Sabbath day.

observance of Sunday.

"he changeth the times and the seasons" God certainly can do as He desires. He created time and is its Master. He appointed the days and nights of creation, the 7-day week and the Sabbath, the prophetic timetable starting in Genesis 3. He will establish the 70 weeks and stop the clock after 69 weeks (as we will see in chapter 9) and then re-start the clock at His own discretion. The times and seasons of the rapture and second coming are in His hands, as well as was the time of the birth and death of Christ, the birth of the Church and all yet-unfulfilled prophetic events. He can also exempt the Gentiles from Sabbath observance that was binding on Israel and give the Church Sunday instead as a day of worship.

God did this in Exodus 12:1,2 when He established a new calendar for the nation of Israel, just before the Exodus ("**And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.**"). In Daniel 9, He stopped the 70-week countdown at the 69th week and we do not know when He will re-start it.

The Antichrist, in his delusion that he is God, will also think to do this in Daniel 7:25. It is interesting that there have been many who have tried this, such as the demonic leaders behind the French Revolution, or the dictators in North Korea (with their Juche, or "self-reliance" philosophy). They attempt to re-start the calendar from some man-made event, such as the "start of the revolution" or the birth of some tyrant. The French Revolution even thought about re-designing the week from seven days to ten days (re-doing the calendar into the metric system).

"think" Or literally, "intent to change…" Whether the Antichrist manages to do this is an open question. He wants to, but how successful is he?[67]

"laws" Since the Antichrist will have great political power, he attempt will do this. He will attack natural laws and the laws of God and attempt to replace them with his own laws. We wonder if there is a greater truth here. Maybe he would even try to change spiritual, moral or physical laws that man cannot change in his own power?

The "laws" he will think of changing will be the laws of God in nature and Scripture. You are already seeing that in the generation getting ready to receive the Antichrist. The movement of society these days is to "push the envelope"; that's double-speak for breaking God's laws. It starts with changing the Bible over 323 times (since 1880). Then it goes to removing Bible reading and prayer from the schools (1962–1963). Then it goes to violating every law of art and music (Picasso, Salvador Dali, the Beatles, Aaron Copeland, Andy Warhol, the Rolling Stones, KISS, David Bowie, Alice Cooper, et al.). Then it goes to the "sexual revolution" (fornication and promiscuity) and legalizing of pornography (Miller vs. California, 1973). Then it goes to nudity and sex acts on television ("cable"). Then it introduces the funny faggot characters, introduce

67 The leaders of the French Revolution tried to do this, in changing a week from seven to ten days. "The calendar consisted of twelve 30-day months, each divided into three 10-day cycles similar to weeks, plus five or six intercalary days at the end to fill out the balance of a solar year. It was designed in part to remove all religious and royalist influences from the calendar, and it was part of a larger attempt at dechristianization and decimalisation in France (which also included decimal time of day, decimalisation of currency, and metrication)… Each day in the Republican Calendar was divided into ten hours, each hour into 100 decimal minutes, and each decimal minute into 100 decimal seconds. Thus an hour was 144 conventional minutes (2.4 times as long as a conventional hour), a minute was 86.4 conventional seconds (44% longer than a conventional minute), and a second was 0.864 conventional seconds (13.6% shorter than a conventional second). Clocks were manufactured to display this decimal time, but it did not catch on. Mandatory use of decimal time was officially suspended 7 April 1795, although some cities continued to use decimal time as late as 1801. (Wikipedia, "French Republican Calendar")."

the “caring, sharing” Lesbian talk show hosts, and let the crossdressers come to class with their panties, hose, and make-up. Finally, you legalize two men or two women shacking up together and call it “marriage,” and you let the men in the women’s bathrooms as long as they “think” they’re women. The latest is “transhumanism,” where you mess with the genes and mix animals with men and men with machines. You are right back in Genesis 6 in 2353 B.C. How’s that for your “evolutionary progress”?[68]

The Antichrist will be in power for a “time” (1), “times” (2) and the “dividing of time” (2), or 1+2+.5=3.5 years, or 42 months. This must date from the Abomination of Desolation to the Second Coming, which is 42 months in duration. Certainly, the Antichrist will be on the scene and quite active in the first part of the Tribulation, but he will be raising and consolidating his power during that time but will not come into his full power and kingdom until the last half of the Tribulation. He will not be in power during the first 42 months of the Tribulation. That period is spent in his preparation for and ascent to power.

7:26 But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

“**they shall take away his dominion**” At the Second Coming. But notice the “they”. Not just Christ, but “they”. Again, the saints are somehow associated with the fall of the Antichrist and his final judgment unto condemnation, but the Scripture never really gives us more details about just what role the saints play in this judgment.

AV	ESV	LSV
26 But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to **consume** and to destroy *it* unto the end.	26 But the court shall sit in judgment, and his dominion shall be taken away, to be consumed and destroyed to the end.	26 ‘But the court will sit *for judgment*, and his dominion will be taken away, annihilated and destroyed forever.

“**consume**” The LSV has “annihilated”. The ESV reads as the Authorized Version.

7:27 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.

Nations that before had served the Antichrist or the spirit of their Age shall instead serve Christ during His Millennial kingdom. Many of them will do it by force, but they will do it.

“shall serve” Including the worship and paying of reverence and homage that God is entitled to.

7:28 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.

“cogitations” Or “thoughts, meditations”. “From Latin ‘cogitatus, cogitare’, from ‘co-‘ ‘together or with’ + ‘agitare’ ‘to stir or revolve’ (we get our English word ‘agitate’ from ‘agitare’.) + ‘-ation’,

68 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer’s Commentary on Daniel*, pages 195-196.

'state or condition.' Thus 'cogitations' are 'two or three times of having thought things over and over' (revolving them in the mind and having considered them from all angles)."[69]

Simply because Daniel received and recorded these revelations does not mean he understood them. The burden of the prophet is to faithfully and accurately record what God gave him, not to interpret it.

Summary of Material on The Antichrist from Daniel 7-12

1. He is associated with the Fourth Beast, the Roman Empire, 7:7,8
2. He is called the Little Horn, 7:8; 8:9
3. He comes up among ten other horns on the Fourth Beast, 7:8,24
4. The Little Horn has eyes like a man, 7:8,20
5. The Little Horn has a mouth that speaks great things against God, 7:8,20; 11:36
6. He is called a beast, 7:11
7. The Beast is slain, his body destroyed, and he is given to the burning flame, 7:11
8. The Little Horn destroys three other horns in his rise to power, 7:20,24
9. The Little Horn has a very stout look, 7:20
10. The Little Horn makes war with the saints and prevails against them, 7:21; 8:24; 11:31
11. The Little Horn is different from the other ten horns, 7:24
12. The Little Horn rises after the ten horns rise, 7:24
13. The Little Horn blasphemes against God, 7:25
14. The Little Horn shall wear out the saints, 7:25
15. The Little Horn shall think to change times and laws, 7:25
16. The Little Horn shall be in power for 3 1/2 years, 7:25
17. The dominion of the Little Horn will be taken away and destroyed, 7:26
18. He is associated with the goat of the Macedonian Empire, arising out of one of the four kingdoms that arose from its breakup, 8:9,22; 11:2,4
19. The Little Horn waxes exceeding great, 8:9,10
20. The Little Horn grows toward the southeast, toward Israel, meaning that he is based to the northwest of Israel, in Europe, 8:9
21. The Little Horn waxes great enough to affect events in heaven, 8:10
22. The Little Horn casts down some of the heavenly host and stamps on them, 8:10
23. The Little Horn magnifies himself even against Christ, 8:11,25; 11:36
24. The Little Horn takes away the sacrifices in the rebuilt temple and casts it down, 8:11; 9:27; 11:31
25. The Little Horn has supernatural assistance in his designs against the temple, 8:12
26. The doctrines and activities of the Little Horn prospers, 8:12,25; 11:36
27. He is a king of fierce countenance, 8:22
28. He shall understand dark sentences, 8:22
29. He shall have mighty power, but not by himself, 8:24
30. He shall destroy wonderfully, 8:24
31. By peace, he destroys many, 8:25; 11:21,24
32. He shall be defeated by supernatural instrumentality, 8:25
33. He is called a prince, 9:26

69 Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language*, volume 1, pages 246-247.

34. He comes with a flood to destroy Jerusalem, 9:26
35. He makes a covenant for 7 years (probably with Israel) which he shall break in the midst of those 7 years, 8:27; 11:23,30-32
36. Abomination of Desolation, 9:27; 11:31
37. He shall make the temple desolate, 9:27; 11:31
38. He is called a "vile person", 11:21
39. He obtains the kingdom by flatteries, 11:21,32,34
    A. American political campaigns are like this. The candidate who can flatter the largest number of stupid and ignorant voters wins.
40. He becomes strong with just a few people, 11:23
41. He attacks and destroys the King of the South, 11:25
42. Lots of power politics, 11:27
43. He will become rich and powerful through conquest and politics, 11:28
44. Israel will resist him with valor, 11:32
45. He will persecute Israel severely, 11:33,35
46. Few will help Israel against the Antichrist, 11:34
47. He is called a king, 11:36
48. He does according to his will, 11:36
49. He may be an apostate Jew, 11:37
50. He will not regard the desire of women, 11:37
51. He regards no god, except the god of forces, 11:37,38
52. He is an idolater, 11:38,39
53. He plans to divide the land of Israel for gain, 11:39
54. He will be attacked by both the King of the North and South, 11:40
55. He will invade Israel, 11:41
56. He overthrows many nations, but Edom, Moab and Ammon survive, 11:40
57. He attacks Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia, 11:42,43
58. He is troubled by tidings from the east and north, setting the stage for a great battle, 11:44
59. Armageddon? and his final defeat, 11:45

The various overlapping visions in Daniel, from John Phillips, *Exploring the Book of Daniel,* page 144:

Daniel 7	**Daniel 8**	**Daniel 9**	**Daniel 11**	**Daniel 12**
A little horn, 7:8,20,21,24-26	A little horn 8:9-12,23-25		A vile person 11:21-30	
	The daily sacrifice taken away 8:11-13	The daily sacrifice taken away 9:27	The daily sacrifice taken away 11:31	The daily sacrifice taken away 12:11
	Abomination of Desolation set up 8:13	Abomination of Desolation set up 9:27	Abomination of Desolation set up 11:31	Abomination of Desolation set up 12:11
The midst of the week, 1260 days 7:25	The 2300 days 8:14	The midst of the week 1260 days 9:27		The midst of the week, 1260 days,

				1290 days, 1335 days 12:7,11,12
	The sanctuary cleansed 8:14	The anointing of the holy of holies 9:24		
The end 7:26	The time of the end 8:17,19	The end 9:25	The time of the end 11:40	The time of the end 12:4,9,13

Daniel's Empire Visions (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 2	**Daniel 7**	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Gold	Lion		Babylon
Silver	Bear	Ram	Medo-Persian
Brass	Leopard	He-Goat	Greece
Iron	Non-descript		Rome

The Leopard and the Goat (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 7	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Leopard	He-Goat	Greece
	"Came from the west"	
"Dominion was given to it"	"Over the face of the whole earth"	Extent of Conquest
Four wings of a bird	Touched not the ground	Celerity of Progress
	A notable horn between its eyes	Alexander the Great
Four heads	Four notable horns	Alexander's generals
	"The "little horn" out of one of them	Antiochus, the Antichrist

The Bear and the Ram (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 7	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Bear	Ram	Medo-Persia
Two sides	Two horns	Media and Persia
Raised on one side	One horn higher than the other	Persia more prominent than Media
	Higher horn came up last	Persia the younger of the two kingdoms
Three ribs between teeth	Pushed west, north, south	Countries conquered

There are some interpretations of the beasts from Daniel 7 that view the beasts in a more modern context. I have heard some non-dispensational/premillennial commentators present variations of the following. Peter Ruckman, in his audio teaching notes on Daniel (taught in his Pensacola Bible Institute and in his commentary on Daniel) also promotes this alternate view, as below:

BEAST	"STANDARD" or "TRADITIONAL" VIEW	RUCKMAN[70]	RUCKMAN'S MODERN ALTERNATE VIEW
Lion	Babylon	Medo-Persia	England (as her symbol is a lion)
Bear	Medo-Persia	Macedonia	Russia (as her symbol is a bear)
Leopard	Macedonian under Alexander	Rome	United States (as an integrated "melting pot" nation, as the leopard is an "integrated" animal
Fourth Beast	Rome (historically and prophetically)	Antichrist's kingdom[6]	Antichrist's kingdom[71]

There are some interesting possibilities with the alternative interpretations, especially prophetically, but I am going to stick to the more "traditional" views for reasons and interpretations given above, but I am not going to outright reject the alternative interpretations.

70 "But verse 1 is much more than the historic setting of the chapter. It is the key to understanding Daniel's vision in verses 3–7. All the prophetic expositors destroy the passage by making the beasts match the metals of Nebuchadnezzar's image. The assumption is that the lion matches Babylon, the bear Persia, the leopard Greece, and the last beast Rome, out of which the Antichrist arises. Even Clarence Larkin falls into the trap.

"But look at verse 17. "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which SHALL ARISE [future] out of the earth."

Well, if Babylon is the "head of gold" (2:38), then the first beast (the lion) can't be Babylon. Why not? Well, if all four beasts are future, then they arise after the King who rules in verse 1.

"Belshazzar is the last King of Babylon (5:30–31). So the first beast arises after Babylon is gone. That being the case, if you are going to match the beasts to the metals of the image, you have to start after the "head of gold." The lion, therefore, wouldn't be Babylon; it would be Persia. The bear would be Greece. The leopard would be Rome. The last beast would be the Antichrist's kingdom, the feet and toes of iron and clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image (Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*)."

71 The Antichrist's kingdom has been referred to as a revived Roman Empire, so either the "standard" view or Ruckman's view could work. The issue is the correct identification of the first three beast empires. Regardless, you still end up at Rome.

Daniel Chapter 8

The narrative reverts back to Hebrew from this point forward. From verse 1 of chapter 8 to the end of the book, the Lord is dealing with Israel as a nation again, back in the land, with the temple and sacrifices back in operation.

This chapter deals with Alexander "The Great". While he was an important historical figure. The Bible presents him as an important prophetic figure.

Outline of Daniel 8:

1. This is a vision for the time of the end, 17
    - A. At the last end of the indignation, 19
2. A ram, 3
    - A. Had two horns, 3
        - i. Both were high but one was higher than the other, 3
        - ii. The higher horn came up last, 3
        - iii. The horns were the kings of Media and Persia, 20
    - B. It pushed west, north and south, 4
    - C. No beast could stand against it, 4
    - D. No one could deliver out of his hand, 4
    - E. He did according to his own will, 4
    - F. It became great, 4
3. A he-goat, 5
    - A. Called a "rough goat", 21
    - B. It is the king of Grecia
    - C. It came from the west, 5
    - D. It did not touch the ground as it moved, 5
    - E. It had a notable horn between its eyes, 5
        - i. It is Grecia's "first king", 21
    - F. It waxed very great, 8
    - G. When he was strong, its horn was broken, 8
    - H. Four notable horns rose in the place of the first horn, 8
        - i. They came toward the four winds of heaven
4. The battle between the ram and he-goat, 6
    - A. The he-goat was moved with choler against the ram, 7
    - B. The he-goat smote the ram and broke his two horns, 7
    - C. The ram fell before the he-goat, 7
5. A little horn, 9
    - A. It came from the four horns of the he goat, 9
    - B. It waxed exceeding great toward the south, east and toward the pleasant land, 9
    - C. It waxed great, even against the host of heaven, 10
        - i. It cast down some of the host of heaven and stamped upon them, 10
    - D. It magnified itself to the prince of the host, 11
    - E. It took away the daily sacrifice, 11
        - i. A host was given to him against the daily sacrifice, 12

F. The place of sanctuary was broken down, 11
G. It cast the truth to the ground, 12
i. It prospered against the truth, 12
H. It is a king of fierce countenance, 23
I. He shall understand dark sayings, 23
J. He arises when transgressions are come to the full, 23
K. His power is mighty, 24
i. But not in his own power, 24
L. He shall destroy wonderfully, 24
M. He shall destroy the mighty and holy people, 24
N. He shall cause craft to prosper, 25
i. This is through his policy, or politics, 25
O. He shall magnify himself in his heart, 25
P. By peace he destroys many, 25
Q. He shall stand against the Prince of princes but shall be broken, 25

6. The 2300 days, 13-14
A. The time period until the sanctuary shall be cleansed, 14

10. Daniel's Second Vision: The Goat and Ram 8:1-27

8:1 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.

This vision took place a few years before the events of Daniel 5.

8:2 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.

"Shushan" Also mentioned in Nehemiah 1:1; Esther 2:8; 3:15; 4:16; 8:15; 9:11,15. It was the chief city in Persia. It was called Susa by the Greeks.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	2 And I saw in the vision; and when I saw, I was in Susa the citadel, which is in the province of Elam. And I saw in the vision, and I was at the Ulai canal.	2 And I looked in the vision. And it happened that while I was looking, I was in the citadel of Susa, which is in the province of Elam; and I looked in the vision, and I myself was beside the Ulai Canal.

"Shushan in the palace" The ESV and LSV have this as a "citadel".

"river of Ulai" Ethelbert Bullinger identifies this as the Eulæus Canal, near Susa, now the Karun River.[72]

72 *The Companion Bible*, page 1194.

8:3 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.

The prophecy is interpreted in Daniel 8:20-27, which see.

"ram" The Medo-Persian Empire (Daniel 8:20). The ram was always a symbol for Persia. The king wore a ram's head of gold.

"two horns" One horn for the Medes, one for the Persians. They did not grow evenly nor were they equal, as one was higher than the other. The Medes and Persians were not exactly equal partners, for one had dominance over the other, although the vision does not suggest which was the "senior partner" but I would think that based on secular history, it would be the Persians.

8:4 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.

"pushing" In a forceful, hostile manner.

"pushing westward, and northward, and southward" The expansion of the Medo-Persian Empire to the west, north and south- but not to the east, interestingly enough.

"he did according to his will, and became great" For a while, the Medes and Persians had their will and way in their military conquests- until Alexander the Great came along.

8:5 And as I was considering, behold, a 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.

"he goat" The Greco-Macedonian Empire under Alexander the Great (Daniel 8:21). A goat was a symbol for Macedonia. The first Macedonian king, Caremus, was directed to take a goal for a guide by an oracle and build a city. He did, following a herd of goats to Edessa, which he made his capital, changing the name to Egaea, or the Goat City.

"from the west" From Europe.

"touched not the ground" Denoting swiftness, as Alexander conquered the known world in only 12 years. The Antichrist will be even faster, consolidating his political power within three and a half years, from the time just after the rapture to the abomination of desolation at the mid-point of the tribulation period.

"notable horn" This horn, who is Alexander historically and the Antichrist prophetically, is discussed in Daniel 8:23-25. With the single horn, this could by a “unicorn”. A unicorn is any animal with a single horn. They are not extinct or mythological creatures.

“Now Alexander is one of the few conquerors who moves west to east with success. He starts out conquering Greece and then crosses the Hellespont to take on Persia and, eventually, India. He has the largest empire of the ancient world.

But as we pointed out in Daniel 2, the movement in the Bible is from east to west. When Napoleon and Hitler tried to move west to east and take Russia, they both "lost their shirts." Though successful in his military campaigns, Alexander paid personally for the west-to-east movement. Upon returning to Babylon from his India campaign, he finally succumbed to the ravages of years of alcoholism. After a night of extremely heavy drinking, he took fever and died ten days later at the age of 32 (one month short of his 33rd birthday).[73] "When he was strong, the great horn was broken" (vs. 8). The practical application should be obvious: "whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased" (Luke 14:11)."[74]

8:6 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.

The clash between Medo-Persia and Alexander, which Alexander won.

8:7 And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and broke 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.

"moved with choler" Great anger and indignation. "From the Middle English 'colre', from the French 'colere' meaning 'anger', from the Late Latin 'cholera' meaning 'bile'. Ancient physicians through the bile (the bitter liquid secreted by the liver) was what caused anger. The English word 'choleric' refers to an angry disposition. Thus 'choler' is a very bitter type of anger."[75]

8:8 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.

"he goat waxed very great" So great that Alexander would dominate the known world.

"when he was strong, the great horn was broken" Alexander's untimely death, in his mid-30s. He died in the prime of life and at the peak of his power. Alexander conquered more of the world than any previous ruler, but he was not able to conquer himself. Partly due to a strenuous exertion, his dissipated life, and a raging fever, Alexander died in a drunken debauch at Babylon, before his 33rd birthday. His death left a great conquest without an effective single leader, and it took about twenty years for the empire to be successfully divided.

"God allows Kings and kingdoms to rise up. As long as they suit His purpose, they exist; and the moment the Lord is through with them, they are cast on the dump heap of history. In the last century, we saw it with England, Germany, and Russia. You are in the process of watching it happen to America. You are now seeing the greatest, most powerful "superpower" the world

---

73 Christ also died at age 33, although we are not suggesting that Alexander isa type of Christ. But how old will the Antichrist be when he comes to power? To keep the anti-type with Christ, we would suggest that he is 30 years old when he is revealed, 33 and a half at the abomination of desolation and dies around 37. The Antichrist will complete a 7-year ministry. We wonder of Christ was destined to have a public ministry of seven years before He was "cut off" in Daniel 9:26. Antichrist will be mortally wounded as Christ was but will also be resurrected as Christ was in Revelation 13:3.

74 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*, pages 207-208.

75 Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language,* volume 1, page 232.

has ever known, being brought to its knees for setting itself against God's Book."[76]

"four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven" After his death, Alexander's empire was divided among his four main generals after years of civil war.

1. Ptolemy received Egypt
2. Seleucius received Syria
3. Antigonus received Macedonia
4. Cassander received Asia Minor

8:9 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*.

"a little horn" The Antichrist again, ultimately, under the picture of the "little horn", as seen in Daniel 7. But this time, we are told that he will arise, geographically, from one of the four empires that came out of Alexander's empire when it broke up at his death. I would think that Syria is the best candidate for the Antichrist's "hometown" since Syria has always been an enemy to Israel, more than Greece or Egypt or Asia Minor.

The **"little horn"** in Daniel 7:8 and here in Daniel 8:9 are two different Hebrew phrases. In chapter 7, the idea is "a horn, a little one". In chapter 8, it is "a horn less than little, a horn from littleness", meaning a horn that arose from very small and humble origins. The little horn of Daniel 7 arises from Rome. The little horn has Greek origins. The little horn of Romans 7 would fit the future Antichrist well. The little horn of Daniel 8 would be a better fit for Antiochus IV Epiphanes, king of Syria, who himself is a type of the Antichrist. He ruled from 175-164 B.C. His name means "Antiochus the Illustrious One", a title he took to heart in his megalomania. Historically, we are looking at Antiochus, but through the Law of Double Application, we are looking at the Antichrist politically. Antiochus' campaign against Israel is a type of the Antichrist's activities in the tribulation.

"waxed", grew, from the Anglo-Saxon "weaxan"- to grow.

"waxed exceeding great" Antiochus' rise to military and political domination.

"toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant *land*" He is looking to the south-east, toward the "pleasant land" (Israel), meaning that he is to the north-west of Israel.

"pleasant" or "beautiful".

"pleasant *land*" Israel. This shows what God thinks of the land of Israel. "And what was Daniel's position? He was a captive among the Chaldeans at Babylon; but Palestine was for him the pleasant land. His captivity takes off nothing from its interest. It was a very small province of an immense empire, almost unknown in the empire, so small was it in comparison. But to God it was everything. His purposes were ever towards it."[77]

"King of Syria; reigned from 175 B.C.; died 164. He was a son of Antiochus the Great, and, after the murder of his brother Seleucus, took possession of the Syrian throne which rightly belonged to his nephew Demetrius. This Antiochus is styled in rabbinical sources הרשע, "the wicked." Abundant information is extant concerning the character of this monarch, who exercised great

76 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel.*
77 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, page 151.

influence upon Jewish history and the development of the Jewish religion. Since Jewish and heathen sources agree in their characterization of him, their portrayal is evidently correct. Antiochus combined in himself the worst faults of the Greeks and the Romans, and but very few of their good qualities. He was vainglorious and fond of display to the verge of eccentricity, liberal to extravagance; his sojourn in Rome had taught him how to captivate the common people with an appearance of geniality, but in his heart he had all a cruel tyrant's contempt for his fellow men. The attempt of modern phil-Hellenes to explain Antiochus' attitude toward the Jews as an endeavor "to reform a stiff-necked people" receives no confirmation from the fact that a Tacitus first formulated it. Antiochus had no wish to Hellenize his conquered subjects, but to denationalize them entirely; his Aramean subjects were far from becoming Hellenes simply because they had surrendered their name and some of their Semitic gods. His attempt to level all differences among the nations he ruled arose not from a conviction of the superiority of Greek culture, the true essence of which he can scarcely be said to have appreciated but was simply a product of his eccentricity. The Jews themselves afforded Antiochus the first opportunity to interfere in their domestic affairs. The struggle of the Tobiads against the high priest Onias III., originally a personal matter, gradually assumed a religio-political phase. The conservatives siding with the legitimate high priest approached the king of Egypt; for they relied more on that monarch than on Antiochus, sometimes nick-named 'Επιμανής (madman), while the Tobiads well understood that Antiochus' favor was to be purchased with gold. The Tobiads caused the deposition of Onias (173 B.C.), and the appointment of their own partisan, Jason. In order to ingratiate himself with the king, this new high priest established an arena for public games close by the Temple. But the king cared very much more for gold than for the Hellenizing of Palestine, and a certain Menelaus made use of the fact so shrewdly that he received the high-priesthood in place of Jason, in the year 171 .C.. But when false tidings came to Jerusalem that Antiochus had died on a campaign in Egypt, Menelaus could not maintain himself in the city, and together with the Tobiads fled to Egypt. On his return homeward, Antiochus came to Jerusalem to reinstate Menelaus, and then the true character of the Hellenism that Antiochus desired was revealed to the Jews. He entered the Temple precincts, not out of curiosity, but to plunder the treasury, and carried away valuable utensils, such as the golden candlestick upon the altar and the showbread table, likewise of gold. This spoliation of the Sanctuary frustrated all the attempts of Jason and the other Tobiads to Hellenize the people, for even the most well-disposed of Hellenizers among them felt outraged at this desecration. They must have given vent to their sentiment very freely; for only thus can the policy of extermination waged by Antiochus against the Jews and Judaism, two years later, 168 B.C., be explained. As long as he was occupied with preparations for his expedition against Egypt, Antiochus had no time for Palestine; but when the Romans compelled him to forego his plans of conquest, his rage at the unexpected impediment was wreaked upon the innocent Jews. An officer, Apollonius, was sent through the country with an armed troop, commissioned to slay and destroy. He first entered Jerusalem amicably; then suddenly turning upon the defenseless city, he murdered, plundered, and burnt through its length and breadth. The men were butchered, women and children sold into slavery, and in order to give permanence to the work of desolation, the walls and numerous houses were torn down. The old City of David was fortified anew by the Syrians, and made into a very strong fortress completely dominating the city. Having thus made Jerusalem a Greek colony, the king's attention was next turned to the destruction of the national religion. A royal decree proclaimed the abolition of the Jewish mode of worship; Sabbaths and festivals were not to be observed; circumcision was not to be performed; the sacred books were to be surrendered, and the Jews were compelled to offer sacrifices to the idols that had been erected. The officers charged with carrying out these commands did so with great rigor; a veritable inquisition was established with monthly sessions for investigation. The possession of a sacred book or the performance of the rite of circumcision was punished with death. On Kislew (Nov.-Dec.) 25, 168 B.C., the "abomination of desolation" (שקוץ משומם, Dan. xi. 31, xii. 11) was set up

on the altar of burnt offering in the Temple, and the Jews required to make obeisance to it. This was probably the Olympian Zeus, or Baal Shamem.

Antiochus had misunderstood the true character of Judaism, if he thought to exterminate it by force. His tyranny aroused both the religious and the political consciousness of the Jews, which resulted in the revolution led by the Maccabees. After the passive resistance of the Ḥasidim (pious ones), who, much to the surprise of the Hellenes, suffered martyrdom by hundreds, the Hasmonean Mattathias organized open resistance in 167-166 B.C., which, through the heroic achievements of his son and successor Judas the Maccabee in defeating two large and well-equipped armies of Antiochus, grew to formidable proportions. Antiochus realized that a serious attempt must be made to put down the rising, but was himself too busily occupied against the Parthians to take personal charge. Lysias, whom he had left as regent in Syria, received instructions to send a large army against the Jews and exterminate them utterly. But the generals Ptolemæus, Nicanor, and Gorgias, whom Lysias despatched with large armies against Judah, were defeated one after the other (166-165 B.C.), and compelled to take refuge upon Philistine soil. Lysias himself (165 B.C.) was forced to flee to Antioch, having been completely routed by the victorious Jews. But although he began to gather new forces, nothing was accomplished in the lifetime of Antiochus."[78]

8:10 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.

We are beyond Alexander now. The prophecy now exclusively deals with the one who is greater than Alexander, who would be the Antichrist.

"*even* to the host of heaven" The Antichrist's ultimate influence will even reach to and influence the heavenly host. This is yet future, showing that the Antichrist will be so powerful that he will even be able to cause trouble in heaven. Antiochus was also a great blasphemer, as seen in his desecration of the holy of holies.

"it cast down *some* of the host and of the stars to the ground" Compare with Revelation 12:4 ("**And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born**."). This is still future, as Revelation 12 is dated around the time of the Abomination of Desolation, 3 1/2 years into the Tribulation. In the not-too-distant future, the Antichrist will be able to seduce or otherwise influence 1/3rd of the heavenly host (angels and other heavenly creatures) to rebel against God. They, and the Antichrist which influences them in such a manner, will eventually be cast out of heaven. Does the Antichrist make a move against the very throne of God at this point- and fail? After this affair, the Antichrist will be barred from heaven, so he will be forced to concentrate his energies upon the earth while still intending to attack heaven and overthrow the very throne of God.

Relating to Antiochus, it may describe his war against Israel and the Jews. He attempted to make everyone in his realm worship the Greek gods, especially Zeus, under pain of death. The Jews would naturally resist any such attempts, even to the point of martyrdom. The Babylonian captivity had cured them of idolatry once and for all. In this historical context, the "**host of heaven…the stars"** would have to be the Jews. In the historical context, there can be no other interpretation. Prophetically, we see the power of the Antichrist reaches even into heaven.

78 Jewish Encyclopedia, http://jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=1589&letter=A&search=Antiochus%20Epiphanes

"stamped upon them" Despite the fact that the Antichrist is able to wrench 1/3rd of the heavenly hosts away from God, he will not be favorable deposed toward them. After his attack on God fails and he is barred from heaven, the Antichrist may turn on his "allies" and destroy them, blaming them for his failure. Or maybe he destroys them to prevent them from turning upon him. But see the power of the Antichrist, to have such power over angels and other heavenly creatures!

Antiochus would also plunder the temple, desecrate it and savagely murder any Jews who defended the temple and withstood Antiochus' army.

8:11 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.[79]

"the prince of the host" Jesus Christ. The Antichrist even dares to take Him on- and loses. This also refers to Antiochus' blasphemy against the God of Israel, as he did not hesitate to magnify himself against God. Both are great blasphemers as Antiochus speaks and acts against the God of Israel and the Antichrist takes on Christ Himself.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	11 It became great, even as great as the Prince of the host. And the regular burnt offering was taken away from him, and the place of his sanctuary was overthrown.	11 And it even magnified *itself* to be equal with the Commander of the host; and it removed the regular sacrifice from Him, and the place of His sanctuary was thrown down.

"prince of the host" The LSV has "Commander".

"and by him the daily *sacrifice* was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down" Abomination of Desolation. After the Antichrist goes into the rebuilt Jerusalem temple and declares himself to be God, Israel will reject him where before, they thought him to be their Messiah. After this rejection, the Antichrist will turn on Israel to destroy them. Part of this involves defiling the temple to the point where the sacrifices will become impossible due to the ceremonial pollution that he brings into it. Antiochus ordered all activities at the temple to cease by force and by his defilement of the altar. The Antichrist will do the same, but he will defile the altar with himself. Antiochus used a pig, but the Antichrist is much more unclean than a pig.

The mention of a daily sacrifice points to the tribulation period, a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem, and a resumption of the daily sacrifices, until the Antichrist pollutes the temple and ends the sacrifices. When the Antichrist begins his persecution of Israel, any temple activity would be impossible anyway due to the Jews just trying to stay alive. It would be like trying to have a synagogue service in downtown Berlin in 1940. The temple was eventually cleansed again after the defilement by Antiochus but the Millennial temple will not cleansed but rather rebuilt as see in Ezekiel 40-48.

79 Peter Ruckman thinks the Jewish sacrifices will be forced to stop, replaced by human sacrifices and beheadings, where human flesh is "offered" and eaten, maybe as an offering to Satan. It certainly is possible, knowing the hatred the Antichrist will have against the Jews and the sins of the era. He lays this out in his commentaries on Daviel and Revelation.

8:12 And a 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 host**" There is clearly a supernatural/demonic host to assist the Antichrist in shutting down all religious activity by Israel. Antiochus also forced a stoppage of the temple sacrifices. The Antichrist is given "a host" but this "host" is not identified. We also are not told who gave him this host but we would assume that it came from Satan.

"and it cast down the truth to the ground" After the truth has fallen in the streets, the "truth" of the Antichrist will replace the truth of God in the earth during the Tribulation, and this "lie" shall prosper.

Antiochus would also attach "the truth" in burning as many Scripture scrolls as he could and destroy the truth. This could be by overt destruction or internal corruption.

"it practiced" The error of the Antichrist worked, it did what it wanted, it was active. In the Tribulation, truth will fall in the streets, abandoned by all except a small remnant of believers. The lie of the Antichrist will dominate that dispensation and there will be none to stop it, since the Holy Spirit (the Restrainer) was taken out of the world at the rapture and is not fulfilling that same role then as He is today, as He restrains error and evil.

AV	ESV	LSV
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 practised, and prospered.	12 And a host will be given over to it together with the regular burnt offering because of transgression, and it will throw truth to the ground, and it will act and prosper.	12 And on account of transgression the host will be given over *to the horn* along with the regular sacrifice; and it will throw truth down to the ground and do *its will* and succeed.

The ESV adds the idea of the "burnt offering", which may be correct, although the phrase is not used in the Authorized Version.

8:13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain *saint* which spoke, 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?

"saint...saint" Two angels? They also have an interest in prophecy! Their question is "How long will the Antichrist be able to keep the temple shut down and trodden under?"

8:14 And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

I see no particular reason to spiritualize these 2300 days as 2300 years in this context for there is no reason to do so. Most non-dispensational and premillennial prophetic systems (historicists, postmillennialists and cults, like the Seventh Day Adventists) will turn the 2300

days into 2300 years[80] and have this period end sometime in the middle of the 19th century. The most famous date-setter in American history was the Baptist William Miller, who was a classic historicist.[81] He took the 2300 days and turned them into years, a day for a year. Miller's starting year was 457 B.C., the time when Nebuchadnezzar profaned the Temple in Jerusalem. When you add them up you arrive at the year 1843 as the time of Christ's second coming. But when that year came and when, like any other year, it was discovered that a year had been left out for the shift from B.C. to A.D., thus 1844 was the true year.[82] However, it too came and went, and Miller's scheme became known as the "Great Disappointment", which laid the foundation for the Seventh Day Adventist sect to arise. It sounded good but it didn't work. To this day, the eschatology of the Seventh Day Adventist is probably among the most convoluted system there is.

But applying the old philosophical rule of "Occam's Razor" to prophecy (the simplest explanation is usually the correct one), we will keep these days as literal days and interpret them accordingly. Also, to interpret these "days" as "years" will not work exegetically.

"The Hebrew expression is not 'days' but 'evening-mornings', that is 2300 evening-morning sacrifices, which proves that actual days of 24 hours are intended."[83]

This "2300 days" comes to 6.29 years (74.48 months) under a standard 365.25-day year or 6.39 years (76.68 months) under a prophetic 360-day year.

Prophetically, when is the sanctuary defiled? At the Abomination of Desolation. This takes place 1260 days into the tribulation, halfway through. If this is where the 2300 days is dated from, it would extend 1040 days beyond the end of the tribulation, which is the second coming. Would it mean that it takes 2.89 years to cleanse the sanctuary from the abominations and pollutions of the Antichrist and False Prophet?

Which sanctuary is this? It would have to refer to the rebuilt tribulation temple, for that is the temple the Antichrist will pollute by his presence. It would not refer to Ezekiel's temple of chapters 40-48 for that does not exist in the tribulation for the Antichrist to abominate, as it is probably built in the millennium. Will the tribulation temple survive into the millennium? Will the Antichrist eventually destroy it? Will it be incorporated into Ezekiel's temple? We are not told as to the ultimate fate of this temple.

8:15 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.

The angel Gabriel, showing that angels do take on the appearance of men. Angels never appear with wings, as do seraphim and cherubim.

8:16 And I heard a man's voice between *the banks of* Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this *man* to understand the vision.

"a man's voice" The voice of the Father?

---

80 Most of the Plymouth Brethren writers, like John Nelson Darby (*Collected Works*, volume 5, page 158), would agree. It seems that it is mainly the cultic writers who make this as 2300 years.

81 There has been more prophetic horseplay regarding these 2300 days than any other time period in history, even more than the 70 Weeks. Cults (like Seventh Day Adventism) and all manner of unorthodox prophetic systems have arisen over the misinterpretation and misapplication of these 2300 days.

82 Similar to Edgar Whisenant's recalculation after his fiasco in *88 Reasons Why The Rapture Will Be in 1988*.

83 Clarence Larkin, *The Book of Daniel*, pages 157-158.

AV	ESV	LSV
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**.	16 And I heard a man's voice between the banks of the Ulai, and it called, “Gabriel, make this man understand the vision.”	16 And I heard the voice of a man between *the banks of* Ulai, and he called out and said, “Gabriel, give this *man* an understanding of what has appeared.”

“**vision**” The LSV omits “vision”.

8:17 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.

"O son of man" Only Daniel and Ezekiel are called "son of man". Jesus applied the term to Himself during His earthly ministry.

"time of the end" Tribulation/Second Coming context.

8:18 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.

8:19 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*.

"the indignation" Tribulation period, in a prophetic sense, but it must also have a more immediate interpretation. Antiochus’ persecutions of the Jews and defilement of the temple would be the historical application of this, a “little” version of a greater, future prophetic indignation of the tribulation.

8:20 The ram which thou sawest having *two* horns *are* the kings of Media and Persia.

The angel starts to provide the divine interpretation to Daniel. It will be from the area of these two kingdoms that the little horn is to arise.

8:21 And the rough goat *is* the king of Greece: and the great horn that *is* between his eyes *is* the first king.

"rough goat" He is not named but we know from history that this is Alexander. This is the same as the he-goat from earlier in the chapter.

"the first king" Another reference to Alexander.

8:22 Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power.

"being broken" Alexander died in 323 B.C. at age 33 and left no heir. He had a son but he

was too young to take over his father's empire. That son, and his mother, would later be killed to prevent any descendent of Alexander from making a claim to his empire.

"four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation" See Daniel 8:8. These "four" are the four generals that divided Alexander's empire at his death. This gave birth to four new kingdoms.

"but not in his power." Alexander had nothing to do with the division of his empire, since he was dead.

8:23 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.

"when the transgressors are come to the full" Compare Genesis 15:16 "**But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full**." God waits until the sins of a person or a people have reached "full" before He acts in judgment.

"a king of fierce countenance" The Antichrist.

"understanding dark sentences" The Antichrist shall have a supernatural understanding of all things spiritual and occult, things that involve “hidden” or “secret” knowledge, like what you might be initiated into at the masonic lodge.

8:24 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.

"not by his own power" Just as Christ was empowered by the Holy Spirit during His earthly ministry, so shall the Antichrist be empowered either by Satan or the False Prophet during his reign on earth.

"shall prosper, and practice" The Antichrist shall have his will and his way during his reign on the earth. Few could stand before Antiochus in his activities in Israel as well.

"shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." The Antichrist's persecution and near-destruction of Israel. In terms of Antiochus, he did destroy in the fact that “destroy” does not mean “annihilate” but rather “ruin”. He did make havoc of the Jews, Jerusalem and the temple but did not annihilate them. The Antichrist will come as close as anyone in annihilating Israel once and for all but he, too, will fail in that task.

8:25 And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.

“through his policy” Through politics, diplomacy and other “soft” forms of war. Both Antiochus and the Antichrist would both be masters of political games and deceit. Use politics as much as you can before declaring open military conflict and war. Diplomacy often serves as a “softening up” of the enemy before attacking. The political skill and success of the Antichrist will be unmatched in human history, and he will be wildly successful.

"he shall magnify *himself* in his heart" A very telling phrase, revealing his gross sin of pride in elevating himself even above God. Both Antiochus and the Antichrist will suffer from this self-delusion. Antiochus called himself "The Illustrious One" though he was but a man. The Antichrist will believe himself to be God and will demand the worship that accompanies deity.

"by peace shall destroy many" "**When they cry peace and safety, then sudden destruction**" (1 Thessalonians 5:3) and "The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: His words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords" (Psalm 55:21). When he attacks, he does so by stealth and by peace, as he "**obtains the kingdom by flatteries**" (Daniel 11:21). While he talks so much about peace, he is really planning for war. Peace, to him, is just another weapon in his arsenal. But it does have the advantage of throwing his victims off balance. The Antichrist will be a counterfeit "Prince of Peace".

This story is as old as history. How many times have kings and politicians signed peace treaties as a pretext for war? Hitler did this. He signed a "non-aggression pact" with Russia (the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact) in 1939. Two years later, he invaded Russia. The United States did this with the Indian tribes. We would sign treaties with them, only to take their land when the time suited us. Beware of any politician or religious leader (like the pope) who constantly harp about "peace on earth". They are really preparing for war.

"he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes" The Antichrist will even challenge Jesus Christ Himself.

"he shall be broken without hand." Compare with Daniel 2:45 and the "**stone cut out without hands**" which refers to God overthrowing the Antichrist and not human agency.

8:26 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.

"And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told *is* true" The vision is certified and verified as being accurate and genuine.

"shut up the vision" Compare with Daniel 9:24 ("**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**.") and Daniel 12:4 ("**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**."), as well as Revelation 10:4 ("**And when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write: and I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not.**"). But some prophecies are ordered not to be sealed, as in Revelation 22:10 ("**And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand."). ** This means that the meaning and interpretation of the visions are sealed, and no divine aid is given in its interpretation and application until the time draws near for the fulfillment, at which time, God will unseal the meaning. As we get closer and closer to the end of the age and to the fulfillment of these prophecies, the meanings are becoming clearer. I would say that this unsealing probably began in the 1830s under the so-called "Plymouth Brethren" (a term they don't like and that isn't really accurate)[84] who were the first ones to lay out a clear and

84 This group is widely spoken against, and they have had their issues and problems over the years, as every theological group and system has. But these brethren made major contributions to the development, understanding and

logical prophetic interpretation. There are many good works and interpretations on these visions now (plus of Revelation) since we are so close to their fulfillments and God is unsealing these meanings. This is why works on Daniel or Revelation before the 19th century are of little value since they were dealing with trying to unseal divinely sealed prophecies. Since these earlier expositors did not enjoy the revelations and understandings this current unsealing affords later expositors, they were forced to concoct prophetic systems like historicism or preterism to try to unlock the visions. But with the unsealing of the prophecies and the resulting recovery of premillennial truth, we are much better able to study these prophecies than were the Reformers or Puritans, due to the advantage of living so late in this dispensation.

8:27 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*.

"was sick certain days" The first vision had left Daniel troubled in mind; the second vision had left him physically ill.

"none understood *it*." This shows that prophets did not always understand their own prophecies. They are responsible to faithfully give out the prophecy, but not to explain it or to even understand it. The preacher is responsible to faithfully give out the prophecy or revelation. He is not responsible to interpret it or to explain it.

Daniel's Empire Visions (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 2	**Daniel 7**	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Gold	Lion		Babylon
Silver	Bear	Ram	Medo-Persian
Brass	Leopard	He-Goat	Greece
Iron	Non-descript		Rome

The Leopard and the Goat (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 7	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Leopard	He-Goat	Greece
	"Came from the west"	
"Dominion was given to it"	"Over the face of the whole earth"	Extent of Conquest
Four wings of a bird	Touched not the ground	Celerity of Progress
	A notable horn between its eyes	Alexander the Great
Four heads	Four notable horns	Alexander's generals
	"The "little horn" out of one of them	Antiochus, the Antichrist

The Bear and the Ram (from H. T. Spence, *The Canon of Scripture, page* 119)

Daniel 7	**Daniel 8**	**Key**
Bear	Ram	Medo-Persia

promotion of dispensational truth and a premillennial understanding of prophecy. The movement of Fundamentalism may not have been possible without their ministry. The Church owes them a great theological debt.

Two sides	Two horns	Media and Persia
Raised on one side	One horn higher than the other	Persia more prominent than Media
	Higher hirn came up last	Persia the younger of the two kingdoms
Three ribs between teeth	Pushed west, north, south	Countries conquered

Daniel Chapter 9

This is one of the most important prophetic chapters in the Bible.

Outline of Daniel 9 and the Seventy Weeks
1. Gabriel gave the revelation, 21
2. 70 weeks are determined upon Israel, 24
    A. To make reconciliation for iniquity, 24
    B. To bring in everlasting righteousness, 24
    C. To seal up the vision and prophecy, 24
    D. To anoint the most Holy, 24
3. 7 weeks, 25
    A. From the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, 25
4. 62 weeks, 25,26
    A. The street and wall will be rebuilt in troublous times, 25
    B. The Messiah shall be cut off at the end of the 62 weeks, 26
        i. But not for himself, 26
    C. The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, 26
    D. The end shall be with a flood unto the end of the war desolations are determined, 26
5. The 70th week, 27
    A. The Antichrist shall confirm the covenant with many for one week, 27
    B. In the middle of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, 27
    C. For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even to the consummation, 27

11. Daniel's Prayer of Confession 9:1-19

9:1 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;

"Ahasuerus" Daniel received these visions during the time of Daniel 6.

9:2 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.

"understood by books" Daniel was reading and studying Jeremiah 25:11,12 **("And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the LORD, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations.**"), and by backtracking to the time of the deportations, he understood that the Babylonian captivity was coming to an end and the Jews would be allowed to return to the land. In anticipation of that,

Daniel prays a prayer of personal and national repentance, realizing that the nation may not have been spiritually ready to return to the land. But I wonder if there wasn't a bit of sadness in Daniel as he realized that he would not be able to return and see Jerusalem, from which he was deported decades earlier. He would die in exile.

Daniel was a student of the Word of God and that the Jews in the captivity had access to the Scriptures. Everything we know we ultimately know by books, for that is where our knowledge is preserved and is the chosen method by which God has chosen to give us His revelations.

Daniel literally interpreted Jeremiah's prophecy about a 70-year exile in Babylon. There was no reason to interpret any of Jeremiah's prophecies figuratively just as there is no reason to interpret any of Daniel's prophecies figuratively. Daniel took prophecy literally and believed in it, even if the critics of his book don't.

Somehow, Daniel had gotten a copy of Jeremiah's prophecies. These prophetic writings were in wider circulation than we might believe. Even in his exile, Daniel can get books from Israel and he is not isolated from these writings and prophecies.

"**I Daniel understood by books**" Everything we know, we know by books.

AV	**ESV**	**LSV**
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.	2 in the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of the LORD to Jeremiah the prophet, must pass before the end of the desolations of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years.	2 in the first year of his reign, I, Daniel, discerned in the books the number of the years *concerning* which the word of Yahweh came to Jeremiah the prophet for the fulfillment of the laying waste of Jerusalem, *namely*, seventy years.

"**LORD**" The LSV uses the questionable reading of "Yahweh" instead of the more accepted "Jehovah" for the tetragrammaton reading.

"the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet" "Now look at that. Jeremiah finally got himself a convert. Jeremiah only had two converts about whom he knew anything: Baruch and a black fellow named Ebedmelech. But Jeremiah had some converts of whom he wasn't even aware: Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Where did they get the courage not to compromise? They got it from Jeremiah! While Jehoiakim was cutting up the Scriptures and living like hell (Jer. 36), Jeremiah was making an impression on some boys there in the King's court. Of course, they might not have taken heed to it at the time, but when they got hauled off to Babylon, they recalled the old preacher and determined they would follow his example.

"I have a sermon entitled "Not Now, But Afterwards." In other words, you might not see the results of your preaching or ministry right away, but the results will pop up sometime down the road. You just keep "casting your bread on the waters," and "thou shalt find it after many days" (Eccl. 11:1). Jeremiah was still reaping a harvest nearly seventy years after his ministry was over."[85]

85 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel.*

9:3 And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes:

This prayer of repentance runs through Daniel 9:17. Notice the humility that accompanies this prayer of confession and repentance.

9:4 And I prayed unto the LORD my God, and made my confession, and said*t* O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments;

In Daniel's prayer, we see:

1. A response to the Word of God, 9:2
2. Fervency, 9:3
3. Self-denial, 9:4
4. Identification with the people for whom Daniel was interceding, 9:5
5. Confession of sin, 9:5-15
   A. "We have sinned".
   B. "We have committed iniquity."
   C. "We have done wickedly."
   D. "We have rebelled."
   E. We have departed "from thy precepts and from thy judgments."
   F. "Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets."
6. Acknowledgement of the character of God, 9:4,7,9,15
7. All with the goal of the glory of God, 9:16-19.
8. It is a long prayer: it goes from 9:4 to 9:19.
9. It is a serious prayer: Daniel fasts and puts on "sackcloth, and ashes" to show that he is serious in 9:3.
10. It is a personal prayer: "MY God," "MY confession", 9:4
11. It is a respectful prayer. Daniel doesn't approach the Lord with the flippant attitude of modern Christianity. The Lord God is not anybody's "Buddy" or grandpa. He's "the great and dreadful God" (9:4). He is to be approached with reverence, fear and trembling.

Never mind about the kind of prayers that are offered on a "National Day of Prayer". If that "national prayer of repentance" doesn't contain these elements, God will pay no attention to it! Until a nation's leaders (the present, members of Congress, the Supreme Court justices…) will pray a prayer like publicly on the National Mall in Washington, we will remain under the judgment of God. When repenting of sin, you need to be very specific of who is repenting and what specific sins you are repenting of. These "Days" make for a good show and they give you the impression that you are "doing something" to stem the tide of national sins and apostasy, but under prayers are made as Daniel's, nothing is accomplished.

"the great and dreadful God" God is a God to be feared for He does judge the wicked and does reward the righteous.

"God, keeping the covenant" God is much better at keeping covenants than man is.

These covenant blessings are always based on obedience. God will not bless a rebellious or disobedient people. God keeps covenant and mercy with those who:
1. Love Him
2. Keep His commandments

Daniel doesn't approach the Lord with the flippant attitude of modern Christianity. The Lord God is not anybody's "Buddy" nor is He "the Man upstairs". He is "**the great and dreadful God**" (Daniel 9:4). You approach Him not only "with reverence," but with "godly fear" (Hebrews 12:28).

9:5 We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments:

"We have sinned" Notice Daniel includes himself in this prayer. He had sinned, too. He does not pray "they have sinned" but includes himself in the prayer and confession.

Five types of sin mentioned in this verse:

1. sin
2. commit iniquity
3. do wickedness
4. rebel, from both the Scriptures and the prophets that God had sent unto the nation
5. departing from God's precepts and judgments

These sins build, from the simple and generic "sin" to departing from God's precepts and judgments, or an ultimate rejection of the Scriptures. This is where all sin eventually leads.

What made Daniel one of God's greatest saints was not his scholarship or spirituality but his sensitivity to the true depth of his own sin.

9:6 Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spoke in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land.

The Lord made the same charge in Matthew 23:29-32,35 **("Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers… hat upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.")** as does Stephen in Acts 7:52 ("**Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers**:").

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	6 We have not listened to your servants the prophets, who spoke in your name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land.	6 "Moreover, we have not listened to Your slaves the prophets, who spoke in Your name to our kings, our princes, our fathers, and all the people of the land.

"servants" Another ongoing error of the LSV is constantly translating "servant" as "slave".

9:7 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.

"righteousness belongeth to thee" And to no one else except God, unless He should decide to impart it, which He has done to believers.

"all Israel, *that are* near, and *that are* far off" Both those Jews that were left in the land and those in exile.

9:8 O Lord, to us *belongeth* confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned gainst thee.

"confusion of face" Shame that comes with disobedience to God.

"because we sinned against thee" "And we deserve it." Sin is always primarily against God, even if man is the object of it or is harmed by it.

9:9 To the Lord our God *belong* mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him;

God is faithful, even when we are not, and He always treats us better than we treat Him.

AV	ESV	LSV
9 To the Lord our God *belong* mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him;	9 To the Lord our God belong mercy and forgiveness, for we have rebelled against him	9 "To the Lord our God *belong* compassion and forgiveness, for we have rebelled against Him;

"**mercies**" The LSV omits and uses "compassion"

9:10 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.

"Neither have we obeyed…" Sin is usually pictured as a failure to hear or not hearing properly and is this tied to disobedience.

9:11 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.

The **curses** of Leviticus 26:14-39 and Deuteronomy 28:15-68 is in view here, the curses for disobedience, rebellion and breaking of the covenant.

"poured out…" The same imagery as God pouring out the wrath and judgments in the vial judgments in Revelation 16.

9:12 And he hath confirmed his words, which he spoke 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.

"judges" Civil magistrates.

"**for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem**" God judged His own rebellious people harder than He ever judged a Gentile nation. With the greater privileges and blessings from God come the greater responsibilities, and greater judgments for disobedience.

9:13 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.

"turn" The idea of repentance here. It would appear than even after the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile into Babylon, the nation had still not sought out God in national repentance. I'm sure many individuals confessed their sins like Daniel did, but even that would only have been a remnant of the people. The nation itself had not confessed their sin, even while starting full in the face of God's judgments.

9:14 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.

Even in judgment, the LORD is righteous and true in His acts towards a rebellious people. We must always remember that, as He never judges wrongly or unrighteously. Man usually does not understand why God does what He does, but that is because He is God and we are finite and limited in our understanding.

9:15 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.

Remembering the Exodus. The Jews in Daniel's day were as guilty as the Jews in Moses' day, and even in every generation, of forgetting the great things God did on behalf of the nation of Israel in the Exodus and during the 40 years in the wilderness and in the invasion of Canaan.

"You have not heard anyone in America in the past sixty years confess sins like that. None of the TV preachers do it, including the few good ones on the air. When was the last time you heard anyone get up and say, "Lord, every one of us here in America has disobeyed you, rebelled against you, broken your laws, rejected your Bible, and ignored your preachers"? Well, that's what you would need to say if you misappropriated 2 Chronicles 7:14 for professing Christians under a Socialistic oligarchy (formerly a democratic, constitutional republic) instead of a Jewish theocracy set up by God Almighty… What we need today is someone to stand up and "read the riot act" to everybody: the President, the Congressmen, the Senators, the "Secretaries" in the Cabinet, the candidates, the police, the Mayor, the soldiers, the sailors, the Marines, the airmen, the city council, the doctors, the lawyers, the bankers, the welfare recipients, the whites, the blacks, the Asians, the "native Americans," the immigrants, the

citizens, the day laborers, the day traders, Wall Street, the "Bowery," skid row, the queers, the cross-genders, the Lesbians, the rapists, the murderers, the thieves, the teachers, the preachers (let's not forget them!), the Pope, the Bishops, the Rabbis, the Imams—ALL OF THEM, brother! Don't leave anybody out!

"But no one's going to do it, especially not the preachers. They don't want to "offend" anyone; they're too concerned with their attendance, their offerings, "more stations," bigger buildings, etc. Why, if someone got on the air and said, "All America has turned its back on God and the Bible; all Americans are a bunch of rebels against God Almighty," he would get booted off the air so fast it would make your head spin."[86]

9:16 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.

"**Thy city"** (Daniel 9:16); thy holy mountain (Daniel 9:16) and thy sanctuary (Daniel 9:17). Again, Daniel is playing up God's position in the restoration of Israel, not Israel's benefit. But the question is "Would God still claim Jerusalem, Zion and His temple, despite the apostasy of the nation?"

"**thy holy mountain**" is Mount Zion, where the temple was in Jerusalem, also in Daniel 9:20.

This verse describes Israel obtaining a negative testimony among the heathen, when God punished His own covenant people for their sins. It's a warning to the heathen that God will judge them even more severely if He judges His own people like this.

9:17 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.

A plea for God to allow His temple at Jerusalem to be rebuilt. Eventually it would be.

9:18 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.

"**we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses**" Because we have none! We have no basis to make such a claim upon since we have no righteousness of our own that is not a filthy rag (Isaiah 53:5 "**But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.**").

"**but for thy great mercies."** Here's what gets response from God- plead His righteousness, His mercies and His compassion- His grace!

9:19 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.

86 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*, pages 247-249.

Daniel's desires of God in this prayer:
1. Hear
2. Forgive
3. Harken and do
4. Defer not, or delay not

12. Daniel's Third Vision: The Seventy Weeks 9:20-27

9:20 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;

The divine response to Daniel's prayer was not long in coming, maybe even quicker than Daniel was expecting.

9:21 Yea, while 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.

Although Gabriel was an angel, he appeared as a man (not as a woman as so many New-Age and Roman Catholic pictures depict angels) without wings. If you didn't know he was an angel, Gabriel would have appeared as normal as any man.

Daniel was praying so effectively that an angel came down and interrupted his prayer. When is the last time that happened to you?

"evening oblation" Around 3 p.m. There had been no "evening oblation" in Israel since the destruction of the temple, but it was still remembered and observed among the more godly of the remnant. It would have developed into something of personal evening devotions, which would also have been picked up and developed by the Church of Rome and similar groups (such as the Church of England and many Eastern Orthodox groups) in the development of the "Breviary" or "Liturgy of the Hours" in the various evening prayers.

"The evening oblation was the perpetual burnt offering—appointed to be presented morning and evening continually. The temple having been destroyed, it could no longer be offered; but Daniel was before God in the virtue of it; that is, he identified himself in spirit with all its sweet fragrance, as constituting his own acceptance, and the efficacy of his prayers. (Compare 1 Sam. 7:9-10; 2 Kings 3:20)."[87]

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	21 while I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the first, came to me in swift flight at the time of the evening sacrifice.	21 and while I was still speaking in prayer, then the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision previously, touched me in *my* extreme weariness about the time of the evening offering.

87(Edward Dennett, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles.*

The LSV adds the idea not seen in either the Authorized Version of in the ESV about Daniel and "my extreme weariness".

9:22 And he informed *me*, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding.

"Skill and understanding" Both of which can only be given by God, but God will only give this to an obedient person who is ready to receive and accept such revelations. You don't get this from attending any Bible college or by embracing any manmade, uninspired, flawed theological system.

9:23 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.

At the beginning of thy supplications" The answer takes a while to reach us sometimes, as explained in Daniel 10:12,13, hence the need to persevere and continue in prayer. The moment Daniel began to pray, the angel was on his way. How little we understand the cosmic significance and impacts of our prayers.

"thou art greatly beloved" What a tremendous compliment and encouragement for Daniel! See also Daniel 10:11. Daniel would be the Old Testament version of the Apostle John.

AV	ESV	LSV
23 At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew *thee;* for thou *art* **greatly beloved**: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision.	23 At the beginning of your pleas for mercy a word went out, and I have come to tell it to you, for you are greatly loved. Therefore consider the word and understand the vision.	23 "At the beginning of your supplications the word was issued, so I have come to tell *you*, for you are highly esteemed; so understand the message and gain understanding in what has appeared.

"**greatly beloved**" In the LSV, Daniel is not "**greatly beloved**", just "highly esteemed".

"consider the vision" What vision? The "Seventy Weeks" is not a vision, it is a revelation. Gabriel probably means the vision from back in Daniel 7 or 8, or both.

9:24 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.

1. The length
    A. Seventy weeks, 9:24
        i. Not a literal 70 weeks or 490 days (70 times 7), but the prophetic "day for a year" principle. Just about every prophetic interpretation, no matter of what school or presupposition, understands the "weeks" to be "years" and not literal

"days" with respect to the 70 weeks, as 490 literal days would refer to nothing of historical or prophetic importance here

ii. Seventy weeks would be 490 years.

iii. We would hold the prophetic year to be made up of 360 days.

iv. "Daniel's prayer referred to seventy years fulfilled: the prophecy which came in answer to that prayer foretold a period of seven times seventy still to come. But here a question arises which never has received sufficient notice in the consideration of this subject. None will doubt that the era is a period of years; but of what kind of year is it composed? That the Jewish year was lunisolar appears to be reasonably certain. If tradition may be trusted, Abraham preserved in his family the year of 360 days, which he had known in his Chaldean home. The month dates of the flood (150 days being specified as the interval between the seventeenth day of the second month, and the same day of the seventh month) appear to show that this form of year was the earliest known to our race. Sir Isaac Newton states, that "all nations, before the just length of the solar year was known, reckoned months by the course of the moon, and years by the return of winter and summer, spring and autumn; and in making calendars for their festivals, they reckoned thirty days to a lunar month, and twelve lunar months to a year, taking the nearest round numbers, whence came the division of the ecliptic into 360 degrees." And in adopting this statement, Sir G. C. Lewis avers that "all credible testimony and all antecedent probability lead to the result that a solar year containing twelve lunar months, determined within certain limits of error, has been generally recognized by the nations adjoining the Mediterranean, from a remote antiquity."[88]

2. They are determined

A. They are determined upon thy people, 9:24

i. Appointed unto Israel, not unto the Church or the Gentiles, again showing that the Tribulation is not for the Church and that the Church does not go through it. Daniel is a Jew, not a Gentile, so these 70 weeks are not set or appointed for the Church. Unsaved Gentiles will go through the tribulation period but not saved Jews and Gentiles who will make up the Church, as we will be rapture out to avoid these tribulation period.

B. They are determined upon your holy city, 9:24

i. Jerusalem.

3. The purpose

A. To finish the transgression 9:24

i. Transgressions of the Gentile world powers against God and Israel.

ii. To finish the transgressions of the God of This Age and his influences and philosophies.

B. To make an end to sin, 9:24

i. Probably would include the sin of rebellion against the government of laws of God by the Gentile world powers.

C. To make reconciliation for iniquity, 9:24

i. All sin and iniquity that is associated with the Antichrist, but also for Israel's apostasy and sin.

D. To bring in everlasting righteousness, 9:24

i. The Millennial kingdom and beyond.

E. To seal up the vision, 9:24

i. To conclude these prophecies and fulfill them, thus bringing them to an end.

88 Robert Anderson, *The Coming Prince*.

ii. In the Millennial Kingdom, there will be no need for prophets or prophecy, as all will know the Lord in that day.

a. Zechariah 13:3,4, **And it shall come to pass, that when any shall yet prophesy, then his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him, Thou shalt not live; for thou speakest lies in the name of the LORD: and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he hath prophesied; neither shall they wear a rough garment to deceive:**

iii. The vision is sealed up in Daniel 12:21. It is sealed to the time of the end, then it is unsealed.

a. The closer we get to the end of the age, the more we will be able to understand these prophecies. The fact that the "Plymouth Brethren" were able to understand them in the 19th century as well as they did is a testimony to their scholarship and spirituality. But even they didn't see some things and their understanding was not perfect.

F. To seal up the prophecy and the vision, 9:24

G. To anoint the most holy

i. Maybe the Millennial Temple of Ezekiel 40-48?

ii. Clarence Larkin has this as to anoint but "the most holy place" of the Millennial Temple

a. Ezekiel 41:4, **And he measured the length of the room, twenty cubits, and its breadth, twenty cubits, across the nave. And he said to me, "This is the Most Holy Place."**

b. Ezekiel 45:3, **And from this measured district you shall measure off a section 25,000 cubits long and 10,000 broad, in which shall be the sanctuary, the Most Holy Place.**

iii. The first Tabernacle erected by Moses had to be anointed before it could be used.

a. Exodus 30:26**, With it you shall anoint the tent of meeting and the ark of the testimony,**

b. Exodus 40:9,10, **Then you shall take the anointing oil and anoint the tabernacle and all that is in it, and consecrate it and all its furniture, so that it may become holy. You shall also anoint the altar of burnt offering and all its utensils, and consecrate the altar, so that the altar may become most holy.**

iv. "Clarence Larkin contends that "the most Holy" isn't Jesus Christ, but "the most holy place" of the Millennial Temple (Ezek. 41:4, 43:12, 44:13, 45:3). That could very well be, since the first Tabernacle erected by Moses had to be anointed before it could be used (Exod. 30:26–29, 40:9–10). If that be the case, I would say "the most Holy" refers to the entire Temple, just as it did the Tabernacle back in Exodus."[89]

v. "While much has been preached and written about this having reference to some anointing of Christ as Messiah, it is important to consider the context. The phrase the most holy is not found in the New Testament. Of the twenty-three other times it appears in the Old Testament, eleven times it is the most holy place, ten times the most holy things, and twice the most holy house. If we go to Exodus 26:33 and read, And thou shalt hang up the vail under the taches, that

89 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*.

thou mayest bring in thither within the vail the ark of the testimony: and the vail shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy, we are left with a different thought than the usual interpretation of the final phrase of Daniel 9:24."[90]

4. Seven weeks, 9:25
    A. From the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince
    B. It shall be built again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time
5. Sixty-two weeks, 9:26
    A. An anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing.
    B. And the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary
    C. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war.
    D. Desolations are decreed.
6. And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, 9:27
7. For half of the week he shall put an end to sacrifice and offering, 9:27
8. And on the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator, 9:27

"Now, Clarence Larkin has an interesting chart in his work on *Dispensational Truth*. You will have a hard time finding it on the Internet because it is not included in his numbered pages. But if you get a copy of his printed book, you will find it between pages 71 and 72. It is entitled "Prophetic Chronology or 'Seventy Weeks' of Scripture: Showing God's Dealings with the Hebrew Race." In that chart, Larkin shows you how God deals with the Jewish people in four time periods of 490 years each. Of course, just as you are about to see in verses 26–27, there can be gaps of time not counted in the 490 years because of the sin of God's people.

1. 490 years from the birth of Abraham to the exodus from Egypt, minus fifteen years between the birth of Ishmael and the birth of Isaac. That was the time Abraham was trying to make the promise of God come to pass by his wife Sarah's machinations. God didn't count the time when Ishmael was usurping the promise.

2. 490 years between the exodus from Egypt and Solomon dedicating the Temple, not counting the time Israel was out of fellowship with God in the book of Judges.

3. 490 years between Solomon and the decree for the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem; the seventy years of Babylonian Captivity are not counted.

4. 490 years between the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the Second Advent, with 2,000 (+/–) years of the Church Age not included in the count. That's because Israel, as a nation, in the Gospels, rejected their Messiah."[91]

AV	ESV	LSV
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	24 "Seventy weeks are decreed about your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy place.	24 "Seventy weeks have been determined for your people and for your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint *the* Holy of Holies.

90 James Knox, *Understanding Prophecy*, page 33.
91 Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*, pages 255-256.

prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.		

"**end of sins**" Both the ESV and LSV have "sin" singular. There is a difference between "sins" (the individual acts) and "sin" (the fact of sin in general).

9:25 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.

Two princes are mentioned:
1. Messiah in 9:25
2. Antichrist, who destroys Jerusalem in 9:26

Jesus is called "**Messiah the Prince**". A "prince" is the son of a king who is not yet ruling but is in preparation to reign, which he will do at a future date. When Daniel received the prophecies, Jesus was not reigning. He also is not reigning now. Satan is the current "god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4). Jesus will not reign until the Millennium.

Regarding the 70 Weeks:
1. The time from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks.
2. Then 62 weeks, the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.
3. This makes 69 weeks of years, or 69 x 7 years, or 483 years. This leaves one week of 7 years to be accounted for.

From the commandment to restore the Jerusalem temple to the Messiah will be 69 weeks, or 483 years or 173,880 days, taking 360 days to a year. This commandment went forth on Nisan 1 (March 14 according to Robert Anderson), 445 B.C., the 20th year of Artaxerxes (Nehemiah 2:1-8). This is broken down to "seven weeks" (49 years), maybe the total time it took to repair the wall and the temple, and then 62 weeks (434 years) more to the Messiah. These 483 years would be fulfilled at the so-called Triumphal Entry (not at the nativity), when Jesus presented Himself as King and Messiah- and was rejected.

"In the book of Ezra we have a decree by Cyrus, and another by Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign; but both of these are concerning the house of God in Jerusalem, and hence neither satisfies the terms mentioned by Gabriel. Passing on however to Nehemiah, we find that, "in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes," he issued letters, in response to Nehemiah's request, commissioning him to go unto Judah, unto the city of his fathers' sepulchers, that he might build it (Dan. 2). Here then is the date referred to by Gabriel."[92]

Robert Anderson pins the date of the fulfillment of the 69 weeks at the Julian date of 10th Nisan, or Sunday the 6th April, A.D. 32. What then was the length of the period intervening between the issuing of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem and the public advent of "Messiah the Prince," – between the 14th March, B.C. 445, and the 6th April, A.D. 32? The interval contained exactly and to the very day 173,880 days, or seven times sixty-nine prophetic years of 360 days, the first sixty-nine weeks of Gabriel's prophecy. The 1st Nisan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes

92 (Edward Dennett, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles.*

(the edict to rebuild Jerusalem) was 14th March, B. C. 445. The 10th Nisan in Passion Week (Christ's entry into Jerusalem) was 6th April, A. D. 32. The intervening period was 476 years and 24 days (the days being reckoned inclusively, as required by the language of the prophecy, and in accordance with the Jewish practice).

But 476 x 365= 173, 740 days
Add (14 March to 6th April, *both* inclusive) 24 days
Add for leap years 116 days
Equals a total of 173,880 days
And 69 weeks of prophetic years of 360 days (or 69 x 7 x 360) 173,880 days.

It may be well to offer here two explanatory remarks. First, in reckoning years from B.C. to A.D., one year must always be omitted; for it is obvious, ex. gr., that from B.C. 1 to A.D. I was not *two* years, but one year. B.C. 1 ought to be described as B.C. 0, and it is so reckoned by astronomers who would describe the historical date B.C. 445, as 444. And secondly, the Julian year is 11 minutes, 10.46 seconds., or about the 129th part of a day, longer than 'the mean solar year. The Julian calendar, therefore, contains three leap years too many in four centuries, an error which had amounted to eleven days in A.D. 1752 when our English calendar was corrected by declaring the 3rd September to be the 14th September, and by introducing the Gregorian reform which reckons three secular years out of four as common years; *ex. gr.,* 1700, 1800 and 1900 are common years, and 2000 is a leap year. "Old Christmas day" is still marked in our calendars, and observed in some localities, on the 6th January; and to this day the calendar remains uncorrected in Russia.[93] [94]

The 70 weeks is divided into three sections, 7+62+1 week, or 49+434+7 years.

Seven weeks (49 years or 17,640 days)- relating to the rebuilding of the temple and walls.

Sixty-two weeks (434 years or 156,240 days)- in addition to the 7 weeks, relating to the coming of the Messiah.

One week (7 years or 2,520 days)- yet unfulfilled. This is the still-future tribulation period.

"troublous times" The rebuilding of the wall and temple is recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah. These were troublous times, with enemies without who tried to prevent the rebuilding of the wall, to trouble within regarding the spiritual condition of the returned exiles. The tribulation period will be the ultimate in "troublous times", especially for Israel.

AV	ESV	LSV
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**	25 Know therefore and understand that from the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built	25 "So you are to know and have insight *that* from the going out of a word to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince, *there will be* seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; it will be restored and rebuilt, with plaza and

93 The Orthodox observance of Christmas.
94 Robert Anderson, *The Coming Prince*.

shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.	again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time.	moat, even in times of distress.

"**street**" The ESV and LSV add a lot of other details, such as "squares", "moat", and "plaza".

9:26 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.

9. Sixty-two weeks, 9:26
   A. An anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing.
      i. After 62 weeks, (434 years/156,240 days), the Messiah could be killed, in a violent fashion, via crucifixion.
   B. "**but not for himself**"
      i. He dies but not for His own self or His own sake, but for others. This is the substitutionary death of Christ, as He did not die for His own sins (since He had none) but for the sin of the whole world.
   C. The people destroy the city (Jerusalem) and the sanctuary (the Temple).
      i. The prince himself (the Antichrist) does not do it but his army and supporters do it, no doubt under orders from the Antichrist, the second prince, or really, an anti-prince. This happened historically 40 years after the death of Christ when then Romans destroyed Jerusalem but that is probably not the primary idea here.[95]
   D. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war.
      i. Possibly a flood of people, a great army, that shall be used to attack Jerusalem by the Antichrist. We know there will be millions involved at Armageddon (including the 200-million-man army from the east).
   E. Desolations are decreed.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	26 And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off and shall have nothing. And the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war. Desolations are decreed.	26 "Then after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing, and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end *will come* with a flood; even to the end there will be war; desolations are decreed.

The ESV and LSV add "and shall have nothing".

95 Non-dispensationalists and preterists make a big deal about the events of A.D. 70 when Rome destroyed Jerusalem, pointing to that event as the main focus of Daniel's prophecies and interpreting Revelation in that context chronologically. But it this is true and if it was such a major prophetic event, why is there no inspired account of it? It happened just a few years after the close of the events of the book of Acts. If it was so important, there should be some inspired account of it since it happened during the era of the apostolic church. Yet John, writing about 20 years after the event in his epistles and in Revelation, makes no mention of it. It may have been a historically important event, especially for Israel, but its prophetic significance is marginal at best.

9:27 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.

10. And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, 9:27

A. This is not the Lord, as He never proposed any new covenant with Israel during His earthly ministry. Rather, the Antichrist will confirm a covenant with Israel for 7 years. This will probably be some sort of security agreement that the Antichrist, as the possible head of the European Union, will guarantee to Israel in exchange for something. This will be signed during the early years of the Tribulation, as the 7-year Tribulation will fulfill that final week.

B. The Antichrist "confirms" the covenant, but he does not "make" the covenant. Who made this covenant and when? It would appear that there was already some sort of covenant in place with Israel that the Antichrist will confirm when he comes into his political power. The specifics of this covenant are never definitely spelled out in Scripture, but it may involve some sort of guarantees of Israel's security and possibly allowing Israel to rebuild their temple on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. If this is true, how does the Antichrist convince the Moslems to allow a Jewish temple where their Mosque of Omar is located? The Moslems would never allow it. If this is what the Antichrist manages to accomplish for Israel, no wonder they might think he is their Messiah!

"Scripture is not silent concerning this covenant of the Jews with Antichrist, and their consequent judgment. In Isaiah 28:14, we read, "Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem.. . ." "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not. stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it" (v. 18). These are the threats, as to the moral position in which they shall be found in that day."[96]

11. For half of the week he shall put an end to sacrifice and offering, 9:27

A. The Antichrist breaks the covenant after 3 ½ years. Thus, the Abomination of Desolation is at the mid-way point of the Tribulation.

B. This shows that there must be a rebuilt Jewish temple in Jerusalem where sacrifices are being made. As part of his persecutions of Israel, the Antichrist will force these sacrifices and other temple rituals to cease. This happens after the Abomination of Desolation, which takes place at the midpoint of the seven-year tribulation period. This happens after Israel formally offers himself as Israel's Messiah, which Israel rejects when their spiritual eyes are finally opened regarding the true nation and intentions of the Antichrist.

12. And on the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator, 9:27

A. The Abomination of Desolation, where the Antichrist will offer himself to Israel as their Messiah and where they will reject him. As a result of this rejection, the Antichrist will seek to destroy Israel.

AV	ESV	LSV
27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one	27 And he shall make a strong covenant with many	27 "And he will make a firm covenant with the many for

96 John Nelson Darby, *Collected Works*, volume 5, page 176.

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.	for one week, and for half of the week he shall put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator.”	one week, but in the middle of the week he will make sacrifice and grain offering cease; and on the wing of abominations *will come* one who makes desolate, even until a complete destruction, one that is decreed, is poured out on the one who makes desolate.”

The ESV adds “strong” covenant and the LSV adds “firm” covenant.
The ESV also adds the idea of a “grain offering”.

A summary of the 70 Weeks:

1. The epoch of the Seventy Weeks was the issuing of a decree to restore and build Jerusalem. (Daniel 9:25.)
2. There was only one decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem.
3. That decree was issued by Artaxerxes, King of Persia, in the month of Nisan in the 20th year of his reign, *i.e.* B.C. 445.
4. The city was built in pursuance of that decree.
5. The Julian date of 1st Nisan 445 was the 14th of March.
6. Sixty-nine weeks of years – *i.e.* 173,880 days – reckoned from the 14th of March, 445 B.C., ended on the 6th of April, A.D. 32.
7. That day, on which the sixty-nine weeks ended, was the fateful day on which the Lord Jesus rode into Jerusalem in fulfillment of the prophecy of Zechariah 9:9; when, for the first and only occasion in all His earthly sojourn, He was acclaimed as "Messiah the Prince the King, the Son of David."

Daniel Chapter 10

13. A Prophetic Hermeneutic 10:1

10:1 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.

"**third year of Cyrus**" 534 B.C.

This is an important principle in prophecy, that prophecies may take thousands of years to be fulfilled. The prophecy of a Messiah in Genesis 3:15 took 4,000 years to be fulfilled. And there are still many Old Testament prophecies that have yet to be fulfilled.

Prophecies are not required to have quick fulfillments. I'm sure many of the prophets never understood the prophecies they received. Most of their prophecies were never fulfilled in their lifetimes. Simply because a prophecy may not be applicable to a generation to whom it was given or addressed does not diminish the importance or value of the prophecy. When God gives a prophecy, He is not necessarily giving it to that generation but to future generations. That current generation may not understand the prophecy as it would have no application to them, yet that prophecy is every bit as vital. I say this to refute the postmillennial argument for an early date for the writing of Revelation. Postmillennialists teach that Revelation was largely fulfilled by A.D. 70 and the fall of Jerusalem. They insist that Revelation had to be written in the 60s in order for it to be fulfilled by A.D. 70 and thus, for it to make sense to that generation. They attack the premillennialists who hold to a date for the writing of Revelation in the 90s, saying that if it was true that Revelation would not be fulfilled for 2000 years, then it would have no value for the early church. Well, did Genesis 3:15 have any value for Adam and Eve? Did Deuteronomy 18:15 have any value for Moses? Did Isaiah 7:14 have any value for Isaiah's generation? Revelation is for all generations of the Church, not just the early church. Thus, to insist on an early date and fulfillment by A. D. 70 just to make the book "relevant" to that generation is to violate this principle of prophecy.

AV	**ESV**	**LSV**
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**.	1 In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a word was revealed to Daniel, who was named Belteshazzar. And the word was true, and it was a great conflict. And he understood the word and had understanding of the vision.	1 In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia, a word was revealed to Daniel, who was named Belteshazzar; and the word was true and *one of* great conflict, but he understood the word and had an understanding of what had appeared.

"**but the time appointed was long**" Both the ESV and LSV butcher the meaning by saying something about a "great conflict".
"**vision**" The LSV omits. The LSV had it in Daniel 10:7,8,18, although in italics.

14. Daniel's Fourth Vision: The Battle In The Heavenlies 10:2-21

10:2 In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks.

Because of the prophecies that Daniel has received up to this point. They had really bothered him, and he was greatly troubled by them. He spent these three weeks fasting for understanding and acceptance of the import of these prophecies.

10:3 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 mourning was accompanied by fasting. This may have accounted for Daniel's physical weakness mentioned in Daniel 10:8.

10:4 And in the four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the side of the great river, which *is* Hiddekel;

We first saw the Hiddekel River in Genesis 2:14, one of the rivers that flowed out of Eden, showing that the Babylon/Persia area (modern-day Iraq probably) was the location of the Garden of Eden. Many commentators identify this as the Tigris River.

AV	ESV	LSV
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**;	4 On the twenty-fourth day of the first month, as I was standing on the bank of the great river (that is, the Tigris)	4 And on the twenty-fourth day of the first month, while I was by the bank of the great river, that is, the Tigris,

"Hiddekel" The ESV and LSV have "Tigris".

10:5 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:

This "man" is obviously an angel, probably Gabriel, although his name is not given. But he appears as a man (not a woman) and wings are not mentioned.

The "**gold of Uphaz**" is also mentioned in Jeremiah 10:9.

10:6 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.

This description is similar to the description of the glorified Christ in Revelation 1:13-16 **"And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp twoedged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength."**

AV	ESV	LSV
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 colour to polished **brass**, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude.	6 His body was like beryl, his face like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the sound of a multitude.	6 His body also *was* like beryl, his face had the appearance of lightning, his eyes were like flaming torches, his arms and feet like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the sound of a multitude.

"brass" The ESV and LSV continue their error by substituting "bronze" for "brass".

10:7 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.

Although these men had no real idea what was going on, it still affected them in a strong way, and probably affected Daniel, who knew what was going on, in an even stronger way.

"vision" along the lines of a revelation.

10:8 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.

Daniel is now alone with the angel, and the others are fled. When God speaks with a man, He does it in private, not when he is among a crowd.

His weakness may have been a result of either fasting or of eating a minimal diet, as mentioned in Daniel 10:3.

10:9 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.

This rendered Daniel either unconscious or he went into a trance.

10:10 And, behold, a hand touched me, which set me upon my knees and *upon* the palms of my hands.

This was the angel that touched Daniel and revived him.

10:11 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.

"**a man greatly beloved**" See Daniel 9:23 and Daniel 10:19.

AV	ESV	LSV
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.	11 And he said to me, “O Daniel, man greatly loved, understand the words that I speak to you, and stand upright, for now I have been sent to you.” And when he had spoken this word to me, I stood up trembling.	11 And he said to me, “O Daniel, man of high esteem, understand the words that I am about to speak to you and stand upright, for I have now been sent to you.” And when he had spoken this word to me, I stood up trembling.

“a man greatly beloved” In the LSV, Daniel is not “greatly beloved”, just a man of “high esteem”. Also see in Daniel 10:19.

10:12 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.

God will do the same for any believer who sets his heart to understand the Word of God and who demonstrates a heart-attitude of repentance and humility.

10:13 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.**

"**prince of the kingdom of Persia**" This is obviously a devil or fallen angel who is in charge of all devilish activity and interests over Persia. From this, we may assume that Satan has assigned certain of his followers as his overseers over the various nations of the Earth to promote his interests in these nations and to try to foil God's work there. Therefore, we would also assume that God has similar angels who have a similar ministry over the individual nations, but for good and to promote the interests of God and to hinder Satanic activity in these nations. And since "**Michael, one of the chief princes**" is mentioned, he is probably the angel over the affairs of the nation of Israel, which would seem to be confirmed in Daniel 10:21.

Michael is a "**chief prince**" and an archangel (Jude 9 “**Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee**.”), meaning that he is over the angelic hosts and is probably more powerful and has more spiritual authority than ordinary angels.

Spiritual warfare is also seen, as this unnamed angel (probably Gabriel) has been fighting the "Prince of Persia", who has been attempting to hinder these angelic messages and visits to Daniel. Daniel, of course, knew nothing of this and did not know why the answers to his prayers were delayed. But there are angelic/demonic battles going on that are beyond our sight that we know nothing about and cannot see. Although it appears that things are "all quiet", we know that there is a spiritual warfare currently raging that makes all the wars of man seem like weaving a daisy chain- and the battle will only intensify as we approach the end of the age.

This “battle in the heavenlies” reminds us of Paul’s words in Ephesians 6:12, where we wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers. There are battles going on in the heavenlies that we know nothing about but that outdoes any battles going on here on Earth. There are wars in heaven as much as there are wars on earth. People may talk about bring in “peace on earth” but there will be no peace on earth until there is peace in the heavenlies and that will only be possible once Satan is bound in the Millennium and after his final defeat.

“The unseen world is real, and modern men and women are particularly vulnerable to that spirit world because of their ignorance of it and their inquisitiveness about it. The average person today is like a person living in the Middle Ages, trying to fight disease while ignorant of bacteria. During the plague that decimated London and parts of Britain in 1665, people knew next to nothing about the simplest principles of sanitation. An open city sewer ran down the middle of each street. Rats multiplied. What caused the plague? The Royal College of Surgeons said it was carried by the air. People shut themselves in their houses and stopped up the doors, windows, and chimneys. They burned noxious and evil-smelling compounds to battle the "enemy," fresh air. Suppose that someone had told them that the plague was carried by a bacillus, that the invisible microbes were carried by fleas, and that rats were the chief hosts of the deadly fleas. They would have regarded that person as insane; the notion was nonsense.

“Modern man no longer scoffs at microbes. But demons? Evil spirits? Fallen angels ruling the nations from an unseen world and delighting in the miseries of mankind and in wars, famines, earthquakes, and persecutions? Nonsense! Most people consider incredible the idea that behind our destructive ideologies, foolish "scientific" hypotheses, and false religions are vast intelligences, organized principalities who are working according to a master plan, are implacable in their hatred of the human race, and feast their diabolical appetites on human sufferings and souls. No wonder the world cannot achieve peace when it not only rejects the Prince of Peace but also denies the existence of Satan and his minions.”[97]

10:14 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.

"latter days" The end of the age, still future even today. The vision is for "***many* days**", meaning that its fulfillment is still in the far future (from Daniel's day). But the vision will concern Israel in these latter days (referring to the Tribulation period and the Antichrist).

10:15 And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb.

10:16 And, behold, *one* like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spoke, 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.

"**sons of men**" An angelic reference? In Genesis 6:4 and Job 38:7, they are called "**sons of God**". Maybe a lesser order of angels? We know there are angels and archangels. Are angels sub-divided into other “classes” or “orders”?

97 John Phillips, *Exploring Daniel.*

10:17 For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is there breath left in me.

"Straightway" Or **"**immediately", as it is used so often in the early chapters of Mark.

10:18 Then there came again and touched me *one* like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me,

Again stressing the appearance of angels is of men without wings.

10:19 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.

Daniel needed this strength and encouragement for his prophetic ministry was not yet done.

"be strong, yea, be strong" Repeated for emphasis.

Daniel refers to the angel as "**my lord**". He does not worship the angel, but he does show him the proper respect.

10:20 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 Greece shall come.

See remarks under Daniel 10:13. This teaching is confirmed by a new reference to the "**prince of Greece**" in addition to the "**prince of Persia**".

10:21 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.

"**noted in the Scripture of truth**" This is another way of saying "it is written" in the Greek perfect tense, showing that it has been written by God and will not be changed or altered.

AV	ESV	LSV
21 But I will shew thee that which is noted in the **scripture** of truth: and *there is* none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.	21 But I will tell you what is inscribed in the book of truth: there is none who contends by my side against these except Michael, your prince.	21 "However, I will tell you what is inscribed in the writing of truth. Now there is no one who exerts strength with me against these *forces* except Michael your prince.

"scripture" There is no "scripture" in the ESV and LSV.

"**Michael your prince**" Over the affairs of the nation of Israel. See remarks under Daniel 10:13.

Daniel Chapter 11

This chapter gives a very detailed prophetic-historical summary of the career and eventual downfall of the Antichrist by taking the events around 170-160 B.C. in Israel and the activities of Antiochus Epiphanes as a type of the activity and career of the Antichrist. The level of precision and detail in this prophecy is simply amazing. This is a very detailed and complicated chapter that is difficult to interpret without a good understanding of the events that took place during the inter-testamental period. Clarence Larkin probably has the best historical interpretations in his commentary on Daniel but John Phillips is good, too. I do not agree with Larkin when he refuses to make any prophetical application of the historical events of this chapter (page 241). This is a pre-written history (which prophecy is) of the wars between the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Selucides of Syria and its prophetical application to the activities of the Antichrist in the Tribulation, which is given in great detail.

This is that one chapter in Scripture where I mainly had to “cut-and-paste” from other commentaries and references (mainly secular history books) as I do not have the background in ancient secular history to interpret every verse. Few commentators do, so there is not as much in the way of original commenting in this chapter. This is the most detailed- and difficult- prophetical chapter in the Bible. This is the one chapter in the Bible where it really helps to have some knowledge of classical history.

A good book that deals well with this history would be *Annuals of the World* by James Ussher. *The Chronology of the Old Testament* by Floyd Nolen Jones would also be a good reference.

15. Daniel's Fifth Vision: The Career of Antiochus 11:1-45

11:1 Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him.

"first year of Darius" 538 B.C.

Daniel "stood" to "confirm" and “strengthen” a non-believer as ruler over the Medo-Persian empire. Was this a compromise on Daniel's part? Was he supporting a non-"Christian" government? Well, just how many “Christian” or “godly” governments have there been in world history? How many do we have today? Daniel had been placed into his high government post by God and was maintained by God to serve in that position under various heathen administrations. He was God's man in a fallen environment who constantly stood for and promoted the interests of the God of Israel. Such godly men are a rarity in any government or nation. And now, Darius had come to power, with the approval of God, who sets up kings and puts them down at His will. Daniel recognized Darius' authority and power, even if he did not support the man individually or his policies. But Daniel must have seen something promising in this man (as seen in the events of Daniel 6) to make a public and open show of support for him. This is not a compromise. This is acknowledging the yet-to-be-written Romans 13.

11:2 And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia .

There would be four kings of the Medo-Persian Empire (Ahasuerus (Cambyses 529-522 B.C.), Artaxerxes (Pseudo-Smerdis 522-521 B.C.) and Darius Hystaspes (521-485 B.C.). Cyrus (Xerxes, the son of Darius Hystaspes, 485-465 B.C.) was the fourth). And the fourth one (Cyrus) would pick a fight against Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Empire, fielding an army that might have numbered up to 5 million men.

11:3 And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.

This is Alexander the Great, who shall "**do according to his will**" because he conquers the known world and none was able to defeat him, until he defeated himself by his self-destructive lifestyle. Alexander was the son of Philip of Macedon began his reign when 20 years old and expanded it to include Asia, Egypt, Persia, into India by age 32.

Verses 3 and 4 go back to the prophecy of the Ram and He-Goat in Daniel 8.

11:4 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.

"**And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken**" At the peak of his power and influence, Alexander died in 323 B.C.

"**and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven, but not to his posterity nor according to his dominion wherewith he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others besides these**." Alexander's empire did not pass to his descendants. He did leave a young son at his death who was too young to rule who was later murdered, along with his mother. His four primary generals thus divided the empire among them after years of strife and civil war. Antigonus, in Asia Minor, tried to seize all but was killed at the battle of Ipsus by the others who then divided the kingdom four ways:

1. Seleucus Nicator, a general of Ptolemy Lagus, was given his place in the east over Syria, Babylonia, Media, Susiana, Armenia, a part of Cappadocia, Cilicia. (From the Hellespont to the Indies)
2. Cassander assumed the government of Macedon, Thessaly & Greece in the East.
3. Lysimachus took part of Thrace, Asia Minor and Cappadocia in the North
4. Ptolemy Lagus took Egypt in the South

11:5 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 prophecy narrows down to the conflict between the Egyptian and Syrian remains of Alexander's empire. The two major powers are starting to come to the fore: the Seleucids, his kings of the north (Syria), and the Ptolemies, his kings of the south (Egypt), who had the stronger kingdom early in the fourth century. The strong king of the south is almost certainly

Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283-246 B.C.), who extended his territories at the expense of Antiochus I who was having trouble securing the Seleucid throne (ca.280-279 B.C.). The prince was his successor, Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 B.C.), who proved to be an even stronger ruler.

"**dominion...dominion**" although we have two different Hebrew words here, they are almost the same word, so it is not very noteworthy to note the different Hebrew words used for the same English word here.

"King of the South" Generally, the Kings of the South would be the Ptolomies while the Kings of the North would be the Seleucids.

11:6 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.

Antiochus II Theos repudiated his first wife, Laodicea, in order to marry the daughter of Ptolemy II, Berenice, bringing about a short-lived alliance referred to above. Antiochus II soon returned to his first wife and poor Berenice and her young son were killed.

"**And the daughter of the king of the south**" Bernice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus

"**Shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement**" Married to Antiochus Theos of Syria after putting away his former wife, Laodice, and to disinherit her children.

"**But she shall not retain the strength of her arm, neither shall he stand, nor his arm, but she shall be given up and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in those times**." Ptolemy died two years afterwards. Antiochus restored Laodice and put away Bernice. He was then poisoned by Laodice. Bernice fled with her children to Daphne where she was killed.

11:7 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:

Ptolemy III was Bernice's brother. He inflicted a heavy defeat on the Seleucids in what is now known as the 3rd Syrian War (246-241 B.C.), taking the Seleucid capital at Antioch and having free reign in the area, only to be brought back to Egypt by a revolt.

"**But out of a Shoot from her roots shall one stand up in his place**," Ptolemy Euergotes, brother of Bernice

"**Who shall come unto the army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north**," Seleucus Callinicus

"**And shall deal against them, and shall prevail**:" He conquered most of Syria

11:8 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.

Almost contemporaneously, Seleucus II Callinicus began his reign in Syria (247-226 B.C.). It was he who suffered the defeat, being forced into a peace confirming Ptolemy III's newly won possessions.

"of silver and of gold" Ptolemy Euergotes, brother of Bernice, who carried away 40,000 talents of silver and 2500 precious vessels from Syria.

"**He shall continue more years than the king of the north**." He reigned for 25 years, four more years than Seleucus.

11:9 So the king of the south shall come into *his* kingdom, and shall return into his own land.

Daniel tells us that Seleucus II attempted to regain his possessions: It was at this time that Antiochus Hierax, the brother of Seleucus II, attempted to win the throne, so Seleucus II was forced to return home to deal with this strife.

11:10 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 fortunes of Seleucus II's sons, first Seleucus III Ceraunus (226-223 B.C.) then Antiochus III (223-187 B.C.) are then taken up. In 218 Antiochus III the Great, who had, through great effort, rebuilt and strengthened the Seleucid empire, took his forces all the way to Ptolemais, retaking all the territories lost to the late Ptolemy III Euergetes, succeeded by Ptolemy IV Philopator (226-204 B.C.).

"**And his sons shall war**," Probably Seleucus Ceranus and Antichus the Great, sons of Seleucus Callinicus

"**And shall assemble a multitude of great forces, which shall come on, and overflow, and pass through**" Seleucus died and Antichus (age 15) pressed the war.

11:11 And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth and fight with him, *even* with the king of the north: and he shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand.

"**And the king of south shall be moved with choler**" Ptolemy Philopator

"**choler**" the hithpalpel form suggests he angers or enrages himself.

"**and shall come forth and fight with him, even with the king of the north; and he shall set forth a great multitude, and the multitude shall be given into his hand**. Battle at Rapna victory over Antiochus in 217 B.C.

11:12 *And* when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down *many* ten thousands: but he shall not be strengthened *by it*.

"**lifted up**" in pride.

"**And the multitude shall be lifted up, and his heart shall be exalted; and he shall cast down tens of thousands, but he shall not prevail**." His people were dissatisfied at peace made with Antiochus. And this military victory gives no benefit as a result.

"**ten thousands**" a Hebrew expression signifying a great multitude, not an exact number. Biblical Hebrew did not have words for “millions” or “billions” so it will use “thousands” or “thousands of thousands” or “ten thousands”.

11:13 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.

Ptolemy IV responded quickly the following year at Rafia (217 B.C.). Antiochus III lost at Rafia, but this was only a setback, for he was soon organizing his next move.

11:14 And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall.

Here Daniel first talks about the Jews. There seems to be a legendary account of these events in the first chapters of 3 Maccabees, which tells us that after the victory at Rafia, Ptolemy IV went to Jerusalem to make a sacrifice and attempted to enter the Temple. Despite resistance, he probably got his way -- if this is what Daniel is referring to.

"**thy people**" the Jews.

"**And in those times there shall many stand up**" Philip of Macedon who conspired with Antiochus. Also Scopas the Aetolian, the army commander, foiled by Aristomenes, the prime minister and Agathocles who excited a rebellion in Egypt against the king of the south, Ptolemy Epiphanes.

"**also the children of the violent among thy people shall lift themselves up to establish the vision; but they shall fall**." The Jews would rebel against Egypt but not gain independence.

11:15 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.

"**So the king of the north shall come**" Antiochus the Great

"**and cast up a mount, and take a well fortified city: and the forces of the south shall not stand**," Scopas, a general of Ptolemy defeated at Paneas 198 B.C.

"**fenced cities**" walled or otherwise fortified cities.

"**cast up a mount**" besiege the city by building a ramp up one wall in an attempt to scale it.

"**neither his chosen people**," His best hand-picked men

11:16 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.

Now we start moving into the activity of the Antichrist, prophetically, through the activities of Antiochus.

1. He does according to his own will
2. None shall stand before him, or shall be able to withstand him
3. He enters the "glorious land", which is Israel, which he shall consume.

Taking advantage of the instability in Egypt after the death of Ptolemy IV, Antiochus the Great moved against Egypt and by 202 BC he had taken Gaza, the "well-fortified city", returning all the possessions previously lost and going further than any Seleucid previously. He then consolidated his position a few years later defeating the Ptolemies again at Panion. It was around this time that Judaea came under the power of the Seleucids: this is probably what is referred to with his standing "in the glorious land".

"**But he that cometh against him**" Antiochus the Great against Scopas.

"**glorious land**" Israel.

11:17 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.

"**upright ones**" faithful Jews (and probably other associated Gentiles in the tribulation period) who refuse to compromise with the ungodly forces and influences of their day. In this day, these were the ones who withstood the Greek influence the Syrians were trying to impose upon the Jews. In the Tribulation, these "**upright ones**" will be faithful in their opposition to the Antichrist.

"**and he shall give him the daughter of women, to corrupt her**;" Cleopatra given to Ptolemy Epiphanes, son of Ptolemy Phillopator.

"**but she shall not stand, neither be for him**." She did not stand with her father's designs.

11:18 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.

In order to legitimate these conquests in the eyes of the world -- and especially Rome who was starting to take an interest in Seleucid affairs -- Antiochus III attempted to forge an alliance with Egypt by marrying his daughter, Cleopatra I (called Sira), to the young Ptolemy V Epiphanes (204-180 B.C.), though this arrangement proved to be unsuccessful. Antiochus turned his hopes toward Asia Minor and the Aegean coastlands, leading him into direct confrontation with Roman

interests in the area (note the reference to commander = consol) and bringing him a humiliating defeat at Magnesia in 190 B.C., which left him enormous reparations to pay.

"**After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many**:" war with the Romans.

"**but a prince shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease**;" Scipio Asiaticus (Roman), brother of Scipio Africanus who fought against Hannibal.

"**yea moreover, he shall cause his reproach to turn upon him**." Complete overthrow of Antiochus the great in battle of Magnesia, 190 B. C. He was compelled even to give his son, Epiphanes, as hostage and to pay the Romans tribute.

11:19 Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land: but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found.

Antiochus III's end was extremely bitter, having to find money and losing all hopes of empire. Antiochus the Great was killed while attempting to rob a temple in Elymais, to pay the Romans.

11:20 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.

He was succeeded by his son, Seleucus IV Philopator (187-175 B.C.), the eldest son of Antiochus the Great, under whom Heliodorus was an official, who 2 Maccabees 3:7-40 tells us tried to rob the temple.

"**raiser of taxes**" This is not a good connotation for politicians and other civil servants to raise taxes! Rome required Seleucus IV Philopator to render tribute, so he was forced to raise taxes to come up with the money.

The Hebrew word (Strong's #5065 nagas; to press, drive, oppress, exact, exert demanding pressure; (Qal) to press, drive, to exact, driver, taskmaster, ruler, oppressor, tyrant, lord, exactor of tribute (participle); (Niphal) to be hard pressed) equates taxes with oppression, so he who raises taxes is an oppressor and an evil man. And how accurate, as modern taxes are a very useful tool for Statist oppression and social change.

"**that shall cause an exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom**" A raiser of taxes who sought to appropriate the wealth of the temple to help pay the Roman tribute.

"**but within few days he shall be destroyed**," His reign was only about 11 years.

"**neither in anger nor in battle**." He was poisoned by Holiodorus.

11:21 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.

Demetrius, the son of Seleucus IV, was sent to Rome as a hostage in exchange for Antiochus IV (175-163 B.C.), another son of Antiochus the Great. On Seleucus IV's sudden death, Antiochus IV aided by the king of Pergamum took the throne at the loss of Demetrius.

“vile person” in type, has to be the Antichrist. Historically, this “vile person” is Antiochus Epiphanes.

"**And in his place shall stand up a contemptible person**", Antiochus Epiphanes (the "Illustrious")(175-163 B.C.), who had been freed by the Romans and replaced by Demetrius, son of Seleucius Philopator, seized the throne.

"**to whom they had not given the honor of the kingdom:**" The true heir of the throne was Demetrius. Applied to the Antichrist, this suggests that his rise to power was illegitimate, in that he was a schemer and a climber who does not "earn" his position but rather seizes it. The Antichrist will have to take the honor he wants but is not given him.

Antichrist applications:

1. He is a vile person.
2. He will not be given the honor of the kingdom
3. He comes in peaceably
4. He obtains the kingdom by flatteries

“obtain the kingdom by flatteries” This is how 99% of politicians get into power.

11:22 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.

Daniel doesn't supply much background to help us understand the following events, but the indications given are rather interesting. Antiochus IV was a vigorous king who proved successful in his early years. It was on his succession to the thrown that Onias III the high priest in Jerusalem -- almost unanimously acknowledged as the prince of the covenant of this passage -- was found in Antioch. The unfortunate Onias was not permitted to return home, but was replaced with his brother, Jason (Yeshua?), who seems to have offered suitable bribes to gain the office of high priest. (2 Maccabees 4:30-34 tells us that Onias III was killed three years later at the instigation of Menelaus.)

This indication of Onias III is intriguing especially when considered in the light of the earlier reference to Jerusalem at the time of Ben Sira's lauded high priest Simon (BS 50:1-24) who doesn't even warrant a mention here. Suddenly there is a covenant and it has a prince. This stirs comparison with the covenant of the Dead Sea Scrolls which seems to have flowered with the same sort of rapidity.

11:23 And after the league *made* with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people.

With Jason and his supporters in control in Jerusalem, Daniel continues. (Daniel supplies no indications of the leaders of the small people - the pro-Seleucid junta in control of Jerusalem -, but it was around this time that Jason was replaced by Menelaus, probably because he offered more financial support to Antiochus IV, and the Seleucids were in need of cash.)

"**And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully**;" Antiochus repudiated pledges of Coelo-Syria and Palestine to Egypt to Ptolemy Lagus by treaty in 301 B.C. and Antiochus the Great, in dowry of Cleopatra as queen of Egypt.

"**for he shall come up, and shall become strong, with a small people**." Antiochus gradually took over Egypt with a small force.

Antichrist applications:

1. A "league" is mentioned, probably the 7-year treaty he makes with Israel. He no sooner signs it than he sets out of undermine it and use it for his own ends.
2. He conquers with a rather small force.

11:24 He shall enter peaceably 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.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes continued in the steps of his father, attempting to enlarge his kingdom and gain money.

"**fattest places**" the best, most productive places and areas.

"**his fathers**..." With context to the Antichrist, he will probably be an apostate and atheistic Jew, a racial Jew but certainly not a religious one.

11:25 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.

"**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 war in battle**" Ptolemy Physcon.

11:26 Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow: and many shall fall down slain.

Inevitably he returned to the ever-present Egyptian danger. Antiochus IV invaded the Nile delta capturing Ptolemy VI Philometer (180-145 B.C.). Ptolemy VII Euergetes II took power in Alexandria and had some success, till Antiochus IV took the side of Ptolemy VI, gaining good advantage

"**Yea they that eat of his dainties shall destroy him**," Antiochus held the rightful heir, Ptolemy Philometor, and fostered discontent against Ptolemy Physcon.

"**and his army shall overflow**;" No effective control against Antiochus

11:27 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.

Daniel suggests that there is a more complicated story here.

"**shall speak lies**..." How very much like politicians and military leaders! Of course, the Antichrist will be a master at this game of deception. Antiochus represented Ptolemy Philometor as the rightful king to weaken the power of Ptolemy Physcon.

"**And as for both these kings**," Antiochus and Ptolemy Philometor, who he controlled. their hearts shall be to do mischief,

11:28 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.

Antiochus IV then returned to Antioch with his spoils, perhaps paying a passing visit to Jerusalem.

The will that he worked against the **holy covenant** isn't indicated in the few sources that tell us about the period. Yet, here again we have the covenant, this time it's clarified as "the holy covenant", as though what came before the covenant was relatively inconsequential, for it didn't warrant comment. Prophetically, it probably refers to the seven-year covenant the Antichrist signs with Israel. A "**holy covenant**" signed by the unholy Man of Sin?

"**Then shall he return into his land with great substance**;" Antiochus had conquered Memphis, plundered its wealth and left Ptolemy Philometor in control of lower Egypt.

11:29 At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

Antiochus IV tried his luck again against the Egyptians here and in Daniel 11:30a. Whereas in the earlier expedition Rome showed little interest, the times had changed and Antiochus was given an ultimatum to retire from Egypt. Still in debt with the Romans and unwilling to incur their enmity, he was obliged to leave his gains. It should be noted that the reference to Kittim here is unlike the earlier biblical references that referred to Cyprus: here it obviously refers to Rome, making another connection between Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

"**At the time appointed he shall return, and come into the south; but it shall not be in the latter time as it was in the former**." Ptolemy Philometor, who Antiochus had left in Egypt, joined with his brother, Ptolemy Physcon and they obtained help from abroad.

"**At the time appointed**" Since one of the major themes of Daniel is the sovereignty of God over the political affairs of men, this must be God's appointed time, not the time decided upon by the Antichrist. God is still pulling his strings, even if the Antichrist thinks that he is doing his own will. But even the Antichrist cannot function independently from the overall will and plan of God.

11:30 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.

"**For ships of Chittim shall come against him**;" The Romans, who controlled the islands threatened to intervene.

"**Chittim**" Cyprus.

"**therefore he shall be grieved, and shall return**," On his return from Egypt.

"**and have indignation against the holy covenant, and shall do his pleasure: he shall even return, and have regard unto them that forsake the holy covenant**." He placed Jews in power who were backed him. These would be apostate Jews for the righteous ones would not back such a man. No doubt some of the more secular and carnal Jews will support the Antichrist to the hilt while the more godly of them will have serious and deep suspicions about the Antichrist.

Prophetically, we see the justification for the Antichrist in breaking the seven-year covenant he will make with Israel and some of the unfaithful, apostate Jews, who will support the Antichrist.

11:31 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.

It was at this time that Jason, probably with support from Hyrcanus Tobiad, tried to make a comeback in Jerusalem. Antiochus IV, returning from Egypt, enraged by his losses and by Jason's action imposed his will on Jerusalem. Probably Jason's attempt to regain power made Antiochus realize that proceedings in Jerusalem weren't going to succeed in the hands of those in power at the time, so he decided to tackle the problem forcefully. 1 Maccabees 1:54 tells us that this happened on the fifteenth day of Chislev, 167 B.C.

"**And forces shall stand on his part, and they shall profane the sanctuary, even the fortress**," Apollonius, the commander, polluted the holy city.

"**and shall take away the continual burnt-offering, and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate**." Atheneaus dedicated the temple to Jupiter, set up a pagan altar and sacrificed to Jupiter. The Jewish offerings were prohibited. A pig was sacrificed on the altar. Antiochus' soldiers, aided by apostate Jews, took control of the temple, halted all worship, while others attacked Jerusalem on the Sabbath. The soldiers desecrated the temple, banned circumcision and the daily offerings (1 Maccabees 1:44-54). The Syrians even erected a statue of Zeus in the temple.

Prophetically, this verse is clearly pointing to the Abomination of Desolation of Matthew 24:15. This is where the Antichrist will re-enter the rebuilt Jerusalem temple, declare himself to be God (or Israel's true messiah) and abominate the Temple by his own very presence as he will no doubt go into the Holy of Holies. Israel, who may have been inclined to follow him up to this point, by virtue of the seven-year covenant the Antichrist makes with Israel in guaranteeing their security, will then reject the antichrist, who then will turn on Israel, breaking the covenant half-way through, and seek to destroy Israel for their rejection of him.

11:32 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*.

"**but the people that know their God shall be strong, and do exploits**." Judas Maccabeus ("the hammer") and his family. Prophetically, this will refer to the faithful Jewish remnant that will resist the Antichrist- to the death. Their resistance against the Antichrist will be the greatest

ever witnessed by man. There will be those unfaithful Jews who shall "**do wickedly against the covenant**" (not the covenant with the Antichrist but the covenants between Israel and God) who will fall out to the Antichrist and who will be corrupted by him. But those Jews who remain faithful to God during the Tribulation persecutions will resist the Antichrist valiantly.

11:33 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.

Antiochus IV proceeded to turn Jerusalem into a Hellenistic center, not only culturally, but religiously as well. Antiochus tried to stimulate people to turn toward the pagan religious practices, and persecuted those who didn't. This was part of his attempt to destroy Judaism once and for all, by replacing it with Greek religion and philosophy. Hitler never tried that- he just tried to destroy Israel once and for all, not to convert them or to replace them.

One could imagine Antiochus, who was brought up in Rome and by no means an uncultured man, finding the culture of these hard-headed and "bigoted" people in Jerusalem who had been causing so many problems backward and the probable cause of their discontent. His may have been a misguided attempt to improve the life of people in Jerusalem. He may have thought that his Grecian philosophy was so much more superior than this "backward" and "ignorant" Judaism that the Jews would welcome the "new order" he would bring and was personally offended when they rejected it. A man as vain as Antiochus would have taken that rejection personally. To reject his religion, philosophy and way of life was to reject HIM.

The term "**wise**" in this verse and that which follows is in Hebrew *"maskilim"*, instructors, teachers (of wisdom) and is found often in the Dead Sea Scrolls, e.g. Damascus Document XIII, 5, translated as "overseer" or "inspector". Another important term that Daniel uses relates to the flattery of those who take the wrong direction, found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, for example in the Pesher Nahum, in the form *"dorshei chalaqot"*, the "flattery seekers".

The Jews, they will still suffer greatly under the heavy hand of the Antichrist in the Tribulation. Their reward will not be in this life but in the next, if they remain faithful unto death. Their persecutions will include:

1. Death by the sword.
2. Death by the flame- burning at the stake, which has always been popular among those who persecute God's people.
3. Captivity- imprisonment, "concentration camps".
4. By spoil. Some may be sold off into slavery.

"Thus there were, we apprehend, three classes of Jews; first, the mass who were corrupted by flatteries; secondly, the faithful remnant, who refused to renounce their observance of the law of their God; and lastly, some among the remnant who, as taught of God, were able to instruct them in the word."[98]

11:34 Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries.

There will be some people and nations who will try to help Israel in the Tribulation, as there are some sheep nations at the Judgment of the Nations in Matthew 25. But this help will be meager and probably half-hearted, since "**many will cleave to them (Israel) with flatteries**" instead of

98 Edward Dennett, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles*.

trying to really help. They want to be on Israel's good side but also don't want to offend the political might of the Antichrist, so they play both sides of the fence. One wonders where the United States in the Tribulation fits into all this. Will we be one of the few nations trying to aid Israel of will we simply be offering "**flatteries**"?

"holpen" an archaic form of "helped". It is from the Middle English "holpen", "yholpen" from Old English "ġeholpen", past participle of helpan "to help".

11:35 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.

The text is remarkably accurate, and we are left thinking that the more obscure parts of this chapter probably hide real historical events, and it is only when the writer moves into real prediction that his account goes wrong, i.e., when he attempts to deal with the events after the time of writing, including the death of Antiochus IV which he gets completely wrong (see Daniel 11:40ff).

It is possible from Daniel's interest in the holy covenant that suddenly blooms with Onias III that we may be dealing with the birth of the movement embodied in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Jewish "enemy" in Daniel 11:34 was strongly linked to flattery. The leaders of those who were faithful in Daniel 11:32-35 were *maskilim*. Some of the later verses here can be paralleled with events narrated in the opening of the War Scroll, and the movement he refers to led by the wise, which marks the start of resistance against Antioch and their Jewish representatives in Jerusalem, reflects the disinherited sentiments found in a number of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

"to purge, and to make *them* white" The Tribulation persecutions of Israel serves to strengthen and purify this godly remnant. They will not compromise but they must either stand fast or die. We wonder how much of this steadfastness among the Jews in the tribulation was planted there by the earlier ministry of the 144,000.

"**time of the end**" The second coming.

11:36 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 question then arises, Is it the same as the little horn of chapter 7? He certainly has the same character of self-aggrandizement and blasphemy, and it would seem that he is the wicked one of 2 Thess. 2. In Dan. 7:26, the dominion is considered as his, though he be not the beast, because we are in connection with Jews. It was he persecuted the saints. One would be led to think that the second beast of Rev. 13 is the same personage.[99] The first beast having the public
corporate imperial power of the West set up by Satan as the vessel of power, and subsequently object of adoration. God being abandoned, it is no wonder, no more than the emperors did before, only apostasy will do it more decidedly."[100]

99 I think Darby would identify this "second beast" as the Antichrist, not the False Prophet (third beast).
100 John Nelson Darby, *Notes and Comments* volume 4.

"And the king shall do according to his will;" The Antichrist will enjoy some degree of sovereignty during his tenure, probably more than any human king or dictator, has ever enjoyed.

"The appellation of the "willful king" is derived from this scripture, expressive of the fact here stated, that his own will is his only law. He will be the incarnation and manifestation of all that is evil in man....He will be consequently the perfect contrast, morally, to Christ, who, being in the form of God, did not think it robbery to be equal with God, but emptied Himself, and having taken upon Him the form of a servant, humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."[101]

"he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god" Part of the self-deception of the Antichrist is thinking that he is God. He will exalt himself over every false god, as well as against the true God. Both Antiochus and Antichrist would be guilty of this, but the Antichrist more.

"shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods," His blasphemy against God. There will be no blasphemy too vile that he will not utter and promote. The Antichrist will open up new vistas of blasphemy and sin never seen or imagined before.

"shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished" For the seven-year tribulation ("the indignation") period that is appointed to him.

"**indignation**" Another title for the Tribulation, as it will be the period of God's indignation against the Gentile world government that is one of the themes of Daniel.

"for that that is determined shall be done" Determined by the will of God, not by the will of the Antichrist. He will think he is his "own man" and is sovereign in what he does in the tribulation, but what he does has already been prophesied by God over 2500 years before it happened! What he does is only allowed because God is allowing him to do it in order to fulfill God's plan for the ages, for Israel and for the Gentile world powers, not to fulfill the lusts of the Antichrist. Down deep, he probably knows that but would never acknowledge it.

11:37 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.

"Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers" The Antichrist will have no respect for the God of Israel, or the religion and faith of his fathers. He will be a non-observant apostate Jew. He will be his own god, and will not need any other, or external gods, nor acknowledge them.

"nor the desire of women" While the Antichrist could be a homosexual, it is not necessary for him to be one to fulfill this. All this could mean is that he has no time for love or family in his quest for total power and godhood. He would not be below using women to further his plans, but loving a woman is totally out of the question, since he knows he has a short time to complete his plans for total conquest. He is too busy with his own glory to have any love for a woman or to start a family. He is totally obsessed and fixated on his own plans and glory to have any thoughts about a domestic life.

Sodomites are always bragging about how many great historical figures were homosexual. They can probably add the Antichrist to that list. It would make sense, seeing how powerful and influential the Sodomite and Transgender communities are today.

---

101 Edward Dennett, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles.*

"nor regard any god" Except himself, which is the only god the Antichrist will recognize. He needs no other god, or religion, but his own and himself.

"for he shall magnify himself above all" Above all men and gods, including the One True God. He will imagine himself to be greater than all, even the God of glory, Whom he has set himself against.

11:38 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.

"**god of forces**" The god of war, might and power. Power and might are the "gods" of the Antichrist and is the one external force that he will worship and honor. Even his "peace program" is based on force, attack, blackmail and deception. Yet this created "god" is something that his fathers would be totally ignorant of and would have never recognized or honored.

But might this "forces" be something different, as a control of natural forces, such as electromagnetic forces, which the Antichrist will claim- or be able- to control? Why not? If he has the power to work miracles, then he would have the ability to control some of the forces of nature.

AV	ESV	LSV
38 But in his estate shall he honour the **God of forces:** and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.	38 He shall honor the god of fortresses instead of these. A god whom his fathers did not know he shall honor with gold and silver, with precious stones and costly gifts.	38 "But instead he will honor a god of fortresses, a god whom his fathers did not know; he will honor *him* with gold, silver, costly stones, and desirable things.

"**forces**" The ESV and LSV have "fortresses". What is that supposed to mean? The Bibles before the King James (Wycliffe's Bible, the Geneva, and the Bishops') simply give a transliteration of the Hebrew word translated "**forces**" by the King James: "the god Mauzzim," which tells the reader nothing

11:39 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 Antichrist will acknowledge a god, but only one that he creates and can control, and that is no threat to his own delusions of godhood.

"shall divide the land for gain." The Antichrist has plans for the land of Israel and none of them are good. He will seize control of the land, seek to destroy Israel from off of it and also seek some form of profit as well. "Divide and conquer…then annihilate" is his plan for Israel.

There may be a cross-reference to Ezekiel 38:13 **"Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?"**

11:40 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.

"at the time of the end" The end of the Tribulation period, near the Second Coming.

"shall the king of the south push at him" An attack upon the Antichrist, probably led by Egypt.

"the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind" Probably a coordinated attack upon the Antichrist along with the King of the South. Might this be Russia, Turkey or Syria, launching a military invasion of Antichrist-held territory in Israel? It may be a classic "pincher" move, attacking from opposite sides at the same time, thereby forcing him to fight a "two-front war", as Germany had to do in both world wars.

"with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships" The ships may be literal (naval engagements), but the chariots and horsemen may be prophetic language. After all, Daniel knows nothing of airplanes, tanks, or anything else of modern warfare. This may be prophetic language for ground forces, although it is certainly possible that literal mounted cavalry could be used for this military action.

"he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over." This military attack upon the Antichrist will be unsuccessful, as the Antichrist will still be able to expand his military power and influence, despite this two-front attack.

11:41 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.

Somehow, Edom, Moab and Ammon (corresponding roughly to Jordan and maybe northern Saudi Arabia geographically) will escape destruction by the Antichrist, maybe because they will be allied unto him in his genocide against Israel, or that he simply doesn't have time to deal with them or they are not important enough for him to worry about.

"glorious land" Israel. The Antichrist enters it in preparation for a final assault against Jerusalem, setting up Armageddon.

11:42 He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape.

The Antichrist has it in for Egypt since the Egyptians attacked him- and failed. He will settle scores against the countries who dared to oppose him.

11:43 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.

The Antichrist will end up controlling the Egyptian economy, and probably will loot the country to finance his campaign against Israel.

The Libyans and Ethiopians will also come under the power of the Antichrist, since they were probably allied with Egypt in their unsuccessful attack against the Antichrist.

11:44 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.

This troubling news comes from the east (A Chinese-Japanese-Korean-Indian alliance moving westward to challenge the Antichrist?) and the north (Russia?). With all this military movement directed against him, the Antichrist acts quickly, lashing out at his enemies and Israel as quickly as he can before he is forced to confront these latest threats.

"make away many" and older phrase meaning "take away many (captive)." This is not a typographical error ("make"). It is Strong's #2763 charam; to ban, devote, destroy utterly, completely destroy, dedicate for destruction, exterminate; (Hiphil) to prohibit (for common use), ban, to consecrate, devote, dedicate for destruction, to exterminate, completely destroy; (Hophal) to be put under the ban, be devoted to destruction, be forfeited, to be completely destroyed, to split, slit, mutilate; (Qal) to mutilate. The Antichrist will gain many prisoners of war and carry them away captive.

11:45 And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

When the Antichrist falls, none of his "allies" will be there to render him any aid or assistance. He will meet his doom unlamented.

"glorious holy mountain" Jerusalem.

Daniel Chapter 12

Time periods mentioned in Daniel 12:
1. Time of trouble, 1
2. Same time, 1
3. That time (used twice in verse 1)
4. Time of the end, 4,9
5. The end, 6,8,13
6. A time, times and a half, 7
7. 1290 days, 11
8. 1335 days, 12
9. End of days, 13

16. The Tribulation and Beyond 12:1-3

12:1 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.

"At that time" The time of the Day of the Lord, the Battle of Armageddon.

"Michael" Who is the "patron angel" of the Israel (Daniel 10:13,21). He's a **"great prince"** or an angel of high standing and great power, since he is an "archangel" (Jude 9).

"stand up" Although nothing is directly indicated in Revelation 19 that Michael will have a direct role to play at Armageddon, Daniel says he will "stand up" at this time, on behalf of Israel, so he will do something important at the Second Coming.

"**children of thy people"** Israel.

"and there shall be a time of trouble…" The entire Tribulation is a time of such trouble, but it all comes to a climax at Armageddon, a military battle so large that the world has never seen anything like it. Besides the prophecies of the birth of Christ, the Battle of Armageddon is the primary prophetic theme of the Old Testament.

> 1. Jeremiah 30:7 "**Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it**."
> 2. Joel 2:11 "**And the LORD shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the LORD is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?"**

"and at that time thy people shall be delivered…" All Israel shall be saved (Romans 11:26). Those Jews who survived the Tribulation will be saved at the Second Coming (Matthew 24:13 "**But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved**."). Israel's salvation from both the Antichrist and the Gentile world powers will come at Armageddon, specifically at the Second Coming of Christ in Revelation 19, when Christ will destroy the Antichrist, his armies, and break the power of Gentile world power.

"every one that shall be found written in the book." This is the Book of Life, first mentioned by Moses (Exodus 32:32 "**Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written**."). This Book contains the name of every person ever born. At death or at some point in their life, if that person dies lost without his sin question settled, his name is blotted out of that Book. At the Great White Throne Judgment, a search will be made of this Book for the name of the condemned soul. When the name has been blotted out (and thus missing), that soul will be condemned to an eternity in the Lake of Fire. It makes us wonder if there will be a "blank space" where that deleted name was, to demonstrate that salvation was possible and available to that soul, but through his rejection of the truth, the name was removed but the space remained.

The name of everyone ever born is written in this book at birth, showing the Calvinist teaching of "unconditional election" is unscriptural. The Calvinist maintains that some men are born elect and the rest are non-elect, or reprobate. This is determined before birth, at the election before the foundation of the world. But if this is true, then why would God write the names of reprobates into His Book if He knows that they will be removed later? Why go to that effort? The very presence of the name in the Book shows that every person has a chance, or an opportunity to be saved at some point in his life, which also is contrary to this Calvinistic teaching. The truth is there is no doctrine of reprobation. Every person ever born has an opportunity for salvation by the fact that their name is in the Book. Their name is not removed from the Book until after death or some point in their life that God removes their name in condemnation and judgment. So this doctrine overthrows a key Calvinistic teaching, since "reprobates" have their names in the Book of Life, only to be blotted out later.

The cross-references regarding the Book of Life are:

1. Exodus 32:32,33 "**Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the LORD said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book**."
2. Psalm 69:28 **"Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous."**
3. Daniel 7:10 "**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**."
4. Daniel 12:1 "**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**."
5. Luke 10:20 "**Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven**."
6. Philippians 4:3 "**And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellowlaborers, whose names are in the book of life."**
7. Hebrews 12:23 "**To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect**,"
8. Revelation 13:8 "**And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."**
9. Revelation 3:5 "**He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels."**

10. Revelation 13:8 "**And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."**
11. Revelation 17:8 "**The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is."**
12. Revelation 20:12,15 "**And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works…And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."**
13. Revelation 21:27 **"And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life."**

12:2 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.

"sleep in the dust of the earth" Those who are dead, as death is often likened to sleep in the Bible. Of course, this gives no basis to the false doctrine of soul sleep. This also is a reminder of the universality of physical death, even the righteous. Their physical bodies may decay but that would not prevent their bodily resurrection. That also applies to the unrighteous dead. Some may insist their bodies be cremated and their ashes scattered in the vain hope that God would not be able to reconstitute them for a resurrection and a judgment but that will be no impediment to the Lord in that day.

"shall awake" Resurrection. Both the first resurrection of the just and second resurrection of the wicked are in view here.

"some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" The resurrections are split into two separate events. We do see the two classes of the resurrected- some who awake to everlasting life (the righteous) and some who awake to shame and everlasting contempt (the unrighteous). The "when" of these resurrections are not given here and this verse must be compared to other verses dealing with the resurrections, else one may fall into the trap of teaching the error of a General Resurrection, a doctrine not supported by Scripture.

But when does this resurrection take place? We have the resurrection of the just at the rapture. We have the resurrection of the wicked at the Great White Throne. What about the resurrection of the Tribulation Righteous? The Tribulation Wicked will be raised with the rest of the wicked at the Great White Throne, but it would seem there is another resurrection, one of the Tribulation Righteous at the end of the Tribulation period, probably in that 75-day period between the Second Coming and the establishment of the Millennial kingdom.

12:3 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.

"wise" Same idea as the righteous, the ones who understand spiritual things.

AV	ESV	LSV
3 And they that be **wise** shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.	3 And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky above; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.	3 "And those who have insight will shine brightly like the brightness of the expanse *of heaven*, and those who lead the many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.

"**wise"** is much better than "have insight". Also see Daniel 12:10.

"shall shine as the brightness of the firmament" A definite heavenly meaning here, maybe relating to a special glory these wise righteousness ones will enjoy in heaven. It will be very interesting to witness the literal fulfillment of this!

"and they that turn many to righteousness" Includes the evangelization of both saint and sinner. It is obvious that evangelization of the lost can be seen here, as the "wise ones" would turn them from sin to righteousness. But many saints who are cold, indifferent, careless and backslidden must also be reclaimed by the "wise ones" and that is also a vital, if overlooked, ministry.

"stars forever and ever." Stars burn at extremely bright and powerful levels. The righteous, through the glory they shall enjoy, shall shine even brighter.

17. "Shut Up The Words" 12:4

12:4 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.

"shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end" The reason why earlier expositors had so much trouble with Daniel (and Revelation) is because the meaning and interpretation of these books was "shut up" until "the time of the end". As we get closer and closer to the Second Coming, these meanings and interpretations will be opened by God since these books must be properly understood by the generations leading up to these events. But earlier generations, who would not witness and live through these events, would not need the information. Historically, it looks like the Lord began to open these books around 1830 when the premillennial and dispensational methods of interpretation were rediscovered, mainly by the so-called "Plymouth Brethren", although other groups also were used by the Lord to recover these truths and crack the prophecies. Earlier than this, attempts to interpret Daniel and Revelation usually ended in frustration. Reformation-era commentators (and up to about 1830 or so) generally used a historicist method of interpretation of Daniel and Revelation that simply didn't work, which greatly limits the value of their works. I don't bother going to Luther or Calvin if I need comments on Daniel or Revelation. They had trouble in their interpretations since the books were still "sealed up", and it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to understand a divinely-sealed book.

"many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Two sure signs of the end-times:

1. An increase in movement and transportation. The 20th century has brought in mass- and easy transportation. People seem to be always on the move today, in constant

motion. Cars, trains, automobiles, make such movement possible, something unthought of in earlier generations. For an example, just look at the Cross Bronx Expressway in New York City. Or you can see the thousands of aircraft that are in the air on a daily basis.

2. A great increase in knowledge. The internet has opened up vast areas of knowledge to everyone. Entire libraries are on CDs and DVDs and even on your smartphone. The internet has multiplied the amount of knowledge that is available. It seems like everyone is going to college, including those who have no business going. Yet with such increases in knowledge has come no corresponding increases in wisdom or spirituality. This increase in knowledge just makes sinful man that much more arrogant and self-sufficient. You can observe this truth by talking about spiritual things and the Bible to freshmen and sophomores at any state university.

This sounds similar to Amos 8:12, where many will run to and fro in order to seek the word of the Lord, but in vain. But in these last days, the word of God will not be sought for diligently if at all. Men will seek after proofs for evolution, life in outer space, ways to discredit the Bible, the occult- anything but the truth. We have become very knowledgeable in certain areas of science but are still grossly ignorant about the truths of Scripture today. What Bob Jones Sr. observed is correct- "Education with salvation is damnation". We are the smartest, most knowledgeable generation in history and more men, percentage-wise, are going to hell today than ever before. What shall it profit a man if he walks on Mars but loses his own soul?

Second Timothy 3:7 also applies here as they will be forever learning yet never being able to come to the knowledge of the truth. We have more people in college today, yet we know nothing as a culture. We have more "doctors" in the church today (many of them with honorary degrees, or "synthetic sheepskins") yet knowledge of Scripture is at an all-time low. We have such men in our pulpits yet spiritual understanding and the possession of spiritual insight is practically non-existent.

"many shall run to and fro," is Strong's #7751 shuwt; to go, go or rove about, go to and fro; (Qal) to go or rove about; (Polel) to go to and fro, go eagerly or quickly to and fro; (Hithpolel) to run to and fro, to row. Ethelbert Bullinger thinks it has the idea of "to apostatize".[102]

18. Prophetic Time Frames 12:5-12

12:5 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.

These two men are probably angels. Notice they appears as men, without wings. People often mistake cherubs and seraphs (who both have wings) for angels.

12:6 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?

"wonders" Certainly, the prophecies Daniel has seen would qualify to be marvelous and wonderful things!

102 Companion Bible, page 1205.

12:7 And I heard the man clothe[e] in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swor by him that liveth forever that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.

"**it shall be for a time, times, and a half**" Three and one-half years, or 42 months or 1260 days.

"**when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished**." The Antichrist's nearly-successful attempt to destroy the nation of Israel, the "holy people".

12:8 And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?

12:9 And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

As we get closer to the time of the fulfillment of these events, our understanding of them will increase. This is seen in church history. During the Reformation period, there was little writing on prophetic themes. Luther and Calvin are practically worthless when they write of prophetic topics. That was not their burden, but rather, they concentrated on salvation by grace and related doctrines. God had not revealed anything in terms of prophecy because the time was not ready. As we moved into the 19th century, both the so-called Plymouth Brethren and the early Fundamentalist movement (through their Bible and Prophetic Conferences) began to study prophetic events intently and began to make sense of them. That is because they were 200-300 years closer to these events than the Reformers were. As the Lord tarries, our children and grandchildren may possess an even stronger and clearer insight to these prophecies than we do today. As I write this in 2025, we are probably (hopefully?) right at the door of the fulfillment of these prophecies, so our understanding of Daniel and Revelation would be much more advanced than even of those who wrote in the 19th century, including even those old Plymouth Brethren who did a lot of that early prophetical "leg work".

12:10 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.

The righteous Jews and Gentile will be dressed in white and purified after the tribulation and leading into the start of the millennial kingdom. This purification comes as a result of trouble. Tribulation and persecutions often drive us to our knees, and drives us closer to God. There is a ministry of trouble to the Christian and the more we suffer, the more we are purified.

1. Psalm 119:67 **"Before I was afflicted I went astray: but now have I kept thy word**."
2. Psalm 119:71 "**It is good for me that I have been afflicted; that I might learn thy statutes**."

They will possess a special and unique level of spiritual discernment, which they will need just to stay alive during the persecutions of the Antichrist. Most of the Gentile world will be fooled into believing The Lie that the Antichrist is God but the Jews and the other remaining Gentile

remnant must draw upon all of their spiritual resources and discernment to avoid being swept away by the strongest and most artful delusion of them all. These are the "wise" for God has given them spiritual understanding and they have accepted and believed what they received from God.

"the wicked shall do wickedly" Because:

1. It is their nature. They do wicked because they are wicked.
2. The do not understand the Scripture- 1 Corinthians 2:14- the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God

"none of the wicked shall understand" Isn't it amazing how the unsaved and the apostate cannot understand even the simplest of prophetic and theological truths? How many rail against a premillennial and a dispensational interpretation of prophecy simply because they cannot understand it. I have read many wild and grossly inaccurate critiques of dispensationalism, of how we neglect the Old Testament or how we all want the Jews to hurry up and get slaughtered at Armageddon so the Kingdom will hurry up and arrive and other related nonsense. Roman Catholics and Preterists (Covenant Theologians) are the worst offenders in this area. We do not expect an unsaved man to understand any of this, but we expect professing Christians to understand, even if they don't agree with it. We would expect that any criticisms of this theological and prophetic system of interpretation would at least be accurate and not based on violations of the ninth commandment.

The wicked do not understand because:

1. They have no desire to know. This is unimportant to them, as they are more concerned with "the babes, the bucks and the Buicks". They will not come to church, will not go to Bible studies and will not buy Biblical commentaries. God does not force-feed truth to anyone who has no desire for it.
2. They cannot know, even if they wanted to, as we already saw 1 Corinthians 2:14.

"but the wise shall understand" It shall require wisdom to live in this day and to learn how to deal with this age. There have been many times I save sat in my study, perplexed, as this age and its sins had me "up against the wall". I did not know how to respond, and I was not sure how to preach about it. I needed wisdom and God provided it as I asked for it (James 1:5 "**If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God**…") This age is so deep, so complex that divine wisdom is absolutely required to understand it and then how to deal with it.

Who are "the wise"? He fears God (Psalm 111:10; Proverbs 1:7; 9:10 all these verses say that the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom). He is a believer who fears God and who is in a right relation with God. He honors God, fears God, lives for God and who loves the Book. God will open up His secret (Psalm 25:14) to this man.

The wise will seek to understand three things:

1. The word of God
2. The will of God
3. The way of God

Remember, wisdom is not intelligence. One can be uneducated in a formal sense and yet still possess great wisdom in spiritual things. Simply because a man has an earned doctorate does not automatically qualify him as being a wise man, as wisdom is the ability to understand what you know and the ability to apply it properly.

12:11 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.

This is a difficult passage to interpret and apply, regarding the actual timing of the events from the Second Coming of Revelation 19 to the actual establishment of the Millennial Kingdom.

The daily sacrifice will be taken away at the Abomination of Desolation. The angel then identifies a period of 1290 days. The second half of the tribulation period, the 3 ½ years would be 1260 days. The tribulation itself would run 2520 days (7 prophetic years of 360 days each). We have then something happening 30 days after the Second Coming. What goes on this thirtieth day after the Second Coming? We are not specifically told but it would seem to perhaps mark the "official" end of the tribulation period.

12:12 Blessed *is* he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

"Blessed" The only beatitude in Daniel. This is reserved for the believer who actively is waiting and eagerly anticipating the return of the Lord. Only a pre-millennialist can qualify for this blessing, as neither the post-milllennalist or the a-millennialist are not expecting or anticipating the return of the Lord at any time or anytime soon.

Now we are talking about a period of 45 days from the end of the Tribulation (day 1290 as in 12:11). These total of 1335 days probably marks from the Abomination of Desolation to the establishment of the Millennial Kingdom. If so, we then have this chronological set-up of the Tribulation period:

DAY	EVENT
0	Rapture
1260	Abomination of Desolation
2520	Second Coming
2550	Official end of the Tribulation Period (second coming plus 30 days)
2595	Official start of the Millennial Kingdom (second coming plus 75 days)

The 45 days between Day 2550 and 2595 will probably be required by the Lord for the various judgments that He will have to conduct (such as the Judgment of the Nations of Matthew 25 and and the regathering and judgment of Israel in Ezekiel 20:34-38) and other "housekeeping" duties that will be required to set up the millennial kingdom. Remember, we are moving out of the most destructive period of human history and moving into what will prove to be the most blessed time in human history, so it will take a few weeks to make that transition!

It is possible that the events surrounding the Battle of Armageddon lasts about 30 days. It starts at the 1260 day make and is finished at the 1290-day mark. The resulting 45-day period could be required to set up the Kingdom.

We must also factor in Matthew 24:21 where the Lord said those days would be shortened. Whether the length of the days themselves would be shortened due to the severity of the tribulation judgments (the day going to 18 hours instead of 24) or the number of days are shortened (say, 1250 days instead of 1260) is not clear. But if the number of the days in the last

half of the tribulation are shortened, then the lay-out above would be off by a few days- how many we don't know.

These dates MUST be future and prophetic. Attempts by critics of Daniel to force this timeline into 165 B.C. or so and the days of Antiochus Epiphanes are ridiculous and cannot be made to work regardless of whatever historical and theological "sleight of hand" that may be used.

19. The Promise to Daniel 12:13

12:13 But go thou thy way till the end *be*: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

"But go thou thy way" In other words, don't worry about these prophecies, since they will not be fulfilled in your lifetime.

"for thou shalt rest" Daniel will die before these prophecies are fulfilled, but he will die the death of the righteous.

"**stand in thy lot at the end of the days.**" Daniel's promise of his participation in the Resurrection of the Just and in the Millennial Kingdom, where he will enjoy his Millennial inheritance. What a tremendous blessing this was to Daniel! He was specifically told that he was among the righteous who would stand with the righteous in that great day.

APPENDIX A- CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

From the servitude to Babylon to the dedication of the second temple.

(from *The Coming Prince* by Robert Anderson)

Jewish Year*	Kings of Babylon	Kings of Judah	Era of the Servitude	Era of the Captivity	Era of the Desolations	Events and Remarks
B.C. 606	20th year of Nabopolassar	3rd year of Jehoiakim (Eliakim)	1	-	-	The 3rd year of Jehoiakim, from 1st Nisan, 606, to 1st Nisan, 605. Jerusalemtaken by Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. i. 1, 2), see p. 231, *ante*. With this event the servitude to Babylon began, 490 years (or 70 weeks of years) after the establishment of the Kingdom under Saul. "The 4th year of Jehoiakim, that was the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar," *i.e.*, the year beginning 1st Nisan, 605 (Jer. xxv. 1).
605	Nebuchad nezzar	4	2	-	-	
604	2	5	3	-	-	Vision of the great image (Dan. ii).
603	3	6	4	-	-	-
602	4	7	5	-	-	-
601	5	8	6	-	-	-
600	6	9	7	-	-	-
599	7	10	8	-	-	-
598	8	11	9	1	-	

		3 months of Jehoiachin				This year included the 3 months' reign of Jehoiachin (Jeconiah), whose captivity began in the 8th year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv. 12).
597	9	Zedekiah	10	2	-	Reigned 11 years (2 Kings xxiv. 18).
596	10	2	11	3	-	-
595	11	3	12	4	-	-
594	12	4	13	5	-	Ezekiel began to prophesy in the 30th year from Josiah's Passover (2 Kings xxiii. 23), and the 5th year of the captivity (Ezek. i. 1,2.)
593	13	5	14	6	-	-
592	14	6	15	7	-	-
591	15	7	16	8	-	-
590	16	8	17	9	-	-
589	17	9	18	10	1	Jerusalem invested for the third time by Nebuchadnezzar, on the 10th day of Tebeth-- "the fast of Tebeth,"-- the epoch of the "Desolations"
588	18	10	19	11	2	"The 10th year of Zedekiah, which was the 18th year of Nebuchadnezzar" (Jer. xxxii. 1).
587	19	11	20	12	3	Jerusalem taken on the 9th day of the 4th month, and burnt on the 7th day of the 5th month in the 11th year of

						Zedekiah, and the 19th year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 2,3,8,9), called "The 12th year of our Captivity" in Ezek. xxxiii. 21, the news having reached the exiles on the 5th day of the 10th month.
586	20	-	21	13	4	-
585	21	-	22	14	5	-
584	22	-	23	15	6	-
583	23	-	24	16	7	-
582	24	-	25	17	8	-
581	25	-	26	18	9	-
580	26	-	27	19	10	-
579	27	28	20	11	-	-
578	28	29	21	12	-	-
577	29	30	22	13	-	-
576	30	31	23	14	-	-
575	31	32	24	15	-	-
574	32	33	25	16	-	The 25th year of the Captivity was the 14th (*inclusive,* as the Jews usually reckoned) from the destruction of Jerusalem (Ezek. xl. 1).
573	33	34	26	17	-	-
572	34	35	27	18	-	-
571	35	36	28	19	-	-
570	36	37	29	20	-	-

569	37	38	30	21	-	-
568	38	39	31	22	-	-
567	39	40	32	23	-	-
566	40	41	33	24	-	-
565	41	42	34	25	-	-
564	42	43	35	26	-	-
563	43	44	36	27	-	-
562	44	45	37	28	-	According to the Canon, the accession of Iluoradam (Evil-Merodach) was in the year beginning 1st Thoth (11th Jan.) B.C. 561. But the year 562 in this table is the Jewish year, i.e., the year preceding 1st Nisan (or about 5th April 561, and the 37th year of Jehoiachin's captivity was current till towards the close of that year. In this year Jehoiachin was "brought forth out of prison." (Jer. lii. 31).
561	Evil-Merodach	46	38	29	-	-
560	2	47	39	30	-	-
559	Neriglissar or Nergalsherezer	48	40	31	-	-
558	2	-	49	41	32	-
557	3	-	50	42	33	-
556	4	-	51	43	34	-
555	Nabonidus	-	52	44	35	The Nabonadius of the Canon is called

						Nabunnahit in the Inscriptions, and Labynetus by Herodotus.
554	2	-	53	45	36	-
553	3	-	54	46	37	-
552	4	-	55	47	38	-
551	5	-	56	48	39	-
550	6	-	57	49	40	-
549	7	-	58	50	41	-
548	8	-	59	51	42	-
547	9	-	60	52	43	-
546	10	-	61	53	44	-
545	11	-	62	54	45	-
544	12	-	63	55	46	-
543	13	-	64	56	47	-
542	14	-	65	57	48	-
541	15	-	66	58	49	In or before this year, Belshazzar (the Belsaruzur of the Inscriptions) became regent in the lifetime of his father, Nabonadius. Daniel's vision of the Four Beasts was in the 1st year, and his vision of the Ram and the Goat was in the 3rd year of Belshazzar (Dan. vii., viii.).
540	16	-	67	59	50	-
539	17	-	68	60	51	-
538	Darius (the Mede)	-	69	61	52	Babylon taken by Cyrus. Daniel's

						vision of the 70 weeks was in this year.
537	2	-	70	62	53	-
536	Cyrus	-	-	-	54	Decree of Cyrus authorizing the Jews to return to Jerusalem: end of the Servitude. (N.B. The 70th year of the Servitude was current till the 1st Nisan, 536.)
535	2	-	-	-	55	-
534	3	-	-	-	56	Year of Daniel's last vision (Dan. x.-xii.).
533	4	-	-	-	57	-
532	5	-	-	-	58	-
531	6	-	-	-	59	-
530	7	-	-	-	60	-
529	Cambyses	-	-	-	61	-
528	2	-	-	-	62	-
527	3	-	-	-	63	-
526	4	-	-	-	64	-
525	5	-	-	-	65	-
524	6	-	-	-	66	-
523	7	-	-	-	67	-
522	8	-	-	-	68	-
521	Darius I	-	-	-	69	Darius Hystaspes
520	2	-	-	-	70	End of the Desolations. The foundation of the Second Temple was laid on the 24th day of the 9th month in the 2nd

						year of Darius (Hag. ii. 18)
519	3	-	-	-	-	-
518	4	-	-	-	-	-
517	5	-	-	-	-	-
516	6	-	-	-	-	The Temple was finished on the 3rd day of Adar in the 6th year of Darius (Ezra vi. 15).
515	7	-	-	-	-	The Temple was dedicated at the Passover in Nisan 515 (Ezra vi. 15-22), 490 years after the dedication of Solomon's temple (B.C. 1005), and 70 years before the date of the edict to build the *city*.

Listing of Archaic Words

"**astonied**" "The word first appeared around 1350, Middle English 'astony', 'astone' from the Old French 'estoner' (to stun), from the Latin 'extonare', (to be thunder-struck).

'Astonied' means 'having received a severe personal devastation, and not being able to protect from it or even correct it'. All 10 occurrences of the word in the Bible deal with some negative event (Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language*, volume 1, pages 124-125)."

"choler" Great anger and indignation. "From the Middle English 'colre', from the French 'colere' meaning 'anger', from the Late Latin 'cholera' meaning 'bile'. Ancient physicians through the bile (the bitter liquid secreted by the liver) was what caused anger. The English word 'choleric' refers to an angry disposition. Thus 'choler' is a very bitter type of anger (Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language*, volume 1, page 232),"

"cogitations" Or "thoughts, meditations". "From Latin 'cogitatus, cogitare', from 'co-' 'together or with' + 'agitare' 'to stir or revolve' (we get our English word 'agitate' from 'agitare'.) + '-ation', 'state or condition.' Thus 'cogitations' are 'two or three times of having thought things over and over' (revolving them in the mind and having considered them from all angles) (Steven J. White, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language*, volume 1, pages 246-247)."

"cunning" From Middle English cunning, kunning, konnyng, alteration of earlier Middle English cunninde, kunnende, cunnand, from Old English *cunnende*, present participle of *cunnan* ("to know how to, be able to"), equivalent to con + -ing. From Middle English cunning, kunnyng, partially from Old English **cunning* (verbal noun), from *cunnan* ("to know how to, be able to"); partially from Old English *cunnung* ("knowledge, trial, probation, experience, contact, carnal knowledge"), from *cunnian* ("to search into, try, test, seek for, explore, investigate, experience, have experience of, to make trial of, know"), equivalent to con + -ing. Cognate with Scots cunnand ("cunning"), German dialectal könnend ("cunning"), Icelandic kunnandi ("cunning"). The idea then is "ability", "experience". It does not necessarily have the negative connotation that it has today.

"countenance" is from the Anglo-Norman, from Latin contineō ("hold together"). It has the idea of appearance, especially the features and expression of the face.

"holpen" an archaic form of "helped". It is from the Middle English "holpen", "yholpen" from Old English "ġeholpen", past participle of helpan "to help".

"**pulse**" is from the French 'pols', which is from a Latin word meaning 'porridge'. 'Pulse' is grain or see of beans, peas or lentils used as food (Laurence Vance, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, page 274)." This would be a very mean diet.

Bibliography

Anderson, Robert, *The Coming Prince.* A standard prophetic treatment of Daniel from a Plymouth Brethren.

Bullinger, Ethelbert, *The Companion Bible.* Brief notes, many are critical. Bullinger was a hyper-dispensationalist so care must be used but that shouldn't be too much of an issue for Old Testament studies. The meat is in the appendixes.

Clarke, Adam, *Commentary on the Whole Bible.* Usually useful but Clarke can get a little weird at times.

Constable, Thomas, *Notes on Daniel.* Generally useful notes from a standard, evangelical view.

Darby, John Nelson, *Collected Works*

Darby, John Nelson, *Notes and Comments.* Generally useful and very dispensational. Darby and other Brethren were infected with higher criticism.

Dennett, Edward, *Daniel the Prophet: And the Times of the Gentiles.* Plymouth Brethren so it will be useful.

Hoffman, David Allen, *The Common Man's Reference Bible.* Useful, but patterned too much of the Ruckman Reference Bible. Notes are rather spotty as well and too few verses are commented upon.

Huebner, R. A*., Daniel's 70 Weeks and the Revival of the Roman Empire.* Plymouth Brethren and echoes whatever Darby would have taught. Still interesting and useful.

Jordan, James, *Biblical Chronology.* Christian Reconstructionist so it will be postmillennial and not dispensation. But good material is here.

Keil, Carl and Franz Delitsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament.* Standard work, somewhat critical.

Knox, James, *Understanding Prophecy.* A very good summary of prophecy from a dispensational and premillennial position.

Larkin, Clarence, *The Book of Daniel*

Larkin, Clarence, *The Book of Revelation.* Just about every dispensational and premillennial commentator has a debt he owes to Clarence Larkin.

Phillips, John, *Exploring the Book of Daniel.* Phillips is dispensational and premillennial. The outlines are worth the price of the book. He use the Authorized Version about 99% of the time.

Riplinger, Gail, *New Age Bible Versions.* I recommend all of Riplinger's work in defense of the Authorized Version. The fact that the Fundamentalist "Scholar's Union" came out so hotly against her when she first published New Age Bible Versions, should tell you something. A hit dog always barks and Riplinger hit a lot of digs with this opening salvo. She has not let up since.

Ruckman, Peter, *Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel.* One of his later works but valuable. Based on the King James Bible, premillennial and dispensational. Ruckman gives a basically orthodox commentary that supports all the fundamentals but also adds several unusual interpretations and many practical applications. It will be ignored by the "Scholar's Union".

Ruckman, Peter, *Ruckman Reference Bible.* An uneven work, meaty in some areas, sparse in others. Many notes that are digressions and are distracting. His appendixes are useful but there are a few oddballs there.

Smith, Hamilton, *The Book of Daniel, An Expository Outline.* Plymouth Brethren. Brief but useful notes.

Spence, H. T., *The Canon of Scripture.* A very good Bible survey, recommended.

Vance, Laurence, *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*. A good dictionary of so-called "archaic" words found in the Authorized Version. Vance demonstrates they are not "archaic" at all but many of them are still used today. Stephen White's (unfinished) dictionary (below) has fuller definitions.

Walvoord, John. *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation.* Good, standard interpretation of Daniel.

White, Steven, *White's Dictionary of the King James Language.* Only two volumes are completed, covering English words A-H. I wish we had the entire set finished as White gives good, meaty definitions.

Encyclopedia Britannica, 1997 CD edition

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia

Jewish Encyclopedia, http://jewishencyclopedia.com

----------, Wikipedia

About the Author

Dr. John Cereghin was saved on February 9, 1978 at the age of 13 after being raised in the Roman Catholic church. He was saved after listening to a program on missionary shortwave radio station HCJB from Quito, Ecuador. He left the Catholic church in 1983 and joined Maranatha Baptist Church in Elkton, Maryland in 1985. In 1986, she transferred from the University of Maryland to Maryland Baptist Bible College, earning the first doctor's degree awarded by the school in 1995. Dr. Cereghin also earned his Master of Theology degree from Foundations Theological Seminary in 1994.

Dr. Cereghin's ministry background includes working at Radio Station WOEL in Elkton, Maryland (1986-1998), teaching in various capacities at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland from 1988-1998, also serving as Dean of Men, Registrar and Academic Dean, and pastoring Queen Anne's Baptist Church, Centreville, Maryland (1989-1990), Charity Baptist Church, Mebane, North Carolina (1994-1995) and Grace Baptist Church in Smyrna, Delaware (1998-present). He and his wife Teresa have four children and four grandchildren.

Booklist on Daniel

As we would expect with such a book, the number of commentaries will be numerous. Many will be speculative, outdated and just plain unreliable, as would also be the case in commentaries on Revelation. Also, like Revelation, later commentaries on Daniel would probably be more useful and accurate than earlier commentaries. As we go deeper into prophetic time and get closer to the rapture and the second coming, we gain a better understanding of these prophecies.

Comments are that of the reviewer and not necessarily those of the author. As always, discernment in choosing commentaries is required. I also try to focus on commentaries, not transcribed lectures, which are not as useful.

The reviews are taken from the following sources:
@ *Biblical Viewpoint*, Bob Jones University
$ Commenting and Commentaries by Charles Spurgeon
 # The Master's Journal, from The Master's Seminary
% *The Minister's Library*, Cyril Barber
& *Top 5 Commentaries on Daniel*, Keith Mathison*, http://www.ligonier.org/blog/top-5-commentaries-on-the-book-of-daniel/*
? *Old Testament Commentary Survey* by Tremper Longman
< *Bible Study Tools* by David Bauer
> *Commentaries for Biblical Expositors* by James Rosscup
! Entries of the author, Dr. John Cereghin

$ Amner, R., *Essay Toward Interpretation*, 1776, Written on the absurd hypothesis that the prophecies were all fulfilled before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.

@ Anderson, Robert, *The Coming Prince*, 1903, 1954. A study on the prophetic portions of Daniel. He identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome (32); thinks the prophetic year had 360 days in it (67f); thinks the 69 weeks extended from 445 B.C. to Palm Sunday 32 A.D., numbering exactly 173,880 days (122-128); maintains the coming prince is the Antichrist, ruler of the revived Roman Empire (198); gives exhaustive chronological tables.

! He does quote the inferior Revised Version of 1881.[103]

> The premillennial author presents a detailed work on the 70 weeks of Daniel 9. In this popular treatment he reckons the chronology of the first sixty-nine weeks from the decree of Artaxerxes (Nehemiah 2) to rebuild Jerusalem to the triumphal entry of Christ (Luke 19). He figures the exact number of days involved in 483 prophetic years which he believes would contain 360 days each, not 365 as Julian years. In his reckoning, the sixty-nine weeks end in A. D. 32 which poses a problem in light of more accepted views today that Christ died in A. D. 30 or 33.

@ Anderson, Robert, *Daniel in the Critics' Den,* 186 pages. A formal reply to the

103 One problem of the "Plymouth Brethren" is that they were not dedicated to the Authorized Version, as they often quote the Revised Version or Darby's translation.

destructive critical attacks on the historical accuracy of Daniel by Farrar and Driver. He attacks the idea that the presence of two Greek words in Daniel demands a Maccabean date (42-55); refutes Farrar's claim that there are "violent errors" in Daniel (70f); criticizes Driver's commentary on Daniel (92f); argues the 69 weeks ran from March 14, 445 B.C. to April 6, A.D. 32, covering 173,880 days, which are 7 times 69 years of 360 days each (134).

! Anderson unfortunately promotes the Revised Version over the Authorized Version, especially in commenting on 2 Timothy 3:16, but then turns right around and says that the Authorized Version has a better reading! He is not very consistent in how he deals with the various English translations.

$ Auberlen, Carl August, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*, 1856. Not a textual commentary but a treatise upon the mysterious prophecies. Auberlen's spirit is reverential, and his views are evangelical. He acknowledges his indebtedness to Magnus Frederick Roos.

@ Auchincloss, William Stuart, *The Book of Daniel Unlocked*, 1905, 134 pages. An early premillennial interpretation. Identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, Rome (53-54); thinks the "little horn" in Daniel 7 means the Caesars (54) but in Daniel 8 the Seleucids (61); holds that the 70 weeks extend to and beyond the time of Christ (70-71); identifies the willful king as Antiochus (82-84); thinks that the 1290 days run out on the day of Pentecost (87-88).

% Baldwin, Joyce G., *Daniel: An Introduction*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentary, 1979. A capable exposition by a respected Old Testament scholar. Good treatment of textual matters, but indifference to prophetic themes minimizes the value of this book.

! Barnes, Albert*, Daniel*, 2 volumes, Notes on the Old Testament, Explanatory and Practical, 1982 reprint, 632 pages total. Massive notes from a 19th century Presbyterian commentator. Probably good on the historical sections, but weak on the prophetic parts, especially since the book is over 150 years old and our prophetic understanding of Daniel has increased much since.

$ Dr. Wardlaw said of this work: "I have examined the 'Notes' of' the Rev. Albert Barnes on a considerable variety of testing passages; and, so far as my examination has gone, I feel confident in pronouncing them to be characterized, in no ordinary degree, by discriminative judgment, sound theology, unostentatious learning, practical wisdom, and evangelical piety."

$ Birks, T. R., *The Two Later Visions of Daniel historically explained*, 1846. We must leave judgment upon this work to those skilled in prophetic interpretation.

@ Blair, J. Allen, *Living Courageously*, 1971, 251 pages. A devotional exposition. Identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (49-50); identifies the "little horn" of Daniel 7 as Antichrist, but in Daniel 8 as Antiochus (141, 166); holds that the coming prince is Antichrist (190-191); identifies the willful king as Antichrist as well (223); calls Daniel 12:2 the spiritual awakening of the Jews (235).

% Boutflower, Charles, *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, 1977. Reproduced from the 1923 edition, this work is indispensable to a study of the visions and prophecies of Daniel. It sets each incident in the historic context of the times and demonstrates how an understanding how an understanding of the setting frequently contains the key to the correct interpretation of the passage.

$ Brightman, Thomas*, A most comfortable Exposition of the last and most difficult part of the Prophecies of Daniel, from the 26th verse of the 11th Chapter to the end of the 12th Chapter, wherein the restoring of the Jewes and their calling to the faith of Christ after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies is set forth in lively colors*, 1644. This exposition and the author's commentary on Canticles are appended to his work on Revelation, and do not appear to have been published separately. In his title page Brightman is called a bright and worthy man, and in the preface we are told that "he shined every way and was a Brightman indeed." His work is rather a curiosity than a treasure.

$ Broughton, Hugh, *Daniel's Chaldee Visions*, 1662. This author was pedantic and eccentric, but yet a man of real learning. His works have almost disappeared. In his own day some considered him a sage and others a quack. He was a little of both.

@ Burton, Alfred H., *Hints on the Book of Daniel,* 1903, 219 pages. Introduction and 30 expository messages on Daniel. He charges rationalists with deciding beforehand that Daniel was not a prophet (3); holds the fourth empire was Rome (30); predicts the resurrection of the fourth empire; argues that Greek words in Daniel prove that musical instruments were known in Babylon at an early date (40); commends dispensationalism (51); teaches a pretribulation rapture (54); cites Sir Robert Anderson's chronology of the seventy weeks (144f); holds that Antichrist will have contact with spiritism and occult forces (193).

@ Calvin, John, *The Book of the Prophet Daniel*, 1561, 806 pages. Dated comments. He identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, Rome (1:162; 2:21); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Julius Caesar and his successors (2:27) and the little horn of Daniel 8 as Antiochus (2:96); makes the "prince who shall come" Titus (2:223); thinks Christ caused the sacrifice to cease (2:226); holds that Daniel 12:2 teaches a general resurrection (2:374- 375).

% Campbell, Donald Keith, *Daniel: Decoder of Dreams*, 1977. Thorough in interpretation and practical in application, this treatment of Daniel is ideal for use with lay people. Premillennial.

@ Charles, R. H., *The Book of Daniel*, 197 pages. Brief critical testimony. He dates Daniel in the Maccabean period as a pseudonymous work (ix-xii); thinks the book starts with an error (3); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia, Macedonia (25,26,68,70); claims the author of Daniel was not concerned with historicity (50); identifies the little horn as Antiochus (74); makes the 70 weeks run out in Maccabean

times (p. 107); identifies the willful king as Antiochus (134).

$ Coleman, Thomas*, Decision, exemplified in Daniel*, 1858. This is by the author of "Memorials of Independent Churches." It is intended for children and is suitable for them.

? Collins, J. J. *Daniel*. Forms of Old Testament Literature, 1984, 120 pages. A very competent form-critical analysis and summary of discussion of Daniel. The book is technical and for that reason will only really interest scholars.

? Collins, J. J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia, 1993, 498 pages. The lengthy and extremely informative introduction includes an essay by A. Y. Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament.” J. J. Collins is a noted Daniel expert, and this volume is the apex of his decades-long research. It is critical in its approach, but evangelicals can learn much from this volume.

< The most complete and detailed commentary available in English. Considers the stories of the book to be legendary, and maintains that Daniel never existed. Thus, the book is a work of religious fiction that has no historical value in relation to events described. The extensive introduction provides a wealth of information; most helpful is a discussion by Adela Yarbro Collins on the influence of Daniel on the NT. The commentary itself (a) discusses the literary structure of the passage; (b) gives a verse-by-verse interpretation that is rich in linguistic analysis, historical background, and the author’s use of traditional material; (c) identifies the passage’s genre and discusses significance of form for the construal of the passage; and (d) treats the setting and function of the passage, summarizing the religious and social significance for the original readers (with some suggestions regarding theology), and discussing its function within the book.

> Massive in exegesis, this assumes a Maccabean date and prophecy as not foretelling but speaking of events known already to have occurred. Collins also holds that details in Dan. 1-6 are confused (26). Readers meet with many mere opinions of unbelief, such as the comment on 1:8 that vv. 8-21 originally related only to Daniel; his three friends were falsely inserted into the story by a redactor (141). Collins feels the writer of the Bible book is mistaken in conclusions, for example in Dan. 1 (145-46). The work verse by verse will at times make advanced students, also teachers, be aware of critical theory and views on points, and many details help on word meaning, grammar, etc. For most evangelical teachers and pastors, as well as for students and lay readers, positive works committed to the integrity of passages offer far better benefit along more reasonable lines.

> Contesse, Peter and John Ellington, *A Handbook on the Book of Daniel*, United Bible Societies, 1993. Here is a verse by verse effort to render meaning into English and explain details as an aid to missionary translators for various linquistic groups. At times this results in very good information, at others the turns given to words do not convey a proper idea. For example, in 7:24 the ten horns (kings) are seen as ruling consecutively, succeeding one another rather than rightly as existing at the same time as the eleventh horn (king), the “little horn” (198). Then the work regards details of three kings falling as

fulfilled in 175-164 B. C. (199), and details of the seventy sevens in 9:25-27 are all viewed as fulfilled up through ca. 167 B. C., as many liberals have held. This reviewer sees much that is reliable in the work, but also much that is misleading.

@ Criswell, Wallie A., *Expository Sermons on the Book of Daniel*, 1968-1972, 651 pages. A thorough exposition. Denies the alleged errors in Daniel (1:25-36) and defends Daniel as author (1:55); identifies the four kings as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (2:62f; 4:26f); holds that the one like the son of man is a manifestation of Christ (4:38f); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist, of Daniel 8 as Antiochus, a type of Antichrist (4:66f); holds that the 69 weeks extend from 445 B.C. to the death of Christ (4:106,117), the last week being the tribulation period before the millennial reign (4:118); identifies the coming prince as Antichrist (4:124); teaches two resurrections (4:176f).

@ Culver, Robert D., *Daniel and the Latter Days*, 1954, 224 pages. The best exposition of the eschatological portions of Daniel. He sets forth the essentials of premillennialism (24-25) and discusses at length difficult problems of premillennial interpretation and gives answers (27-90). He then compares the premillennial view with Daniel 2,7,9,10-12 (96-176); outlines Daniel by its languages (100); holds that Nebuchadnezzar did not forget his dream (106); attacks liberals who deny the fourth kingdom is Rome (111); stresses that the 70 weeks cannot be fulfilled by Antiochus (136); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (164).

! He also has large sections that deal with the millennium, which is a neglected subject in prophecy.

% Culver, Robert Duncan, *The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel*, 1980. A fact-filled, biblically based exposition which explains the meaning and message of Daniel's prophecy. An ideal work for home Bible classes and adult Sunday school groups.

> Davies, P. R. *Danie*l, Old Testament Guides, 1985. 133 pages. Here is typical liberal late-dating in the time of Antiochus Epiphanies. Davies does not believe the book deals with visions of Daniel in the sixth century B. C. He surveys works he esteems on important critical aspects (these are late-daters too) and makes no serious effort to discuss conservative arguments. Rather, he sees it as "trivial to deal with such protests on their logic, here."

% DeHaan, Martin Ralph, *Daniel the Prophet*, 1967. A premillennial exposition by a renowned Bible class teacher.

@ Dennett, Edward, *Daniel the Prophet,* 1893, 206 pages. Dispensational exposition stressing the times of the Gentiles. Identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (29, 97-99); thinks that Nebuchadnezzar was converted (65); holds that the historical parts of Daniel present moral and prophetic features of the last days (79); maintains that the last form of the fourth kingdom will be a federation of 10 kingdoms and that the little horn of Daniel 7 will be the last head of the revived Roman Empire (111-113); distinguishes between the little horn of Daniel 7 with that of Daniel 8

(124); identifies the fierce king with the little horn of Daniel 8 (132) and the willful king with Antichrist, an apostate Jew (184-186); denies that Daniel 12:2 refers to the bodily resurrection (199).

$ Desprez, Philip S, *Daniel, or, the Apocalypse of the Old Testament*, 1865. The author cannot see the Messiah in Daniel. It is worse than useless.

@ Driver, S. R., "The Book of Daniel" in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges,* 1900, 321 pages. A very critical commentary. He denies the authorship of Daniel, dates the book 168-165 B.C. (xlvii); classes Daniel as one of "imaginative narratives" (lxx); claims that the earliest use of "Chaldean" as a class of wise men is in Herodotus, 440 B.C. (12); thinks that the second, third and fourth kingdoms and the second, third and fourth beasts are the kingdoms of Media, Persia and Macedonia (28,29,84,95); doubts the historicity of Darius the Mede (70); dismisses the premillennial view (98); makes the 70 weeks refer to Maccabean events and to Antiochus (139-142); attacks the idea that any of the 70 weeks refers to Christ (144-145); interprets the willful king as Antiochus (196f).

& Duguid, Iain, *Daniel***,** Reformed Expository Commentary, 2008. Turning from a classic Reformed commentary on Daniel to one of the newest, Duguid's work on Daniel in the Reformed Expository Commentary series is an outstanding reference. This commentary should be of use to both pastors and general readers.

@ Farrar, Frederic W., "The Book of Daniel" in *The Expositor's Bible*, 1903, 334 pages. A destructive critical commentary. He dates Daniel in Maccabean times (3); thinks there are mistakes in the book (20) and that the Greek words in it prove a late date (22); holds that its authenticity is "rarely defended by any competent critic" (27); thinks that those who defend its accuracy are snatching at straws (56); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia, Graeco-Macedonia (160,238-240); thinks that Darius the Mede did not exist (216); holds that the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8 was Antiochus (241,259); makes the 70 weeks end with Antiochus (282).

@ Fausset, A. R., "Daniel" in Volume 4 of *A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical*, 1869, 74 pages. Conservative and premillennial. He holds that the four kingdoms are Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (392, 418); stresses a premillennial second coming of Christ (393, 424); defends the historicity of Daniel (413); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist (419) and distinguishes him from the little horn of Daniel 8, Antiochus (426); makes the 70 weeks run out in the time of Christ (435-437) but thinks the desolator may typify Antichrist (438); identifies the willful king of Daniel 11 as Antichrist (450); attacks the idea of a general resurrection (454).

& Ferguson, Sinclair, *Daniel***,** The Preacher's Commentary, 2002. Students of Scripture should read anything that Sinclair Ferguson publishes, and his commentary on Daniel is no exception. Although aimed specifically at pastors, this commentary is accessible to a general readership as well. Very helpful.

% Ford, Desmond, *Daniel*, 1978. Employing the text of the RSV. Expounds the text with insight and an awareness of the history of the ancient Near East as well as the political machinations and their prophetic implications. Poorly bound.

> A leading man in new emphases within the Seventh Day Adventist circles shows how a SDA scholar who gained his Ph. D. under Bruce deals with eschatological details here. He tries to combine what he feels are the best elements in Preterism, idealism, historicalism and futurism but regards much of the prophecy as related to the ultimate consummation (69-70). He shows awareness of some problems and solutions (as 1:1, 2) but is very brief on some verses (1:17-20; 2:4; 2:36-45 verse by verse; ch. 6; 7:13, 14, sparse on proof for identity of the Son of Man as Messiah, and of the kingdom; 7:7, vague on the ten horns, etc.). On p. 151 he finds the "little horn" of ch. 7 in the system of church Commentaries on Individual Old Testament Books — Daniel 155 and state in medieval times, and relates "a time, times, and half a time" to 3 1/2 prophetic years (1260 actual years) from A. D. 537 to 1798, a year-day view, citing H. G. Guinness, Romanism and the Reformation, pp. 41-43. His "proof" for his little horn theory is unfortunate. The text of Daniel 7 itself puts the horn and the ten horns in the final phase of the fourth empire, that is, in the time that flows right into the future judgment (7:9-14). And Revelation 19 has the Beast of Revelation 13:1-10 on earth at the Second Coming of Christ, who is the Son of Man receiving the kingdom in Daniel 7:13-14. Ford wants the little horn to mean the Antichrist of the centuries and the end-time too, as if it did not refer to one specific person at one particular time. His identification of the "little horn" in chapter 8 as Antichrist also raises questions. Ford feels the 2,300 days of 8:14 represent years from 457 B. C. to A. D. 1844. "In 1844 began the cleansing of the sanctuary. . . " (p. 189). He regards 9:24-27 as speaking of 490 years from 457 to A. D. 33, and believes this is the first segment of 2,300 years which he sees in 8:14 (p. 207). He cites SDA writers such as Wm. Miller and Ellen White (p. 243). He has some good material on Antiochus in 11:21-35, and believes Antichrist is in view in 11:36-45. His is a good effort to look at Daniel from a SDA perspective and a year-day system.

$ Frere, James Hatley, *A Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Ezra, and St. John*, 1826. This has been esteemed by many in its day, but we do not recommend its purchase.

> Fyall, Robert. *Danie*l, Focus on the Bible Commentaries, 1988. This OT lecturer at St. John's College, Durham, Scotland, lists the biography he mainly used (9), studded with liberal and amillennial works, and no premillennial efforts. Fyall often points out valuable principles for life as on 1:8. Comments survey chapters and explain main points, often doing this well even if concisely. On prophecy, the writing gets nebulous and provides no grappling or light to explain key matters, such as the future thrust of the fourth empire in Dan. 2 (41). On 7:15ff., Fyall shows his amillennial bent by having the ten horns represent the whole of human history, and suggesting other thoughts that only work confusion (110-11). He is hit or miss on offering helps on customs, helping on the shape of a furnace (53), but silent about what a lions' den looked like (90). Daniel's praying in Chap. 9 is used for good lessons. Daniel 11:36-39 is said to be about Antiochus, with v. 39 possibly moving on to a later leader (179). The book is for the

most part only worth the time for occasional principles, and has little light on a defensible far prophetical picture.

@ Gaebelein, Arno C., *The Prophet Daniel*, 1955, 212 pages. Premillennial. Defends the authenticity and historicity of Daniel (7, 82); attacks the postmillennial view (33); gives parallels between Daniel and Revelation (85-86); believes the 70 weeks began in 445 B.C. (135); identifies the prince who shall come with the head of the fourth empire (142); gives a chart of the 70 weeks (151).

> Gangel, Kenneth. *Daniel*, Holman Old Testament Commentary, 2001. A light, cursory exposition is along popular and premillennial lines, using a lot of long quotes and doing little more than outline prophetical matters. But it has some good principles for application. For the most part, one would derive more benefit from various works that offer so much more than the appeal of packaging.

$ Gaussen, S. R. Louis, *Daniel, explained for Young Persons.* 2 volumes, 1874. This is a work for children only. We hope it will not set our Sunday School teachers explaining to their little ones the image and its toes, the he-goat, and all the other marvels. If they do attempt it we wish them as well through their task as Professor Gaussen.

? Goldingay, J. Daniel, Word Biblical Commentary, 1989, 351 pages. Goldingay's is perhaps the most comprehensive commentary on Daniel listed here. He gives insight into historical, literary, and theological issues concerning the book. He also demonstrates an amazing grasp of the secondary literature. Many of his readers will be put off by some of his radical (at least for an evangelical) conclusions, most notable of which are that the stories in chapters 1–6 are fictitious and the visions are quasi-prophecies. However, it would be a major mistake to ignore this important commentary while studying Daniel.

$ Harrison, Benjamin, *Prophetic Outlines of the Christian Church and the Antichristian Power as traced in the Visions of Daniel and St. John*, 1849. We like the manner of this book. The author has been content throughout to trace the true outline of interpretation without entering on a detailed examination of counter theories.

% Hartman, Louis Francis and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, The Anchor Bible, 1978. In keeping with the format of this series, the authors try to provide background material for their historic interpretation, thus negating the prophetic element. Roman Catholic.

@ Heaton, E. W., *The Book of Daniel*, 1956, 251 pages. Brief liberal comments. He dates the book 175-163 B.C. (17); terms Daniel "a curious book" (19) drawn from a "hero legend" (25); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece (58-59) and the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8 as Antiochus (177,193); thinks that Darius the Mede is fictional (64); holds that the Christian identification of the Son of Man with Christ is inconsistent (98-99); thinks that the presence of Greek words in Daniel proves that it was written late in the Greek period (141); makes the 70 weeks run out in 164 B.C.

(210).

$ Hengstenberg, E. W., *Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel and the Integrity of Zechariah*. 1848. Much valuable matter is brought out by the discussion; but few of us have time to go into it, or any need to do so; for we are fully persuaded of the integrity of all the prophets, and of their books too.

? Hill, A. E. *Daniel*. Revised Expositor's Bible Commentary, volume 8, 2008. Pp. 19–212. Hill writes with sensitivity to the theological message of the book. He supports the traditional view that the first-person apocalyptic vision reports of Daniel in chapters 7–12 go back to the sixth-century prophet.

! Huebner, R. A., *Daniel's Seventy Weeks*. Written from a dispensational and a "Plymouth Brethren" viewpoint. Quite useful, as Plymouth Brethren-type books tend to be when dealing with prophecy. But even most dispensationalists may not agree with all of Huebner's conclusions, as he mainly repeats and forwards John Nelson Darby's positions. We don't mind a man following Darby but we would like a bit more originality and independent thinking, and that goes for any commentator, not just Huebner. A work like this will be ignored by the "Scholar's Union".

$ Huit, Ephraim, *The Whole Prophecie of Daniel Explained*, 1643. Huit's short doctrinal summaries of the verses will bring useful subjects before the preacher's mind; otherwise Huit is not very remarkable.

@ Ironside, H. A., *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet,* 1920, 253. Premillennial. He defends the authenticity of Daniel (9f); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (34-35,123); teaches a premillennial rapture (42); holds that Daniel in the lion's den is a type of the Jews in the tribulation period (107); thinks that the little horn of Daniel 8 will be a future infidel hater of Jews (148); identifies the prince that shall come with the beast of Revelation 13 (167); gives a history of the wars of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids (191-209); identifies the willful king with Antichrist, a Jew (210, 218); defines Daniel 12:2 as Israel's national and spiritual revival (232).

$ Irving, Edward, *Babylon and Infidelity foredoomed of God: A Discourse on Daniel and the Apocalypse*, 1826. More of rolling sound than anything else.

@ Jeffery, Arthur and Gerald Kennedy, "Daniel" in volume VI of *The Interpreter's Bible*, 1956, 208 pages. A hard-line liberal interpretation. They date the book in the Maccabean era, reject authorship by Daniel in the 6th century (348-349); term the history of Daniel "stories" full of "glaring improbabilities" (359); call the dates in Daniel "part of the decor, not statements of historical fact" (362); think that Daniel's four empires are symbolic (375), that the third empire means Persia and the fourth Greece (388,454); call the fiery furnace and Daniel in the lion's den "martyr legends" (403,434); defend the social gospel (376) and evolution (421); reject the idea that the 70 weeks foretells the coming of Messiah (495).

@ Jerome, *Commentary on Daniel*, 189 pages. Old but interesting. Identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, Rome (31-32,72-75); holds that the ten kings will appear at the end of the world when the Roman empire is destroyed and that the little horn will be the man of sin (77); attacks the idea of a millennium (81); holds that the 70 weeks extend to Christ's first advent (95); applies the prophecy of the vile king and the willful king both to the Antichrist (129,136).

@ Keil, Carl Friedrich, "The Book of Daniel" in *Keil and Delitzsch Commentaries,* 506 pages. A thorough amillennial commentary. He defends the genuineness of the book (19f); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Graeco-Macedonia, Rome (104f, 239, 245-268); provides much historical background; identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist (275-283) and of Daniel 8 as Antiochus (295); holds that the 70 weeks extend to the violent cutting off of Messiah (359) and to the Antichrist and final judgment (375); interprets the willful king as Antiochus with a final fulfillment by Antichrist (462-463); teaches a general resurrection in Daniel 12:2 (482-483).

@ King, Geoffrey R., *Daniel,* 1966, 248 pages. An exposition not in consecutive order. He defends the historicity of Daniel (20); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, but makes the feet a fifth kingdom, Mohammedan power (68,75); holds that Antichrist will be a Mohammedan and that Babylon will be rebuilt (76); thinks that the kingdoms in Daniel 7 are four kingdoms of the end time (119-121); defends a premillennial return (176); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (232f).

% Kirk, Thomas, *Daniel the Prophet*, 1906. Expository sermons which abound in practical application and ably counter Driver's higher critical theories.

? Lacocque, A. *The Book of Daniel*, Westminster, 1979, 302 pages. This is an English translation of a French commentary originally published in 1976. Although he does provide some helpful textual and philological notes, Lacocque is strong on theology and contemporary application (at least relatively so for a critical scholar). He adopts a traditional critical dating and interpretation

! Larkin, Clarence, *The Book of Daniel*. Very useful for presenting the standard dispensational views that have influenced later dispensational writers. Larkin has influenced dispensational writers at least as much as the Plymouth Brethren writers, if not more. One major problem with Larkin is that he refuses to make any prophetic applications to the Antichrist in Daniel 11, sticking with only a historical interpretation with no prophetic application.

"One of the best works you can get on Daniel is Clarence Larkin's commentary *The Book of Daniel* (Peter Ruckman, *The Book of Daniel*, page xii)."

@ Lang, George Henry, *The Histories and Prophecies of Daniel,* 1940, 224 pages. An individualistic interpretation. He identifies the four kingdoms in Daniel 2 as Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome- but not limited to Rome (26, 32-35); objects to many details of premillennial interpretation; thinks that Babylon will be rebuilt (33); takes the historical sections of Daniel as prophecies (46); argues that the four kingdoms of Daniel 7 are

future ones in the end time (84); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8 as Antichrist (85, 109); thinks that the destruction of Jerusalem in Daniel 9:26 will occur in the end time (138); thinks that Antichrist will rise in the Syrian part of the kingdom (158); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (169).

@ Leupold, Herbert Carl, *Exposition of Daniel*, 1949, 549 pages. A very thorough amillennial exposition. Defends Daniel as author (8f) and the historicity of the book (18f); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (113-119, 287); thinks that the church crushed Rome (121); attacks critical theories (223, 238f); holds that the ten horns are the power of Rome (322) and that the little horn refers to all future manifestations of Antichrist after Christ's resurrection, including the papacy (322-323); thinks that the 70 weeks run from Daniel's time to the consummation of all things (405); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (511); teaches a general resurrection in Daniel 12:2 (530).

& Longman, Tremper, III**,** *Daniel*, NIV Application Commentary, 1999. The NIVAC commentaries are hit and miss. Some are very helpful, while others overemphasize one or another feature of the series to the neglect of the others. Longman's commentary on Daniel is an example of one of the better works in the series. Longman's strength is in his literary analysis, and this is the strength of this commentary. Highly recommended.

> A Westmont College professor posits sixth century B. C. matérial in Daniel, but his work is soft toward late-daters, even toward one who denies the possibility of supernatural prophecy in Dan. 7-12 (23). Longman seeks to resolve alleged inaccuracies as in 1:1-2 (43), difficult phrases such as “ten times better” in 1:20 (54), usually meeting them headon in a substantial commentary of 313 pp. He is of the opinion in Dan. 7 that the four beasts represent an unspecified number of evil kingdoms that will succeed one another from the exile to Christ’s future coming (190). Many principles help readers in application, but too often the comments on prophecy mislead or leave uncertainty, not help one have a sound view.

& Lucas, Ernest, *Daniel***,** Apollos Old Testament Commentary, 2002. Although Lucas does not settle firmly on an early or late date for Daniel (He concludes that it is possible to make a reasonable case for either date), he has written a commentary that is worth consulting. This commentary is slightly more technical than the four listed above, but it is not so technical that the average reader cannot use it. All Hebrew and Aramaic is transliterated. A very good contribution to the literature on Daniel.

> Cf. comments on McConville (Deut.). This 359-pager reflects immensely wide reading among critical scholars of a non-evangelical world, and sees stories here as mingling what historically happened this way, and fiction (22). Much of what evangelicals normally would see as long-range prophecy is put within the second-century B. C. time of Antiochus IV, even the little horn and other kings of Dan. 7, all details even of 11:36ff. (40; 193, etc.). Lucas enters into much discussion of non-premillennial views, and those of the latter persuasion will feel that their explanations are far more natural in using hermeneutical principles and understanding long-range prophecy. For that matter, many amillennialists also will reject Lucas’ second-century focus. Daniel Block’s plug on the inside back cover that the series is by “the finest

evangelical scholars" will, at least in this commentary, be thought an astounding misconception by many evangelicals due to a number of claims. The one like a son of man (7:13-14) is collective for the saints, Lucas says (187, 200). To him, the book of Daniel "seems devoid of any messianic hope as usually understood" (185). Lucas holds that the "anointed ones" of 9:25-26 have "nothing to suggest that either of them is the Davidic Messiah of later Judaism" (185). The concept "at that time" (12:1) refers to the period of Antiochus, seen to the very end of Chap. 11 (293-94). In the end bibliography, J. Whitcomb is the only premillennialist listed (not detailed works of S. Miller, J. Walvoord, or L. Wood). Lucas rejects premillennial views or does not mention them. He says, for example on the 1,290 and 1,335 days in 12:11-12, that he has no satisfactory explanation. The ten days of 1:12 is a round number (33). It is disconcerting to find some detail skipped, for instance "ten times smarter" (1:20), "seven times hotter" (3:19), and the nature of the fiery furnace in Chap. 3. The work will help readers see in what they may regard as anything but truly evangelical how a writer construes details that they can feel make much more defensible sense in other interpretations outside the perspective that Lucas thinks convincing.

@ Luck, G. Coleman, *Daniel*, 1958, 127 pages. Devotional. Identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece, Rome (37f); believes that Nebuchadnezzar was truly converted (62); holds that the little horn of Daniel 7 is Antichrist (88f); thinks that the "most holy" refers to the restored temple (102); holds that Antichrist will be an apostate Christian, not a Jew (121).

@ Luthi, Walter, *Daniel Speaks to the Church*, 1947, 140 pages. A practical application of truths from Daniel to the present church. He ignores questions about the date of Daniel; stresses baptismal regeneration (9); makes Nebuchadnezzar's image refer to all nations (20); likens the three in the furnace to the confessing church (33).

> MacArthur, John F., Jr. *The Future of Israel* (Daniel 9:20-12:13), 1991. A brief premillennial dispensational series on the verses.

$ Manchester, George Montague, *The Times of Daniel, Chronological and Prophetical*, 1845. This work has received the most enthusiastic praise from German writers, who dwell with pleasure upon his being "erudite and illustrious." The duke's writing is certainly *sui genera*. He is by no means a favorite author with us.

% McClain, Alva J., *Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks*, 1940. A popular presentation of the material contained in Robert Anderson's *The Coming Prince*. Helpful for its explanation of Daniel 9:24-27.

% McDowell, Josh, *Daniel in the Critic's Den: Historical Evidence for the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel,* 1979. Borrowing the title for this book from Sir Robert Anderson's famous work, McDowell delves into the criticisms leveled against Daniel's prophecy- historical, linguistic and cultural- and demonstrates the accuracy and reliability of the biblical record.

$ Miles, Charles Popham, *Lectures, with Notes,* 1840-1841. Commendable sermons and good notes.

@ Miller, Stephen R., *Daniel*, New American Commentary, 1994, 348 pages. A premillennial commentary based on the NIV. The work defends the conservative date and authorship (34-42), argues for a premillennial interpretation of the great image of Daniel 2 (97-100) and defends the miracles of deliverance of the three Hebrews and for Daniel in the lion's den (122ff, 188). The author thinks that Nebuchadnezzar had a genuine salvation experience (144); identifies the fourth beast as Rome, the ten toes as a ten nation confederacy and the little horn as the antichrist (202f), holds that the 3 ½ times are the 3 ½ years of the Great Tribulation (214-215), defends the premillennial view of the 70 weeks (257) and interprets the willful king of Daniel 11:36 as the antichrist (306).

@ Montgomery, James A., *The Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary, 1927, 519 pages. An exhaustive liberal commentary. He denies Daniel is the author (2f); thinks the Greek words in Daniel favor a late date (22f), and that Daniel is an admirable "example of the short story" (100); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece (185-192,283); calls the deliverance of the three Hebrews "a marvel" (214); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8 as Antiochus (292,349); denies the cutting off of the Anointed One refers to Christ (381f); makes the 70 weeks end in the time of Antiochus (385f); identifies the willful king as Antiochus (460f).

$ More, Henry, *A Plain and Continued Exposition of the several Prophecies of Daniel*, 1681. If a man had no more than More on Daniel he would certainly long for More, and need a work more spiritual and more suggestive.

@ Newell, Phillip R., *Daniel,* 1962, 199 pages. A devotional, premillennial exposition. Thinks that Antichrist's capital will be Babylon rebuilt (38) and that all four kingdoms of Daniel will be in existence in the last days (44,79); holds that the fourth kingdom will include territory that all four previous kingdoms held (85); thinks the 24 elders of Revelation are angels (105); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 and 8 (118); is indebted to G. H. Lang (109, 139); commends Sir Robert Anderson's view of the 70 weeks (147).

$ Newton, Isaac, *Observations on Daniel and the Apocalypse,* 1733. The author's name will always keep this book in repute. The spiritual student will not glean much from it. Sir Isaac's fame does not rest on his expositions.

@ Norris, J., Frank, *Practical Lectures on Daniel*, 219 pages. He identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Persia, Macedonia and Rome (37, 115-117); attacks the postmillennial view (40) and the idea of an ecumenical church (49); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist (119-120), of Daniel 8 as Antiochus (143-144); lists 20 characteristics of Antichrist, the willful king (194-200).

$ Parker, Thomas, *Daniel Expounded,* 1646. This learned book is enough to perplex and distract any ordinary mortal. We had sooner read a table of logarithms.

> Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Daniel*, Bible Knowledge Commentary, 1983-1985. A premillennial dispensational survey by the long-time Professor of Bible Exposition at Dallas Theological Seminary. Pentecost discusses many of the highlights, explains quite a lot, and shows a good grasp on many of the problems, along with clear writing. Even if succinct, the work is worth expositors' consulting the attempt to show the reasonableness of a literal view relating to Israel's prophetic future, as in Dan. 7:15ff, 9:24-27, and 11:36-12:13.

@ Pettingill, William L., *Simple Studies in Daniel*, 1920, 117 pages. Devotional. He advocates premillennialism (14); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (17,67-68); denies the church is seen in the Old Testament (19); thinks that Daniel in the lion's den is typical of the Jewish remnant in the tribulation period (62); identifies the little horn of both Daniel 7 and 8 as Antichrist (70,78); thinks that the coming prince and the willful king also refer to Antichrist (96,109); teaches a premillennial rapture (97).

Phillips, John and Jerry Vines. *Exploring the Book of Danie*l, 1990, 279 pages. This work is a dispensational exposition with clarity of interpretation and practical application to stimulate thought about relevance for today. It does not wrestle deeply with interpretive issues.

! Phillips, John, *Exploring the Book of Daniel*, 2004, 287 pages. Probably similar to the Phillips/Vines work cited above, except this is published by Kregal and is part of the John Phillips Commentary Series and Vines is not mentioned as an author. Conservative and dispensational, but deliberately not dealing extensively with the critical attacks. Phillips includes useful outlines and 23 appendixes. It reads more like a narrative than a commentary at times.

% Porteous, Norman W., *Daniel, A Commentary*, 1965. Starts from the premise that Daniel borrowed from ancient myths, prophecy, psalms and wisdom literature. Expounds it as history, not prophecy, and thereby robs it of its unique place in apocalyptic literature.

$ Pusey, Edward Bouverie, *Daniel the Prophet*, 1869. To Dr. Pusey's work on Daniel all subsequent writers must be deeply indebted, however much they may differ from him in other departments of theological study.

> The author was the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford who, though trained under German critics, became a solid conservative. He was amillennial in prophecy. His greatest contribution is in historical backgrounds. On the key prophetical portions he often allegorizes.

? Redditt, P. L. *Daniel*, New Century Bible, 1999. 211 pages. Redditt gives a rather uninspired traditional critical reading to the book of Daniel

$ Roos, Magnus Frederick, *Exposition of such of the Prophecies of Daniel as receive*

their accomplishment under the New Testament, 1811. Roos is dull to a dreadful degree: we should say that nobody ever read him except his translator. He is very devout and this is the saving point about his book.

$ Rule, William Harris, *Historical Exposition of Daniel,* 1869. A notably interesting exposition, bringing historical facts and memorials to bear upon the prophecy. It is not merely readable but attractive.

! Ruckman, Peter*, Bible Believer's Commentary on Daniel*, 2016. Practical and useful, especially on the prophetic sections. Premillennial, dispensational and based on the Authorized Version.

? Russell, D. S. *Daniel*, Daily Study Bible, 1981, 244 pages. Russell is one of the previous generation's leading critical interpreters of apocalyptic literature. In his introduction, he dates the book late and gives a very unsatisfactory explanation of pseudonymity. However, his insistence on the present relevance of the book (over against a speculative futuristic approach) has much to commend itself.

> This is by the famous author of *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (1964), later General Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain. The series purports to have experts in their field write in a form that will appeal to the general public. Russell dates Daniel ca. 165 B. C., using arguments such as vocabulary and style. These have been answered well in favor of a 6th century date by such men as Edwin Yamauchi, Greece and Babylon. Yet there is much elucidation from careful scholarship even for evangelicals whose studies lead them to different conclusions. Russell in typical liberal fashion sees the parts of the image as depicting Neo-Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece. The fulfillment of God's Kingdom is not in a far off kingdom (that, says Russell, is strained and fanciful exegesis), but in the writer's own time. His hopes were not realized, for the kingdom did not come literally in the way he expected in his day (p. 54). Yet Russell does believe in the New Testament hope of the kingdom at the end of history. On 12:2, he says wrongly that the earlier Hebrews had no belief in individual life beyond the grave (p. 218). While the work often does not offer reliable help that understands the writer's expectation in the futuristic way the writer most naturally seems to mean it, there is much to open up vividly many of the verses on other details. The work is helpful if one wants to see how a liberal mind deals with what is said.

@ Seiss, Joseph A., *Voices From Babylon,* 1879, 391 pages. Premillennial. He identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Graeco-Macedonia, Rome (59-62, 188-192); denies that the church could crush government (85); denies that the little horn of Daniel 7 can be the papacy (194) but holds instead that it is Antichrist (195); maintains the little horn of Daniel 8 is Antiochus, a type of Antichrist (215,220); thinks the 70 weeks extended from 454 B.C. to Palm Sunday, 29 A.D. (245f); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (27f).

! Smith, Hamilton, *The Book of Daniel, An Expository Outline*, 130 pages. Brief Plymouth Brethren treatment. Premillennial, dispensation, occasionally uses the Darby

translation and corrects the Authorized Version.

> Stevens, W. C. *The Book of Daniel*, 1918. There is a good tracing of the thematic development here as Stevens covers the entire book chapter by chapter and lays out his material systematically. He points out many spiritual truths in Daniel's prayer life and non-compromise. It is a refreshing commentary. Most of what he says is good material,

@ Strauss, Lehman, *The Prophecies of Daniel,* 1969, 384 pages. He identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (69-71, 201-202); defends the historicity of Daniel (87); thinks Nebuchadnezzar a type of the Antichrist (108); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist and in Daniel 8 as Antiochus, a type of the Antichrist (213,239); recommends Sir Robert Anderson's interpretation of the 70 weeks (273); calls the coming prince and the willful king Antichrist (282,341); thinks Daniel 12:2 refers to the resurrection of Israel (358).

$ Strong, Leonard, *Lectures,* 1871. Notes of instructive lectures.

$ Stuart, Moses, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 1850. Stuart gives quite an independent interpretation and fails to see the Pope and his Cardinals in Daniel, for which we like him all the better. We do not accept his conclusions, but he is always worthy of respect.

@ Talbot, Louis T., *The Prophecies of Daniel*, 1940, 234 pages. Premillennial. He holds to Daniel's authorship (10); he identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (34,43,118); thinks Nebuchadnezzar's restoration typifies Gentiles entering the millennium (82) and Daniel's deliverance from lions typifies the Jewish remnant (103); identifies the little horn as Antichrist, both in Daniel 7 and 8 (121,143,154); holds the 69 weeks extend to the death of Christ (170), the church age is a parenthesis (160) and the 70th week is the tribulation period (171); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (201); teaches two resurrections and interprets Daniel 12:2 as the restoration of the Jews (215).

% Tatford, Frederick Albert, *Daniel and His Prophecy: Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel*, 1980. First published in 1953, this study exhibits a balance between extremes. It treats the prophetic word with respect but does not probe minutiae. Instead, the Biblical text is expounded for the edification and enlightenment of the believer. Included is a masterful blending of history and theology, practical application and devotional stimulation. Premillennial.

> Tatford, Frederick A., *The Climax of the Ages*, 1953. As a premillennial and dispensational book, this gives a somewhat helpful discussion of several problems and goes into more detail on key passages than most dispensational works. It can take the place of several of the other dispensational works combined because it is fuller in its discussion. The higher critics, in their reviews, regard the book as "imperfectly acquainted with scholarly work". Tatford makes several statements in which he dismisses the beliefs of S. R. Driver and other critics as without substance, and this

naturally is not popular with their group. Miller, Pentecost, Walvoord and Wood are all better.

@ Thomson, J.E.H. and W.F. Adeney, "Daniel" in *The Pulpit Commentary*, 1896, 352 pages. Postmillennial. They defend the historicity of Daniel (xii); do not think Nebuchadnezzar forgot the dream (44); identify the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome (70, 208-211) and the fifth kingdom as the Christian church (73, 214); identify the little horn of Daniel 8 as Antiochus (241); make the 70 weeks run out at the first advent (274f); hold the willful king of Daniel 11 is Antiochus (319); teach a general resurrection (335).

? Towner, W. S. *Daniel*, Interpretation, 1984, 186 pages, This commentary concentrates on the theology of the book and is written from a critical perspective. The writing is clear and often insightful.

$ Tregelles, S. Prideaux, *Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of Daniel,* 1852. Tregelles is deservedly regarded as a great authority upon prophetic subjects.

> The author deals with several critical problems well and devotes fine treatment to the key chapters. He takes the view that the “little horn” of chapter 7 is the same as the “little horn” of chapter 8. He explains that while in a general way this horn can be represented as arising out of the fourth kingdom (Rome) in chapter 7, it can also be said to come more particularly out of the Grecian area in chapter 8 which was amalgamated into the fourth kingdom and became a part of it.

% Wallace, Ronald S., *The Lord is King: The Message of Daniel*, 1979. A clear presentation of the historical aspects of the book.

@ Walvoord, John Flipse, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation,* 1971, 317 pages. A very thorough and careful exposition. He defends the genuineness of Daniel (16-25); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (64-68, 145f); gives both amillennial and premillennial interpretations (72f); defends the historicity of Darius the Mede (132f); identifies the little horn of Daniel 7 as Antichrist (175) and of Daniel 8 as Antiochus (196); recommends Sir Robert Anderson's chronology of the 70 weeks (228); identifies the willful king as the Roman world ruler, Antichrist (272,276); thinks that Old Testament saints are raised after the tribulation (287).

$ Wells, Edward, *Daniel Explained,* 1716. It is of no great value.

> Whitcomb, John C. *Daniel*, Everyman’s Bible Commentary, 1985. 176 pages. A dispensational survey, documenting his use of scholarly literature and mingling exegesis and devotional elements. His dispensational interpretations are fairly standard.

$ Willet, Andrew, *Hexapla in Danielem*, 1610. Williams says that this is a work of much information, as it contains the "opinions of many authors on each point of difficulty." He adds that in none of his expositions does Willet "discover more skill and judgment than in the present work."

$ Wilson, Joseph, *Horæ Propheticæ; or Dissertation on the Book of Daniel*, 1824. We consider this to be of more than average worth.

% Wilson, Robert Dick, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, 2 volumes in 1, 1979. The reprinting in paperback of an indispensable defense of the accuracy and integrity of the book of Daniel. Highly recommended. Amillennial.

$ Wintle, Thomas, *Daniel, an Improved Version, with Notes,* 1792. Learned notes, mainly philological.

$ Wodrow, Robert, *Destiny of Israel, as unfolded in the Eighth and succeeding Chapters of Daniel,* 1844. This devout author follows the system of Sir Isaac Newton and Bishop Newton. His calculations as to the year 1843 were disproven by history.

% Wood, Leon J., *A Commentary on Daniel*, 1972. A fascinating and enlightening commentary which expounds the historic setting of the book, unfolds its prophetic message and provides readers with a fresh, accurate translation of the text. Premillennial.

$ Wood, William, *Lectures on the first Seven Chapters of Daniel,* 1847. Plain sermons of no great expository value.

! Woolvard, John F., Daniel, *The Key to Prophetic Interpretation*, 1971. One of the better commentaries from a conservative and dispendational/premillennial viewpoint. Defends the book from the critical attacks but occasionally wanders a little too close to the critics for comfort. I quote from this book rather frequently in this commentary.

@ Wright, Charles H. H., *Daniel and His Prophecies*, 1906, 356 pages. Studies in Daniel organized rather loosely. He defends the supernatural character of the Book (vii); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (143,148f); holds that the 70 weeks extend to the advent of Christ (206) and that Messiah shall be cut off (244); identifies the vile king and willful king as Antiochus (276,298).

@ Young, Edward J., *The Prophecy of Daniel*, 1949, 330 pages. Amillennial. Defends Daniel as the author (19f); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (74,75,143,147); attacks the idea that the Greek words in Daniel are an argument for a late date (87); thinks that Nebuchadnezzar was converted (114); does not know how to identify the ten kingdoms, but does identify the little horn in Daniel 7 as Antichrist (149-150) in Daniel 8 as Antiochus (170); holds that the 70 weeks are an indefinite period of time to the first advent of Christ (196-201) and that Messiah causes a covenant to prevail (208); identifies the willful king as Antichrist (247f); teaches a general resurrection (256).

@ Zockler, Otto, "Daniel" in *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 1870, 273

pages. A critical Lutheran commentary. He defends the authenticity of Daniel (20-41); gives a harmony of the four kingdoms (44-47); identifies the four kingdoms as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia and the successors of Alexander (77,151-153); denies Nebuchadnezzar's vision of one like a son of God was an objective seeing (101); thinks the banquet of Belshazzar and the capture of the city were separated by some period of time (132-134); holds the 3 2 years should not be taken too literally (162); thinks the cutting off of an anointed one refers to the death of a high priest of Israel (199) and that the people of the coming prince are Antiochus' army (201); teaches a general resurrection (262).