

## Notes

Note: All Scripture quotations in this paper, except when noted otherwise, are from the Holy Bible, New International Version. Copyright (c) 1973, 1978, 1984 International Bible Society.

<sup>1</sup>See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:16-22," *Historicism* No. 14/Apr 88, p. 2-49.

<sup>2</sup>Uriah Smith's *Thoughts on Revelation* first appeared in 1865 and *Thoughts on Daniel* was published eight years later in 1873. Their second editions appeared in 1875 and 1885 respectively and were available separately for some time, with a final printing in 1912. The two were brought together in one volume for the first time in 1881 as *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*. The latest revision of this now classic work was published as *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation* (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1944). See Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary Doctrine: Three Approaches in the seventh-day Adventist Church*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1981), pp. 22-23.

<sup>3</sup>See Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, pp. 245-266. The crucial statement occurs on p. 258: "Now that the prophet has taken us through the secular events of the Roman Empire to the end of the seventy weeks of Daniel 9:24, he takes us back to the time when the Romans became directly connected with the people of God by the Jewish league in 161 B.C." (More recent sources give 160 B.C. as the treaty's date.) It should be understood that what Smith says about vs. 23 involves more than vs. 23.

<sup>4</sup>The subtitle of F. E. Peters book, *The Harvest of Hellenism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), is *A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the triumph of Christianity*. There can be no triumph of Christianity unless it comes into conflict with an opposing force and unless whatever opposes it is defeated. The church clearly came into conflict with pagan Rome. If it is appropriate to say that Christianity triumphed in its conflict with Rome, it is also appropriate to say that Rome was defeated in its conflict with Christianity.

<sup>5</sup>Judaism as we now know it—a religion of communal study and prayer—began when it ceased to be a religion of sacrifice and temple ritual. As long as there was a temple, that was the focus of Jewish worship. Thus, it was only after A.D. 70 that the synagogue assumed its present importance. Christianity might seem to resemble this later Judaism of the synagogue more than the earlier religion of the temple. There are no animal sacrifices in the church and Christians are scattered in small communities around the world, just like Jews in their synagogues. But as long as the cross of Christ is preached the emphasis on sacrifice remains. On this basis I submit that, despite all appearances to the contrary, there is more similarity between the temple and the church than between the church and the synagogue.

<sup>6</sup>Points two and three are related. The basis on which the New Testament asserts the continuation of right Jewish faith in Christian faith is not historical, as in the previous note, but spiritual. The church assumes the role of believing Israel as soon as Israel itself ceases to believe (Gal 3:16, 28). In this way God is not left without a witness. If some fall away by unbelief, others are grafted in to take their places (Rom 11:11-24). "And so all Israel will be saved" (Rom 11:26). Paul is not saying here that all who are Jews by physical descent will be saved. If this were the case, then Judas would be in heaven and so would Jeroboam son of Nebat, Ahab, Caiaphas, and others who to the very end opposed God in a determined manner. What Paul does mean is that all spiritual Israelites who are Jews will be saved—such as Paul himself (2 Tim 4:7-8)—and that all spiritual Israelites who are Gentiles will be saved (Rom 2:28-29). Salvation is by faith in Christ. If anyone has this faith he can be saved, whether Jew or Gentile by physical descent. The prophecy captures this important insight by failing to distinguish between Rome's dealings with Jews before Christ and its treatment of Christians afterward.

<sup>7</sup>What I call group 2 historicists in an earlier paper ("Historicist Model," pp. 5-11) and in my 1983 Andrews University M.A. thesis entitled "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (*Masters Abstracts* 22 [March 1984]:83; MA1321021, pp. 74-83) represent a separate school of thought within historicism because of their attempt to eliminate the present irregularity in the chapter's timeline. Group 2 historicism takes two forms. Edwin R. Thiele and C. Mervyn Maxwell apply the verses surrounding vs. 22 to a time much later than the first century A.D. ("Historicist Perspective," pp. 79-80). Desmond Ford applies them to a time much earlier than the first century (*ibid.*, p. 80, 93-94). Most historicists fall within group 1 (see *ibid.*, pp. 85-94).

<sup>8</sup>I have suggested that Smith's emphasis on Christ in Dan 11:22 validates his interpretation. It is not enough, however, to mention the name of Jesus when interpreting this difficult passage or any other. All historicists place Christ in vs. 22 by some means but not all are able to give equal emphasis to the cross once they have done so (see Hardy, "The Historicist Model for Interpreting Daniel," *Historicism* No. 3/Jul 85, pp. 5-11). There is a further question how naturally and convincingly the rest of the model supports the attempted christocentric interpretation. So while other historicist models might be attractive for various reasons, all have as one of their implications a reduced amount and/or quality of emphasis on "Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor 2:2) within the present prophecy. At Minneapolis Uriah Smith might have had his misgivings, but in this passage he has not failed us.

<sup>9</sup>Hardy, "Notes on the Linear Structure of Dan II," *Historicism* No. 7/Jul 86, table 3, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup>There are three main changes, two of which derive from further study of vss. 16-17. Rome took over Judea in stages. It was regarded as an ally (timeframe of vs. 16a), then taxed but did not govern (vs. 16b), and finally assumed complete control (vs. 17a), eventually overwhelming and destroying the nation (vs. 17b). Thus, the first change is that vs. 16b has been moved from between 22a and 17b to a point between 24a and 18 and vs. 17a has been moved from between 23 and 24a to a point between 20a and 20b. Second, vs. 20a ("Octavian's census and nonviolent death") formerly contained two clauses and there was no vs. 20b. It was simply mislabeled. Verse 20b is now separated from vs. 20a because Rome's annexation of Judea (vs. 17a [A.D. 6]) occurred at a time later than the census which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem (vs. 20a [4 B.C.]) but earlier than Octavian's death (vs. 20b [A.D. 14]). The two clauses are now separated because I must put vs. 17a between them. And third, the crucifixion clause (vs. 22b) could be placed either before or after the reign of terror that was broadly contemporary with it (vs. 22a). The terror began shortly after Tiberius moved to the island of Capriae in A.D. 26 and ended with his death A.D. 37. Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate in A.D. 31 approximately midway between these two points. Earlier I placed vs. 22b before vs. 22a because the terror became dramatically more severe in October of A.D. 31 with the death of Sejanus. But in fact it was divided about equally both before and after that year.

<sup>11</sup>See Hardy, "Dan 11:16-22," pp. 23-26, 33-34.

<sup>12</sup>The Hebrew word *hithabb<sup>e</sup>rût* is a Hithpael infinitive. Other uses of the same root (*hbr*) in the same conjugation are found in Dan 11:6 ("they will become allies [*yithabbârû*]") and 2 Chr 20:37 ("Because you have made an alliance [*k<sup>e</sup>hithabber<sup>e</sup>kâ*] with Ahaziah, . . ."). (The word *ethabbar* in vs. 35, however, is not Hithpael as in Dan 11:6 but Ethpael.) See also Sirach 13:2 ("How can the clay pot associate with the iron kettle? The pot will strike against it, and will itself be broken").

<sup>13</sup>Christian theologians have often wondered at the fact that Judah, who was so zealous in the service of the Lord, made a treaty with and sought security through a pagan power, despite all the admonitions of the prophets. It must be said that there is ground for such wonder. The Maccabees had again taken a step that brought them nearer to the pagan world; they had again accommodated devout Judaism to the ways of the nations" (Elias Bickerman, *From Ezra*

to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism [New York: Schocken, 1962], p. 133).

<sup>14</sup>The text of the treaty is as follows: (23) "May all go well with the Romans and with the nation of the Jews at sea and on land for ever, and may sword and enemy be far from them. (24) If war comes first to Rome or to any of their allies in all their dominion, (25) the nation of the Jews shall act as their allies wholeheartedly, as the occasion may indicate to them. (26) And to the enemy who makes war they shall not give or supply grain, arms, money, or ships, as Rome has decided; and they shall keep their obligations without receiving any return. (27) In the same way, if war comes first to the nation of the Jews, the Romans shall willingly act as their allies, as the occasion may indicate to them. (28) And to the enemy allies shall be given no grain, arms, money, or ships, as Rome has decided; and they shall keep these obligations and do so without deceit. (29) Thus on these terms the Romans make a treaty with the Jewish people. (30) If after these terms are in effect both parties shall determine to add or delete anything, they shall do so at their discretion, and any addition or deletion that they may make shall be valid. (31) And concerning the wrongs which King Demetrius is doing to them we have written to him as follows, "Why have you made your yoke heavy upon our friends and allies the Jews? (32) If now they appeal again for help against you, we will defend their rights and fight you on sea and on land."" (1 Mace 8:23-32)

<sup>15</sup>Bickerman, Ezra, p. 132.

<sup>16</sup>The context for the above statement reads as follows: "So Judas chose Eupolemus the son of John, son of Accos, and Jason the son of Eleazar, and sent them to Rome to establish friendship and alliance, (18) and to free themselves from the yoke; for they saw that the kingdom of the Greeks was completely enslaving Israel. (19) They went to Rome, a very long journey; and they entered the senate chamber and spoke as follows: (20) 'Judas, who is also called Maccabeus, and his brothers and the people of the Jews have sent us to you to establish alliance and peace with you, that we may be enrolled as your allies and friends.' (21) The proposal pleased them, (22) and this is, a copy of the letter which they wrote in reply, on bronze tablets, and sent to Jerusalem to remain with them there as a memorial of peace and alliance: . . ." (1 Mace 8:17-22).

<sup>17</sup>Peters, Harvest of Hellenism, p. 269.

<sup>18</sup>For the most part Judea's treaty with Rome was a diplomatic show piece. It may be, however, that on one occasion it was actually invoked and put to practical use. In 135/34 B.C., during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135/34-104), Antiochus VII Euergetes Sidetes (139-129) besieged Jerusalem. There is fragmentary evidence that Rome sent a message to Antiochus at this time instructing him to raise the siege. See, Tessa Rajak, "Roman Intervention in a Seleucid Siege of Jerusalem?" Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 22 (1981): 65-81.

<sup>19</sup>Real independence did not come until some time later. "In May 142 Simon obtained Israel's complete freedom from tribute. 'Therefore was the yoke of the heathen taken away from Israel.' Public documents began to be dated according to the years of Simon. ... On Elul 18 (about September) of the preceding year (140 B.C.E.) 'in a great congregation of priests and people and princes of the nation, and of the elders of the country,' it was determined that Simon should be 'their leader and High Priest for ever.' Heretofore the legal basis for the power of the Maccabean princes had been royal appointment. Now the rule of Simon and of his successors rested upon the decision of the people itself; hence Simon assumed the new title, 'Prince of the People' (Ethnarch). But lest the people in its fickleness change its mind, it was also resolved that no one should be permitted to alter this law or to convoke assemblies without Simon's consent" (Bickerman, Ezra, pp. 143-44). In 152 B.C. Demetrius had offered to remit all taxes as a means of ingratiating himself to the Jews (1 Mace 10:21-47) but independence did not come until the king's death ten years later (1 Mace 14:1-15).

<sup>20</sup>The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod: 550 BC to 4 BC (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), pp. 124-25. In his list McCullough does not

mention Antiquities 14.217-22. This last mentioned renewal of the treaty with Rome took place soon after the death of Julius Caesar (March 15, 44 B.C.).

<sup>21</sup>See Hardy, "The Verse Division at Dan 11:23-24," *Historicism* No. 6/Apr 86, pp. 32-38.

<sup>22</sup>There are syntactic as well as stylistic reasons to believe that *b<sup>š</sup>alwâ* ("in peace") and *b<sup>e</sup>mišmannê m<sup>e</sup>dînâ* ("in [the] richest [parts] of [the] province") are dissimilar and cannot be treated comparably within the same sentence. I use English examples below because I am writing for speakers of that language, but Hebrew examples could be used without changing the substance of the argument. Below I make the artificially simple assumption that what we are comparing with "in peace" is "in [the] province" rather than "in [the] richest [parts] of [the] province." Both strings take the form of prepositional phrases ("in" + NP) but their syntactic behavior is widely different. Consider the following examples, in which an asterisk (\*) is used to mark unacceptable strings where a question mark (?) is used to mark marginally acceptable strings.

Peace	Province
Original sense	
he came in peace	*he came in province
*he came in [the] peace	?he came in [the] province
*he came to [the] peace	he came to [the] province
Altered sense	
he came peacefully	?he came provincially
he came in a peaceful manner	he came in a provincial manner

The differences between "in peace" and "in [the] province" all spring from a common source and that is that the one string serves an adverbial function, while the other does not. The last pair of sentences illustrates this fact rather than providing evidence against it because the meaning of 4.b. ("he came provincially") is most closely paraphrased by 5.b. ("he came in a provincial manner," i.e., he came from a province), not 3.b. ("he came to the province"). If one must invoke a different meaning in order to give "in the province" an adverbial role in the sentence, then without that change of meaning it does not have an adverbial role in the sentence. But "in peace" clearly does. "In peace" tells how; "in [the] province" tells where. They supply not only different information but different kinds of information. For these reasons it is inappropriate to translate Dan 11:24 in any way that is consistent with "In peace and in the province he came," e.g., "He came in peace and in the province," where the act of coming is modified by both "peace" and "province." To attempt any such a translation is to perpetrate a syntactic pun. Under the proposed interpretation what "in peace" modifies is the verb of rising in vs. 23, not the verb of coming in vs. 24. They are entirely separate and distinct.

<sup>23</sup>Hebrew *m<sup>e</sup>dînâ* is a general term meaning "territory." Judea was not at this time a Roman province in the later and more narrow sense of the word.

<sup>24</sup>Antiochus IV Epiphanes lost his life as a result of wounds suffered in an assault on a temple in Persia. "King Antiochus was going through the upper provinces when he heard that Elymais in Persia was a city famed for its wealth in silver and gold. (2) Its temple was very rich, containing golden shields, breastplates, and weapons left there by Alexander, the son of Philip, the Macedonian king who first reigned over the Greeks. (3) So he came and tried to take the city and plunder it, but he could not, because his plan became known to the men of the city (4) and they withstood him in battle. So he fled and in great grief departed from there to return to Babylon" (1 Mace 6:1-4). He died shortly afterward.

<sup>25</sup>"It was July when the battering-rams eventually breached the wall of the Antonia where John's tunnel had weakened its foundations. The Romans then found themselves facing the unexpected obstacle of another wall built behind it by the defenders, which they scaled at dead of night, taking the sleeping sentries by surprise. With the Antonia in their hands, they then

pressed on in the hope of getting possession of the Temple courts also, but they were beaten back by the combined forces of John and Simon" (E. Mary Small wood. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, no. 20 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976], p. 322). In all of this Titus fared no better than Pompey had one hundred thirty-two years earlier. "When Aristobulus' supporters refused to surrender on favourable terms, Pompey had no choice but to dislodge them by force. But even with the initial advantage of possession of the Upper City, it took him three months to storm the Temple" (ibid., p. 25).

<sup>26</sup>Josephus: *Jewish Antiquities* 10 vols., Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943), vol. 7: *Books XII-XIV*, R. Marcus, transl., 14.110-11.

<sup>27</sup>A difference is that Titus had to fight his way into the city, while Pompey was given free entrance. The time between the two attacks on Jerusalem and the temple is approximately 122 years rather than 123 years. There is no year zero separating B.C. and A.D.

<sup>28</sup>Josephus, *Antiquities*, 14.71-72.

<sup>29</sup>Other violations were soon to follow. Josephus (*Antiquities*, 14.105-09) tells us that Crassus, on the way to his death campaigning in Parthia, took the gold that Pompey had left untouched. A priest named Eleazar thought he might dissuade Crassus from taking everything by offering one item of special worth—the golden bar that supported a curtain—although it had escaped Crassus' attention before. The result was that Crassus took the golden bar, as suggested, and all the rest as well. Notice two points. First Crassus could not have engaged Eleazar in the conversation that Josephus reports without being physically present inside the temple. Second, the veil is not identified but the extraordinary nature of the bar that held it up is clear. Unless the veil into the second apartment rested on a bar inferior to this one, Crassus saw the same things that Pompey had when it was taken down. But the second clause makes it clear that the first applies to Pompey's action and rather than that of Crassus. The act of entering that the first part of vs. 24a reports was unique at the time it occurred. Years later Romans would enter the temple in the person of Titus, and whoever accompanied him. But the prophecy does not apply to Titus any more than it applies to Crassus. It applies to Pompey.

<sup>30</sup>See Josephus, *Antiquities*, 14.127-132.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 14.133-36.

<sup>32</sup>According to Josephus, Strabo of Cappadocia states that, "There were four classes in the state of Cyrene [modern Libya]; the first consisted of citizens, the second of farmers, the third of resident aliens (metics), and the fourth Jews. This people has already made its way into every city, and it is not easy to find any place in the habitable world which has not received this nation and in which it has not made its power felt" (*Antiquities*, 14.115).

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 14.137-48.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 14.137.

<sup>35</sup>Singular examples are: Dan 8:17 ("time of the end"); 9:21 ("about the time of the evening sacrifice"); 11:24 ("but only for a time"), 35 ("the time of the end"), 40 ("the time of the end"); 12:1 ("At that time"), 1 ("a time of distress"), 1 (from the beginning of nations until then [*ad ha<sup>c</sup>et hahhi<sup>2</sup>*]), 1 ("at that time"), 4 ("the time of the end"), 9 ("the time of the end"), and 11 ("From the time that . . ."). Plural examples are: Dan 9:25 ("in times of trouble"); 11:6 ("In those days [*bā<sup>c</sup>ittîm*]), 13 ("and after several years [*ûl<sup>c</sup>qēs hā<sup>c</sup>ittîm šānîm*]), 14 ("In those times"). See also *l<sup>c</sup>mô<sup>c</sup>ēd mô<sup>c</sup>dîm wāhēšî* ("a time, times and half a time") (Dan 12:7).

<sup>36</sup>Singular examples are: Dan 2:8 ("you are trying to gain time"), 9 ("hoping the situation will change [*ad dî iddānā<sup>2</sup> yištannē<sup>2</sup>*]), 3:5 ("As soon as [*b<sup>c</sup>iddānā<sup>2</sup>*] you hear"), 15 ("when [*b<sup>c</sup>iddānā<sup>2</sup>*] you hear"), 7:12 ("for a period of time"), 25 ("a time"), and 25 ("half a time"). Plural examples are: Dan 4:16 (13) ("till seven times pass by for him"), 23 (20) ("until seven times pass by for you") 25 (22) ("Seven times will pass by for you"), 32 (29) ("Seven times will pass by for you"); 7:25 ("the set times and the laws"), 25 ("times").

<sup>37</sup>Preterist and futurist writers alike apply the prophetic time period of Dan 7:25 to the three years during which the temple was desolate under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (see James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927], pp. 312-15). The historical application to Antiochus does not fit the requirements imposed by the text of Daniel. On Kislev 15, 167 B.C. a pagan altar ("desolating sacrilege") was erected on top of the altar of burnt sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:54) and on Kislev 25 blasphemous sacrifices were offered on the new altar (vs. 59). Three years of hard fighting followed. Finally, on the morning of Kislev 25, 164 B.C., Judas Maccabeus was able to have the traditional sacrifices offered once more on a properly reconsecrated altar (1 Macc 4:52). At the very season and on the very day that the Gentiles had profaned it, it was dedicated with songs and harps and lutes and cymbals" (1 Macc 4:54). This was a dramatic moment but not a fulfillment of prophecy. To make the experience of Judas Maccabeus a fulfillment of Dan 7:25 or 12:7 we must find some way to make three years to the day equal three years and a half. Or alternatively we must find some way to make Dan 7:25 stop after saying "a time and two times" rather than going on to say "a time, two times and half a time." Until such difficulties are overcome we must conclude that the Antiochus hypothesis is fatally flawed. Montgomery remains unmoved by such arguments. For him this was "a remarkably approximate prediction of a future event" (ibid., p. 314). It is not remarkable that the fulfillment he has in mind is so far off but that it is anywhere close to being accurate. For him the level of accuracy—to within only six months—is impressive. But that is because he does not believe in predictive prophecy. I do believe in predictive prophecy and am not at all impressed with 86 accuracy.

<sup>38</sup>The prophetic year of 360 days is not drawn from any calendar. It is an abstraction based on the idea of a thirty day month. The reasoning is as follows. The "time, times and half a time" of Dan 7:25 is the same period as the "time, times and half a time" of Rev 12:14. The "42 months" of Rev 11:2 is the same period as the "forty-two months" of Rev 13:5. The "1,260 days" of Rev 11:3 is the same period as the "1,260 days" of Rev 12:7. "1,260 days" (Rev 11:3) make up "42 months" (Rev 11:2) of thirty days each. Forty-two is the number of months in three and a half years (12 + 24 + 6). Thus, the above time periods are all one and the same if a month is taken to have thirty days. In fact there are a number of ways to compute months. For an astronomer the synodic month lasts an average of 29.530588 days, the tropical month 27.321582, the sidereal 27.321661, the anomalistic 27.554550, and the nodical 27.212220. If we want more precision in the prophetic symbols, there is no logical stopping place. God could have overwhelmed us with detail. But it is not His purpose to overwhelm us. Instead he draws on common experience to make points we can understand.

<sup>39</sup>The first and last years of the period in question are not whole years (from January 1 to December 31) but fragments of years. Byzantium, like Rome, was not built in a day. What we must add is not 31 and 330 but 30 plus a fraction and 329 plus a fraction. Taking a median value in both cases we would have 30.5 plus 329.5 for a total of 360. It is not necessary to calculate this period to the month or day. But it is important to realize that we are talking about 360 years and not 361. The number 360 is significant in a prophetic context. This is the point to emphasize.

<sup>40</sup>See Hardy, "Historical Overview of Dan 11:29-39," to appear in *Historicism* No. 18/Apr 89.

<sup>41</sup>See Jack Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion*, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), 2:247; Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, abridged by D. M. Low, 3 vols. (New York: Washington Square Press, 1960), 2:659 .85.

<sup>42</sup>The early kings gave way in 509 B.C., according to the traditional chronology, to a republican form of government which endured until 27 B.C." (Finegan, *Light from the Ancient*

*Past*, 2:247). On the inappropriateness of 27 B.C. as a beginning date for the Empire see below and also n. 47.

<sup>43</sup>Andrew Lintott, "What Was the 'Imperium Romanum'?" (*Greece & Rome*, 2nd. series, 28 [1981]: 53).

<sup>44</sup>*Livy*, 14 vols., Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919), vol. 1: Books I and II, B. O. Foster, transl., 1.60.

<sup>45</sup>"It was time for Octavian to take steps towards fulfilling his promise to restore the Republic when the civil wars were over. He had been consul every year since Actium, and claimed universal power through the oath of 33 B.C. This was symbolized by the fact that all 24 lictors walked before him, and his colleague had none. On 1 January 28, when he entered on his sixth consulate with Agrippa for the second time, he gave up this invidious distinction, sharing the lictors with his colleague in the usual way" (Jones, *Augustus*, p. 45). "Augustus found a solution in his restored Republic, but it was not a Republic" (*ibid.*, 7). My point here is that Augustus thought it was.

<sup>46</sup>In 22 B.C. Augustus failed to run for the consulship and Claudius Marcellus and Lucius Arruntius were elected. "The people of Rome resented the removal of Augustus from the consulship, and their feelings were exacerbated by floods in Rome, a plague in Italy and a shortage of corn. They demanded that Augustus be given a perpetual and annual consulship, or a dictatorship, and besieged the Senate in the senate house until they agreed. They also pressed upon him the censorship and a curatorship of the corn Supply" (*ibid.*, p. 56).

<sup>47</sup>In January of 27 B.C. a major reorganization of the Roman government took place (see n. 45). Octavian laid down his de facto military dictatorship, and constitutional government was reestablished" (Naphtali Lewis and Meyer Reinhold, eds., *Roman Civilization Sourcebook*, 2 vols. [New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1951], vol. 2: The Empire, p. 3). Octavian's ability to lay down power in 27 B.C., if this is what he did, is itself evidence that that is not when he achieved it. 27 B.C. is an important date. But from the angel's perspective the fact that power was redistributed is less important than the battle which created it, making the redistribution possible.

<sup>48</sup>He claims in the *Res Gestae* that by this oath the Roman people demanded him as leader in the forthcoming war, and that he thereby acquired universal power. Constitutionalists may not have agreed" (A. H. M. Jones, *Augustus*, Ancient Culture and Society Series [New York: Norton, 1970], p. 38).

<sup>49</sup>Jones, *Augustus*, p. 37.

<sup>50</sup>Quoted from Cassius Dio (*ibid.*, p. 59). In 22 B.C. an attempt had been made to give Augustus this same power but it was not successful. Claudius Marcellus and Lucius Arruntius had run for the consulship. "The people of Rome resented the removal of Augustus from the consulship, and their feelings were exacerbated by floods in Rome, a plague in Italy and a shortage of corn. They demanded that Augustus be given a perpetual and annual consulship, or a dictatorship, and besieged the Senate in the senate house until they agreed. They also pressed upon him the censorship, and a curatorship of the corn supply. He accepted the last office only, and remedied the shortage in a few days" (*ibid.*,\* p. 56).

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>52</sup>The expression "with arms and with iron" is quoted from a loyalty oath taken by the people of Paphlagonia similar to but thirty years later than the one mentioned above (*ibid.*, p. 38).

<sup>53</sup>The sense of flooding or washing away for *šāṭap* is not confined to later books (see 2 Chr 32:4; Ps 78:20; Isa 8:8; 10:22; 28:2, 15, 18; 30:28; 66:12; Jer 8:6; 47:2; Ezek 13:11, 13; 38:22; Dan 11:10, 22, 26, 40). The sense of rinsing, on the other hand, is not confined to earlier books (see Lev 15:11, 12; 1 Kgs 22:38; Job 14:19; Ps 69:3, 16; 124:4; Isa 28:17; 43:2; Ezek 16:9). But the semantic development of the word seems to have been such that progressively larger amounts of liquid were felt to be compatible with its use.

<sup>54</sup>"It was on this occasion, we are told, that an infantry centurion, a man who had fought many a battle for Antony and was covered with scars, burst into laments as Antony was passing by, and said: 'Imperator, why dost thou distrust these wounds and this sword and put thy hopes in miserable logs of wood? Let Egyptians and Phoenicians do their fighting at sea, but give us land, on which we are accustomed to stand and either conquer our enemies or die.' To this Antony made no reply, but merely encouraged the man by a gesture and a look to be of good heart, and passed on" (B. Perrin, trans., *Plutarch's Lives*, 11 vols., Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920], vol. 9: *Demetrius and Antony Pyrrhus and Gaius Marius*, 64.2) (subsequently Plutarch, Antony).

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 68.2-3.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, 68.1. After Octavian's restructuring there were three legions numbered III (Augusta, Cyrenaica, Gallica). As Jones points out, this "can only mean that Augustus had two third legions in his army at Actium, one his own, one taken from Lepidus in 36 B.C., and that he also took over Antonius' third legion" (*Augustus*, pp. 110-11). In addition there were two legions numbered IV (Macedonica, Sythica), two numbered V (Alaudae, Macedonica), and two numbered VI (Victrix, Gemina) (*ibid.*). The nickname "Gemina" implies that this legion was made up of two earlier ones, from whatever source. The existence of two "Macedonias" (IV, V) again betrays two sources. And since Lepidus' last command was in Africa rather than Europe or Asia, they, as well as two III's, can be traced to Caesar and Antony. Caesar assimilated Antony's forces, taking them over as his own.

<sup>57</sup>Antony at once gained the favour of the soldiers by sharing their exercises, living with them for the most part, and making them presents as generously as he could; but to everybody else he was odious. For his easy disposition led him to neglect the wronged, he listened angrily to those who consulted him, and he was in ill repute for his relations with other men's wives" (Plutarch, *Antony*, 6.5).

<sup>58</sup>Jones, *Augustus*, p. 16.

<sup>59</sup>Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* 14.8.1-2, quoted in Jones, *Augustus*, p. 16.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, 16.4.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, 17.1. The year was 43 B.C. Octavian had been born in 63 B.C.

<sup>62</sup>Jones, *Augustus*, pp. 21-22.

<sup>63</sup>Lewis and Reinhold, *Sourcebook*, vol. 1, The Republic, pp. 298-99.

<sup>64</sup>Plutarch, *Antony*, 19.1-3, 20.1.

<sup>65</sup>Jones, *Augustus*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>66</sup>After Octavian had expelled Sextus Pompeius, a son of Pompey the Great, from Sicily in 36 B.C., "Lepidus tried to take Sicily for himself, but his troops mutinied, and Octavian was able to take them over, with the Pompeians, and depose Lepidus. His life was spared, but he lived under guard henceforth" (Jones, *Augustus*, p. 31).

<sup>67</sup>Tribute was imposed twice in a single year. A man named Hybreas is quoted as saying, "'If thou canst take a contribution twice in one year, thou hast power also to make summer for us twice, and harvest-time twice.' These words were rhetorical, it is true, and agreeable to Antony's taste, but the speaker added in plain and bold words that Asia had given him two hundred thousand talents; 'If,' said he, 'thou hast not received this money, demand it from those who took it; but if thou didst receive it, and hast it not, we are undone'" (Plutarch, *Antony*, 24.5).

<sup>68</sup>Plutarch gives a rather remarkable description of this event (*Antony*, 26.1-2).

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, 30.1-4,

<sup>70</sup>Jones, *Augustus*, pp. 28-29. According to Plutarch the boundary was the Aegean sea (*Antony*, 30.4).

<sup>71</sup>Plutarch, *Antony*, 31.1

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, 35.1.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, 36.2.



<sup>74</sup>Ibid., 50.4.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., 57.3.

<sup>76</sup>Lewis and Reinhold 1:306-7.

<sup>77</sup>E. Badian, *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic*, 2nd ed. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1968), pp. 47-50.

<sup>78</sup>See Hardy, "Dan 11:16-22," p. 42, n. 27.

<sup>79</sup>See Bacchiocchi, "Rome and Christianity Until A.D. 62," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 21(1983): 3-25. See also Acts 18:15; 19:31.

<sup>80</sup>See F. F. Bruce, *New Testament History*, Anchor Books (Garden City: Doubleday, 1972), pp. 299, 303. "Claudius did not attempt to isolate the Christians in Rome and deal with them, but ordered the whole Jewish community to leave" (ibid., p. 303). Bacchiocchi, citing Acts 18:2, challenges the assumption that Christians were included within the scope of Claudius' edict ("Rome and Christianity," p. 13, n. 33). He is forced to adopt this position because of his view that Rome realized the distinctive nature of Christianity from the start (ibid., p. 3).

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 23. Bacchiocchi states further: "The removal of the restraining influence of Stoic advisers, such as Seneca, enabled Nero to implement his irresponsible absolutistic policy, which resulted in the condemnation not only of Christians but also of influential Stoics, such as Barea Soranus and Thrax Paetus. In the case of the latter, it is noteworthy that he was charged with refusing to offer 'a sacrifice for the welfare of the emperor,' living an 'austere' (*tristes*) life in order to condemn the Emperor's 'wantonness' (*lasciviam*), 'deserting the public service,' and treating the 'forum and theatre and temple as a desert.' Basically the same charges were frequently leveled against Christians and were often summarized under the popular rubric of 'hatred of the human race' (*odium generis humani*)" (ibid., pp. 23-24).

<sup>82</sup>New Testament Introduction (New York: Herder and Herder, 1958). p. 452.

<sup>83</sup>Donald R. Dudley, trans., *The Annals of Tacitus* (New York: Mentor Books, 1966), 15.42, p. 352.

<sup>84</sup>"Whether this [the fire] was accidental, or elaborately contrived by the Emperor, is uncertain; historians give both versions. . . . No one dared to fight the flames. Menacing gangs threatened anyone who dared to try to put out the fire; indeed, some men openly cast on torches, and said they had their instructions. They may have been acting under orders, or they may simply have wanted a freer hand to loot. . . . Supplies were brought in from Ostia and the neighboring towns, and the price of grain was reduced to three sesterces a peck. These were meant to be popular measures, but they earned no gratitude, for a wide-spread report had it that as the city was burning Nero entered his private theater and sang of the fall of Troy, comparing the modern with the ancient calamity" (ibid., 5.38-39, pp. 350-51).

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., 15.44, p. 354.

<sup>86</sup>The problem of when Paul died is linked with the question of the pastoral epistles. See W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, last reprint 1971), pp. 829-31; Bruce, *New Testament History*, pp. 364-67; Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction*, pp. 445-52.

<sup>87</sup>The entire book of Hebrews can be seen as a document intended to encourage the church at some time between its first persecution, which was now only a memory, and its first truly severe persecution. "Remember those earlier days after you had received the light, when you stood your ground in a great contest in the face of suffering. Sometimes you were publicly exposed to insult and persecution; at other times you stood side by side with those who were so treated. You sympathized with those in prison and joyfully accepted the confiscation of your property, because you knew that you yourselves had better and lasting possessions" (Heb 10:32-34). It would be possible to apply this passage to the Jewish persecution fomented by Paul (Gal 1:13). "On that day a great persecution broke out against the church at Jerusalem, and all except the apostles were scattered throughout Judea and Samaria" (Acts 8:1). The sentence, "In your struggle against sin, you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding your

blood" (Heb 12:4), tells us two things. First, in the group to which Hebrews was addressed, there had been no loss of life due to persecution at this time ("You have not"). And second, this situation was expected to change ("yet"). When the church had already suffered from Jews would be renewed and extended by the Romans. Whether Christians were persecuted by Nero outside the city of Rome is also unclear. If not, they soon would be under Domitian.

<sup>88</sup>Patmos, an island twelve kilometers long by up to seven kilometers wide, lies fifty-five kilometers off the southwest coast of Turkey (37° 20' N, 26° 34' E). It is volcanic in origin and currently belongs to Greece. Notice that John's punishment was exile rather than death.

<sup>89</sup>Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 8 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910; reprint ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), vol. 2: Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100-325, pp. 33-34.

<sup>90</sup>Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, pp. 579-80.

<sup>91</sup>The single greatest achievement of the entire Diocletianic age was the reform of the tax system: predictable expenses were matched by predictable income, and for the first time the Roman state had what approached a modern national budget. Expenses could be predicted; the hierarchized chain of command enabled the praetorian prefects to prepare fairly reliable estimates of production. Diocletian accomplished this by nothing short of assessing the productivity of every person and every foot of land in the sprawling Empire by a series of careful censuses which were still being taken in A.D. 311" (*ibid.*, p. 608).

<sup>92</sup>Schaff, *History* 2:66.

<sup>93</sup>Diocletian had no male heir and so adopted Maximian, who was soon associated with Diocletian on the throne as a junior colleague in charge of the western provinces. Maximian lived at Mediolanum in the alpine foothills of northern Italy. Diocletian's own residence was in Nicomedia, on the coast of Asia Minor not far east of Byzantium. Both men appointed a deputy, with the rank of "Caesar." Maximian's deputy was Constantius Chlorus, father of Constantine the Great, who ruled Gaul, Britain, and Spain from Augusta Trevirorum close to the German frontier. Diocletian's deputy, and son-in-law, was Galerius, who ruled from Thessalonica in Greece. For the above see Michael Grant, *Atlas of Ancient History*, "The Roman Empire Under Diocletian and Maximian A.D. 284/6-305," pp. 82-83. The theory was that both Diocletian and Maximian would resign at a set time and promote their former deputies to supreme power (Peters, *Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 606).

<sup>94</sup>At this point things may have gotten out of hand. Diocletian's own wife Prisca was a Christian and so was his daughter Valeria. Schaff (*History* 2:65) does not mention any other daughters. If Galerius was Diocletian's son-in-law, it follows that he was Valeria's husband. This same Galerius was the chief architect of the persecution under Diocletian. Neither man could have foreseen that what they had unleashed would touch his own household.

<sup>95</sup>The spelling "Daia" appears is used by Peters (*Harvest of Hellenism*, p. 611 and elsewhere). Schaff, an older source, spells it "Daza."

<sup>96</sup>Schaff, *History* 2:68.

<sup>97</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 72. "Early in A.D. 313 Constantine and Licinius at a conference at Milan agreed upon an Empire-wide religious policy. As a compromise between Licinius' pagan position and Constantine's pro-Christian views, the Roman state adopted a position of neutrality and enunciated a policy of complete religious freedom. No general edict was issued at Milan, but in all probability detailed instructions were drawn up for provincial governors to implement the new policy, already in force in the West under Constantine's rule. The famous 'Edict of Milan' was probably a directive of Licinius despatched several months later from Nicomedia to governors of the Eastern provinces" (Lewis and Reinhold, *Sourcebook* 2:602).

<sup>98</sup>Babylon is not mentioned in chap. 8 either. This is not a simple mission. There are reasons for excluding it (see Hardy, "Daniel 8:9-12," *Historicism*, Supplement/Jul 85, pp. 9-11).

<sup>99</sup>See Hardy, "Linear Structure," pp. 11-18; "Dan 11:16-22," pp. 2-7.

<sup>100</sup>In vs. 31 the word "sacrifice" is supplied.