



# Antiochus OR Rome?

F.L. Sharp

# ANTIOCHUS OR ROME

Frederick L Sharp

1933

Published by Maranatha Media

maranathamedia.com

Throughout the history of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination there have constantly arisen men who have sought to undermine and overthrow its fundamental doctrines and teachings. But for nearly ninety years now those doctrines have stood the test, and survived every unholy attack, not one of them having ever been proved false or overthrown. And in spite of the fact that, at times, some of the most plausible and specious arguments known have been put forward, those truths which our opponents so earnestly sought to overthrow, have belted the world and found acceptance in many honest hearts in every country of this earth, with the result, that the membership of the denomination has been doubling every ten years. As one writer has stated, could we, some Sabbath morning, “race with the sun in its twenty-four-hour circuit” we should – every thirty minutes, reach new groups of believers gathering north and south of the equator, as the Sabbath morning sun passes over.” In other words, we can say that “the Sun never sets” on the church of the Advent movement.

Once again however, we are called upon to defend our position with regard to the eighth and ninth chapters of the book of Daniel, especially with reference to the “little horn” and the 2300 days – doctrines which are fundamental to the very existence of the Seventh-day Adventist cause, being the very root, so to speak, out of which the denomination has grown.

While we regard the 2300 days as prophetic, and as representing a period of years rather than days of twenty four hours we are met with an ancient theory handed out from the Vatican three centuries ago, in which an endeavor is made to apply to this prophetic period the desolating work of Antiochus Epiphanes, and by which the prophecy would be robbed of its solemn import, and be reduced to a mere recital of an historical incident, with no special significance whatsoever.

In the pamphlet issued by our latest critic, it is easily seen that his matter has all been gleaned from other papers and pamphlets, there being nothing new or original with him, and if called upon to substantiate his statements with regard to the late Mrs. E. G. White, he would have to rely wholly upon the like malicious statements and writings of others. He most certainly had no personal knowledge of what he has published relative to her, as he never knew her, or even ever saw her.

Then it is an old story about the publishers of Conybeare and Howson's book having threatened legal action unless Mrs. White's "Life of Paul" was taken off the market. Some extracts from a letter addressed by Pastor C. E. Holmes, some years ago, to the Editor of the "Gathering Call" may be of interest here. He says:

"I have just been looking over the April-May issue of the 'Gathering Call'. I am surprised at the misrepresentation, limping logic, and inaccuracy which it contains.

"As I opened its pages my eye fell on your statement regarding Mrs. White's book 'Sketches From the Life of Paul'. You proceed to give some facts, as you say; yet I find nothing but a few of your own assertions, and you would have me repudiate the work of Mrs. White on such flimsy evidence.

"You state that Mrs. White's book was 'such a perfect copy' of 'Life and Epistles of Paul', published by Conybeare and Howson, of England, that the American publishers threatened 'legal action' unless it were taken off the market.

“I studied Conybeare and Howson’s book in college and I have a copy of Mrs. White’s book in my library. To assert that Mrs. White’s work of 321 small pages, with no maps, illustrations or footnotes, is ‘such a perfect copy’ of a two-volume set of 1400 pages, with maps and illustrations and extensive notes, as to provoke legal action, is the height of absurdity. This is just as true of the contents as of the general plan of the book, and the style is also entirely different.

“The English edition, published in London, does not show a copyright. This is further substantiated by the following letter to me, from Thomas Y Crowell Company of New York City:

“We publish Conybeare’s ‘Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul’, but this is not a copyrighted book and we could have no legal ground for action against your book. January 18, 1924.

“Furthermore, your claim is squarely denied by W. C. White. In his reply to this, enquiry concerning this matter, he stated, in part ‘I do not know exactly how many copies were printed, but I think that two editions, of 5000 copies were printed. ‘Sketches from the Life of Paul’ was never suppressed. It simply went out of print when all the copies were sold, and the publication of another edition was delayed because of the desire of the author to present a more complete book. Such a book we now have in Acts of the Apostles, April 1, 1917.

“It is quite noticeable that the complaints are not made by the authors or publishers, but are limited to those who are enemies of Mrs. White and who are trying to discredit her God-given work. I notice that you have printed and are selling A Word to the Little Flock. Did you get permission from Elder James White or his legal successors to do this?

“In the light of real facts, your charges against Mrs. White and her book are shown to be untrue.”

## MRS. WHITE'S FINANCES

Now with reference to the wonderfully detailed statement which our critic gives regarding the financial affairs of the late Mrs. E. G. White, one would suppose that he must have been most intimately associated either with her or those who had charge of her affairs, but the fact is that he has never been within ten thousand miles of her or of her home, yet he feels himself fully competent to make such sweeping statements as though he personally knew those things to be true. And true or untrue it is clear that the thousands of miles of sea rolling between him and the representatives of the late Mrs. White embolden him in the prosecution of his nefarious work of circulating any malicious story whatever that Dame Rumor supplies.

He even goes so far as to say that Mrs. White "has been the cause of more trouble in the church than all other things combined" and adds that Seventh-day Adventists, in order "to defend her, have to do as she did – lie, hide, suppress, cover up, and deceive – and the Conference is now finding this out, much to their sorrow and discredit."

A most sweeping statement, the whole of which is positively false, both as regards Mrs. White or any S. D. A. Conference. The statement is not only ridiculous but malicious in the extreme, and displays a rashness, a recklessness that is born only of ignorance and inexperience.

There is one thing that is very certain, the late Mrs. E. G. White was an honorable and God-fearing woman, and those who knew her best can testify that whatever money she received was not used selfishly, but in helping the poor and needy, and in furthering the cause of God and as to her ever paying her son's debts (if it were trite) would that be anything to her discredit?

We wonder if our critic would regard it as discreditable to have his mother find money to get him out of a difficulty, or would he think it derogatory to have a woman find money to pay his debts? Perhaps he would not so regard things in his own case. Yet he would endeavor thus to cast a reflection upon

a dead woman, whose only object in life was to help others both spiritually and materially.

Now we will deal with the views expressed by this latest critic concerning the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel relative to the “little horn” and the 2300 days.

## ANTIOCHUS AS THE LITTLE HORN

In rejecting Uriah Smith’s interpretation of the prophecy concerning the little horn of Daniel 8:9 he makes much of the fact that Uriah Smith shows that the little horn first “goes east toward Syria whereas the prophecy says that it would go south. The Roman horn then goes south to Judea, whereas the prophecy says it would go east. And again, Rome goes further south to Egypt, whereas the prophecy says that the little horn would then go to the Pleasant Land (which is a westerly direction).”

Let it be noticed particularly, that for the fulfillment of the prophecy, he regards the exact order of the events outlined therein to be necessary, which we admit, of course, to be quite right.

In another place in his pamphlet, he purports to give (and what he would like us to believe to be) the real fulfillment of the prophecy. He says, “According to the prophecy the ‘little horn’ was first to go to the south,” and then after quoting 1 Maccabees 1:17-19 to show that Antiochus went to war with Egypt. He says “Thus did Antiochus Epiphanes wax great toward the south – to Egypt in the 143rd year.” But he stops short of giving the ultimate result of that invasion. The simple fact of Antiochus going to war would not necessarily be a reason for regarding him as waxing “exceeding great.” On one occasion Pyrrhus of Macedonia, though he proved to be victor in two furious battles, had to confess, “One more such victory and we are inevitably ruined.” Then we might also notice that Antiochus Magnus (Antiochus the Great) the father of Epiphanes, was, as history says, the most illustrious of all the Syrian kings, and this in contrast with his son Epiphanes, who was nicknamed by his

subjects, Epimanes the madman. Nothing very “great” in being regarded as a madman.

Our critic then says “The next direction was toward the east,” and again he quotes 1 Maccabees 3:31-37 to show that Antiochus went over to Persia in the 147th year, and once more he says. “Again, Antiochus fulfils the prophecy!” But again, he fails to say what happened on this occasion. But we shall see later.

And now he goes on to say “The last direction which is toward the Pleasant Land, I shall fully explain after showing another fulfillment of prophecy which comes in here.”

## GARBLED HISTORY

He then jumps over the remainder of that verse (verse 9) which gives the third direction of the “little horn”, and goes on to deal with verses 10-12 which, he says, “comes in here.” Now why does he do this? Because he very well knows that in giving Maccabees’ history which tells of Antiochus going to the Pleasant Land, it also gives the year in which he went, viz., the 143rd year, which reveals the fact that his going there was not in the order of the prophecy.

The prophecy sets out that the “little horn” would go in the following order:

First	South
Then	East
Lastly	To the Pleasant Land (Palestine)

But history shows that Antiochus DID NOT GO in that order, but went as follows:

First	South
Then	To the Pleasant Land
Lastly	East

And there was very good reason for his not going in the order given in the prophecy and not going to the Pleasant Land last of all, for after going to the east he became greatly incapacitated and did not return. HE WAS DEAD.

The Maccabees' history and other records show that he died in Persia following his failure at Elymais in the east, and consequently it would have been impossible for him to have gone into Palestine after his incursion into Persia.

So, in the endeavor to show that Antiochus went to the east next after going to the south, so as to make it appear that he fulfilled the prophecy. The purpose of it is defeated, for if it were true that he went to Persia after going into Egypt and before going to Jerusalem, that circumstance alone would at once very conclusively settle the question as to whether or not Antiochus was the "Little Horn," for being dead, he could not in such a case fulfill the next part of the prophecy – that of waxing great toward the Pleasant Land – or in fact, any of the remaining portion of it.

But he did go to the Pleasant Land, Jerusalem, but it was immediately after going toward the south (Egypt) and in the self-same year and before he went to the east (Persia) as is revealed in the Maccabees and other histories. But in so doing, he did not fulfill the prophecy in the order that the prophecy calls for. Nevertheless, our critic would fain make us believe that he did, and in quoting Maccabees' history in the order that he has, nothing could be more obvious than that he has deliberately attempted to deceive his readers by quoting it out of its setting. His quotations are in the following order:

1 Maccabees 1:17-19 – To show that Antiochus went south to Egypt. And this was in the 143rd year of the Greek kingdom.

Then he quotes:-

1 Maccabees 3:31-37 – To show that he went east to Persia. And this as in the 147th year.

And lastly he comes back to:-



1 Maccabees 1:21-24 – To show that he went to Jerusalem. But Maccabees' history shows that this was in the 143rd year, four years before he went east, in the 147th year.

Thus, has he taken the history out of its proper setting and fitted it into the prophecy in order to make his point, and then to emphasize it he says, on page 27 of his pamphlet, "After going south, THEN east we find that he did wax exceeding great toward the Pleasant Land."

That there can be no mistaking his intention in regard to this will be seen from further statements. On page 22 of his pamphlet he says, "Antiochus Epiphanes did wax great toward the south – Egypt, towards the east – Persia; and towards the Pleasant Land – Judea and Jerusalem. Thus, again fulfilling the prophecy, TO THE LETTER. And again on page 28 he writes, "Antiochus Epiphanes fulfilled ALL this prophecy IN EVERY DETAIL."

And these statements that he has made, the very quotations that he gives, when used in their correct setting, not only give the actual and correct order in which Antiochus went to these three places, but also give the very years, and in such a definite way that there could be no mistaking it.

## ANTIOCHUS DOES NOT FULFIL THE PROPHECY

Now as we go further and examine more closely the experience of Antiochus, we shall see that in no way did he fulfill the prophecy.

From the very first when Antiochus came to the throne, and all through his reign, he was under heavy tribute to Rome. Moreover, he himself, had been held by Rome as a hostage for the due payment of that tribute. To begin with, then, we do not find anything very great about that. Such an experience was anything but great.

When he invaded Egypt, it is clear that he did so in a somewhat surreptitious manner. Rome was at the time engaged in a war with Perseus, and taking advantage of this engagement of the Roman forces, Antiochus, regarding the

time opportune, determined to invade Egypt. But so as to avoid any possibility of interference on the part of Rome, and to conceal his real objective, it is stated in history that "In the meantime, to observe measures with the Romans, he sent ambassadors to the Senate to represent the right he had to the provinces of Coele-Syria and Palestine, of which he was actually in possession, and the necessity he was [tinder?] of engaging in a war in order to support that right, immediately after which he put himself at the head of his army and marched toward the frontier of Egypt."

So, under the pretense of establishing his rights in Coele-Syria and Palestine, he deliberately marched into Egypt. In this invasion he certainly was successful, and overran the country, conquering it all with the exception of the capital city, Alexandria, which held out against him. And this conquest is the ground for regarding him as waxing great toward the south; but his greatness was short-lived and was about to be laid in the dust, for just as he was on his way to again besiege that one remaining unconquered city, and was within one mile of it, the Roman ambassador, Popilius, confronted him, and in the name of the Senate, not only commanded him to stop the war, but compelled him to abandon all the conquered territory and leave the country immediately; and history records the fact that "He quitted Egypt, humiliated and boiling with passion, sure ere long to find vent against some section of his subjects or all of them.

The first storm fell upon the Jews. Picture the scene. The so-called "exceeding great" Antiochus, surrounded by his generals and army, in full battle array, being so forcefully warned off the ground and compelled to leave behind him all the fruits of his conquests and that, by a man armed by nothing more than a mere "scrap of paper." What could be more humiliating, more abasing, or a more effectual shattering of his supposed greatness? Who, then, on this occasion, proved to be "exceeding great," Antiochus or his master, Rome?

Then after Popilius had seen Antiochus depart from Egypt, according to "the time stipulated," he, with his two colleagues, returned to Alexandria where:

“he brought to a conclusion the treaty of union between the two (Ptolemy) brothers, which had hitherto been but slightly sketched out.

“He then crossed to Cyprus; SENT HOME ANTIOCHUS’S FLEET, which had gained a victory over that of the Egyptians; RESTORED THE WHOLE ISLAND TO THE KINGS OF EGYPT, who had a just claim to it; and returned to Rome to acquaint the Senate with the success of the embassy.”

Later, ambassadors from Antiochus appeared before the Roman Senate where they stated that their Sovereign “had OBEYED THE COMMANDS OF THE ROMAN AMBASSADORS as strictly as if they had been sent from the Gods.”

Again, we ask: Which was the greater, Antiochus or Rome?

In that same year, 168 B.C., “Egypt voluntarily submitted to the Roman protectorate and thereupon the kings of Babylon also desisted from the last effort to maintain their independence against Rome.” – Momsen, History of Rome Book 3, Chapter X, 168 B.C.

In the face of such history, who will contend that Antiochus waxed “exceeding great” when not only was he all through his reign under heavy tribute to Rome, but was also regarded by his subjects as a madman, while on the other hand Rome’s power and prestige was such that, without recourse to arms, her commands were immediately and implicitly obeyed by him.

Now history informs us that immediately after Antiochus was driven from Egypt, “humiliated and boiling with rage” he went directly to Jerusalem where he vented his rage on the Jews. He despoiled their temple and did away with their services etc. And this was done by Antiochus the same year that he was driven from Egypt. The 143rd year of the Greek kingdom.

To fulfill the prophecy, he should have gone to the east before going to Jerusalem. But he did not do so, and therefore it cannot be claimed that he fulfilled this part of the prophecy.

Finally, he went to the east in the 147th year of the Greek kingdom again out of the order even in the prophecy! He went there to plunder the temple at Elymais but history informs us that “he failed in every one of his leading projects and fled, was driven from Elymais into Persia, where he died “far from his own land.”

Can it be said then, that he waxed “exceeding great” toward the east when his attempted enterprise failed so ignominiously, having made no conquest or added anything to his territory, but instead was obliged to flee? Absolutely not. There is nothing great in being defeated and driven away.

So, from the standpoint of the order in which he invaded the different countries, he did not fulfill the prophecy; and in view of the fact that he was so summarily divested of all his Egyptian conquests and driven out of the country though he did plunder the temple at Jerusalem – but in the east failed absolutely and was driven away from Elymais, he certainly did not wax “exceeding great.” So, in no sense can he be regarded as having fulfilled the prophecy.

## ANTIOCHUS NOT THE LITTLE HORN

Now for another vital point in the prophecy. In Daniel 8:11 it is said of the “little horn” that “he magnified himself even to the Prince of the host.” This expression is divinely interpreted in verse 25 as follows: “he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes.”

Now whatever other interpretation that some may put upon this passage, the Prince of princes has reference to Christ (and this is the view that is taken by Dr. Adam Clarke and other commentators), and the prophecy indicates that the “little horn” was to stand up against Him. But as Antiochus died 164 years before Christ was born it is self-evident that he could not possibly fulfill that part of the prophecy.

No! Nor did he as the “little horn” fulfill any part of it. He, as king of Syria was not the “little horn” at all. He never was. But during his occupancy of the throne (and there were 26 kings of Syria, he being the eighth, with 18 others succeeding him) he was the Syrian horn itself – one of the four horns out of which the “little horn” was to come.

The prophecy says that out of one of the four horns a little horn should come. But a little horn coming out of the original horn would not be the horn itself, i.e., the original horn. To assert that it would be, would be perfectly ridiculous. Nor would its coming out of the horn do away with the horn out of which it came. To illustrate. In Revelation 18:4, God calls to His people “Come out of her my people.” This is the call to come out of Babylon. But when God’s people come out of Babylon are they Babylon itself, or have they left Babylon behind? Again, when Israel came out of Egypt, were they Egypt, or did Egypt still exist as a separate place and people after Israel came out? We all know that Egypt did still exist after Israel came out, and that Israel was also a separate people from Egypt.

So, likewise, the little horn, which was to come out of one of the four horns, would be an additional horn while the original horn would still continue in existence.

The four horns represented four separate powers – the four divisions of Alexander’s kingdom. These were Thrace and Bithinia, the northern portion, ruled over by Lysimachus; Greece and Macedonia, the western portion, ruled over by Cassander; Syria and Babylon, in the east, the kingdom of Seleucus; and Egypt on the south under the rule of the Ptolemies. Out of one of these four horns, or kingdoms was to come the “little horn” an additional power, which, according to the prophecy, was at first “little”, but later waxing “exceeding great” first “toward the south” then “toward the east” and finally “toward the Pleasant Land.”

That Rome was that “little horn” and answered the specification of the prophecy we will now show.

## ROME PROVED TO BE THE LITTLE HORN

As we turn the pages of history, we find it stated that: “The Romans are not accounted to belong to any of the Italian nations.

“Even the writers who talk with credulous simplicity about the people of Romulus as a colony from Alba, never reckon them among the Latins; and in the traditions concerning their earliest ages they are represented as equally strangers to all the three nations amid which their city stood.” – Niebuhr’s History of Rome, Volume 1, page 6.

To begin with, then, we have this clear and definite statement that the people of Rome did not spring from the natives of the Italian soil. They must, therefore, have had their origin outside Italian borders. To discover that origin we need do little more than quote the history as we find it.

“The traditions respecting the origin of Rome are innumerable. Some historians assert that ITS FOUNDER WAS A GREEK; others, Aeneas and his Trojans; and others give the honor to the Tyrrhenians: all, however, agree that THE FIRST INHABITANTS WERE A LATIN COLONY from Alba. Even those who adopted the most current story, which is followed by Dr. Goldsmith, believed that THE CITY EXISTED BEFORE THE TIME OF ROMULUS, and that he was called the founder, from being the first who gave it strength and stability. It seems probable that several villages might have been formed at an early age on the different hills, which were afterwards included in the circuit of Rome; and that the first of them which obtained a decided superiority, the village on the Palatine hill, finally absorbed the rest, and gave its name to “the eternal city.” There seems to be some uncertainty whether Romulus gave his name to the city, or derived his own from it. The latter is asserted by several historians, but those who ascribe to the city a Grecian origin, with some show of probability, assert that Romus (another form of Romulus) and Roma are both derived from the Greek word meaning ‘Strength.’ The city, we are assured, had another name, which the Priests were forbidden to divulge. There is, however, some plausibility in the conjecture that it was Pallanteum; from the Greek care with

which the Palladium, or image of Pallas, was preserved; it seems probable that the city was supposed to be under the care of that deity. If this conjecture be correct, the Pelasgic origin of Rome cannot be doubted, for Pallas was a Pelasgic deity.” – Whittaker’s improved edition of Pinnock’s Rome, page 13.

In harmony with this the historian Merrivale, says: “A very ancient tradition records the existence of a Septimontium, or political combination of seven hills, in a Rome far earlier than the city of accredited history, and the hills to which it refers were not identical with the seven which are classically famous. They embrace only the central portion of the site of the later Rome. This Septimontium constituted the city of the Ligures, and of this they seem to have been dispossessed by the next succeeding wave of population, to which is given the name of PELASGIAN.” – Merrivale’s History of Rome, Chapter 2, page 9.

But now we must notice another race that is brought to us inhabiting the banks of the Tiber.

“The Roman writers related that the first people who inhabited the banks of the lower Tiber, were SICULIANS, who had settled at Tibur, Falerii, and a number of little towns in the neighborhood of Rome.” – Niebuhr’s History of Rome, Volume 1, page 46. And this is also confirmed by Merrivale in his history.

“The earliest real name in Roman history is that of the Seculi. The city which holds sway over every land and sea, and is now occupied by the Romans, was first peopled by the Seculi, a barbaric race, sprung from the soil. Such is the declaration of Dionysius, the compiler of the most authentic account we possess of Roman antiquities.” – Merrivale’s History of Rome, Chapter 2, page 8.

From these historians we learn then that the original inhabitants of the seven hills and the banks of the Tiber were the LIGURES and the SICULIANS. We also learn that both these tribes were dispossessed by the “succeeding wave of

population” who were called PELASGIANS. But who were these Pelasgians and whence came they.”

“The Pelasgians are represented by the GREEKS THEMSELVES as THE MOST ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF THEIR LAND. The primitive name of Greece is said to have been PELASGIA. The Pelasgians were SPREAD OVER THE ITALIAN as well as THE GRECIAN PENINSULAR and the Pelasgic language thus formed the basis of the Latin as well as of the Greek.” – Smith’s History of Greece, page 14. Merrivale also says concerning them:

“Of the Pelasgians we may say thus much, that they were the inhabitants of Greece antecedently to the Hellenes. They retained, no doubt, a considerable portion of the character and language which afterwards became the Greek; and to their influence may be assigned many of the traces, both in language and of mythology, which form so mysterious a link between the Greeks and the Italians. It is from some reminiscence, probably of Pelasgic tradition that the Romans of a much later age ATTRIBUTED TO THE ARCADIAN, EVANDER, THE FOUNDATION OF A GRECIAN CITY ON THE PALATINE, and that so many other sites of western Italy were supposed to have been originally colonized from Greece”. – Merrivale’s History of Rome, Chapter 2, page 9.

“With the Pelasgians were connected another people of descent still more mysterious, the so-called Aborigines, who were supposed from their name to have been the most primitive or original inhabitants of the Italian soil; unless, indeed, as some conjectured, their title was itself a misnomer, and they should rather have been called Aberrigines and regarded as aliens who had wandered into the peninsular at some unknown epoch.” – Merrivale’s History of Rome, Chapter, 2, page 9.

Of these Aborigines, Niebuhr says, “The original inhabitants of Latium, as such, went also by the name of Aborigines. These according to Cato and C. Sempronius, were Achaeans and were assumed to have migrated in those early times from the Peloponnesus. But Achaean was another of the Pelasgic names



of the inhabitants of the country afterwards called Hellas.” – Niebuhr’s History of Rome, page 46.

Then according to these two historians, both the Pelasgia and the Aborigines hailed from Pelasgia the most primitive name of Greece.

“The name of Greece was never used by the inhabitants of the country. They called their land Hellas, and themselves Hellenes. It is from the Romans that we have derived the name of Greece.” – Smith’s History of Greece, page 2.

“The term Hellas was also employed in a more extended sense to signify the abode of the Hellenes, wherever they might be settled; and accordingly, the Grecian cities of Cyrene in Africa, of Syracuse in Sicily and of Tarentum in Italy, were as much parts of Hellas as Athens, Sparta, and Corinth.” – Smith’s History of Greece, page 3.

“The Greek people considered themselves the children of one common father. This ancestor was Hellen from whom the people derived the name of Hellenes. Hellen had three sons: Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus. Of these Dorus and Aeolus gave their names to the Dorians and Aeolians. And Xuthus, through his two sons, Ion and Archaeus, became the forefather of the Ionians and Achaeans. In this way the four great divisions of the Greek race, the Dorians, Aeolians, Ionians and Achaeans, were supposed to be the descendants of the patriarch Hellen!” – Smith’s History of Greece, page 12.

Now, that extensive Greek colonization did take place in Italy, and also commenced at a very early date, there can be no question, as the following extracts reveal:

“We have to speak of Greece, as the one which we have the earlier historic notices, which colonized the shores of the Mediterranean and of Italy itself, before Rome was built, and which exercised a wide influence on the civilization of the world while Rome was only as yet maturing her constitution.” – Smith’s Ancient History, Chapter 11, pages 305, 306.

“A steady stream of Greek colonists had been occupying the coast of southern Italy ever since the eighth century B.C. their first settlements dating from two centuries earlier.” – Historians History of the World, Volume 5, page 12.

“The Grecian colonies in Italy began to be planted at nearly the same time as in Sicily. They eventually lined the whole southern coast as far as Cumae on the one sea, and Tarentum on the other. They even surpassed those in Sicily in number and importance; and so numerous and flourishing did they become, that the south of Italy received the name of Magna Graecia.” – Smith’s History of Greece, page 120.

“With regard to Italy, I will begin by reminding the reader that the serfs of the Italian Greeks were called Pelasgians, and that they must have been Oenotrians so that the whole Oenotrian population of southern Italy must be admitted to be Pelasgian. In the next place it is attested by a host of authorities, that the Pelasgians were at one time settled on the coast of Etruria. We are even assured by Herodotus, that the same people, a race wholly different from the Etruscans, were in his days still inhabiting a city in the heart of the country. This city, Dionysius is certainly right in supposing to be Cortona; that is, the Croton which, according to Hellanicus, was occupied by the Pelasgians, and from which they sent out colonies through Tuscany.” – Niebuhr’s History of Rome, Volume 1, page 25.

“With regard to the origin of the Oenotrians, it was stated by Pherecydes that they emigrated from Arcadia with a multitude of Areadians and other Greeks, who were pressed for room at home.” – Neibuhr’s History of Rome, Volume 1, page 25.

From these extracts it is clear that the Greeks colonized very largely in Italy not only on the coastal districts, but also in other parts of Italy and particularly is it mentioned, that the Romans themselves attributed the founding of “a Grecian city on the Palatine” hill, to the Arcadian, Evander, on the very spot where the city of Rome now stands.

But to return to the Pelasgians and Aborigines. We have learned that the first settlements on the Palatine hill and the banks of the lower Tiber were the Ligures and the Sicilians who were, apparently, native tribes. Now we are informed that “It was by the union of the Pelasgians and the Aborigines (both of whom we have seen were of Greek origin) according to the prevailing tradition, that the Seculi and the Ligures were overthrown, and their power in Italy extinguished. The new possessors signalized themselves by the massive fortifications which they erected, of which some mighty remains may even now be traced at a distance of perhaps thirty centuries; and it is evident that of all the conquerors of Italian soil, none laid their hands so heavily upon it, and impressed their mark so deeply and durably as these.” – Merrivale’s History of Rome, Chapter 2, pages 9, 10.

Thus does the early history of Rome reveal the fact that THE ROMAN NATION IS OF GREEK ORIGIN. And when, as by conquest and absorption of the surrounding districts, Rome began to expand and continued to expand until in 274 B.C. the war with Pyrrhus left her in full control of all Italy, the time had then fully come for the “little horn” to be seen emerging from one of the four horns of Alexander’s kingdom. And right then, Rome, as an offshoot from Greece, was fast coming into prominence, small though she was, yet giving strong evidence of her expanding power, a circumstance that the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, were not slow to recognize. Then a few years later, after the war with Hannibal, so mightily had she grown in power that the historian says of her:

“And now for the first time the vast strength of the Roman state stood forth in all its imposing majesty; for while defending itself against Hannibal in Italy, it was able to take the offensive with absolute success in every other theatre of war, Spain, Sicily, and Greece.” – Historian’s History of the World, Volume 5, page 8.

Then the Historian continues to proclaim her ever increasing greatness as follows: “There is no need to tell here how the preponderance of Rome made itself felt in political matters throughout the world immediately after the war

with Hannibal, or how within a little over thirty years all the states of the civilized world were subject to her sway.” – Historian’s History of the World, Volume 5, page 10.

“In the space of little over eleven years (200-189 B.C.) Rome had broken the power of Alexander’s successors and established throughout the Eastern Mediterranean a Roman protectorate.” – Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 19, page 487.

And now that we have fully demonstrated, beyond all question, that Rome had its origin in one of the four horns of Alexander’s kingdom, the Grecian horn, and that in accordance with the prophecy it was at first “little,” we will now proceed to show that she fulfilled the remainder of the prophecy in that she waxed “exceeding great.” First toward the south, then toward the east, and lastly toward the Pleasant Land. Also, that it was she who stood up against the Prince of princes.

## ROME WAXES “EXCEEDING GREAT” TOWARD THE SOUTH

Now that Rome waxed “exceeding great” towards the south, we need only recall the Egyptian incident history tells us that in response to an appeal from Ptolemy Euergetes and his sister Cleopatra to restrain Antiochus, who was overrunning Egypt.

“The Senate, moved with their remonstrances, and persuaded that it would not be for the interest of the Romans to suffer Antiochus to attain to such a height of power, resolved to send an ambassador to Egypt to PUT AN END TO THE WAR. C. Popilius Lenas, C. Decimus and C. Hostilius were appointed for this important negotiation. Their instructions were that they should first wait upon Antiochus and afterwards on Ptolemy, SHOULD ORDER THEM IN THE NAME OF THE SENATE TO SUSPEND ALL HOSTILITIES AND PUT AN END TO THE WAR.”

Meanwhile Antiochus had raised the siege of Alexandria, and returned to his capital at Antioch, still retaining, however, full possession of Pelusium, the key of Egypt. Then the two brothers Ptolemy Philometer and Ptolemy Euergetes came to terms and united their interests in hope to withstand Antiochus and save Egypt. As soon as Antiochus learned of this, “he resolved (168 B.C.) to employ his whole force against them. Accordingly, he sent his fleet early into Cyprus to preserve the possession of that Island; at the same time, he marched at the head of a powerful army with the design to conquer Egypt openly, and not pretend, as he had done before, to fight the cause of one of his nephews,” but “to make an absolute conquest of the whole kingdom.”

He “penetrated as far as Memphis, subjecting the whole country through which he passed. He afterwards marched toward Alexandria, with design to besiege that city, the possession of which would have made him absolute master of all Egypt. He would certainly have succeeded in his enterprise had he not been checked in his career by the Roman embassy.”

“The ambassadors who were nominated to go to Egypt had left Rome with the utmost diligence. They landed at Alexandria just at the time Antiochus was marching to besiege it. They came up with him at Eleusine, which was not a mile from Alexandria.”

“Popilius then gave him the decree of the Senate, bade him read it over, and return an immediate answer. Antiochus, after perusing it, said he would examine the contents of it with his friends, and give his answer in a short time. POPILIUS, ENRAGED AT THE KING FOR TALKING OF DELAYS, DREW WITH THE WAND HE HAD IN HIS HAND, A CIRCLE AROUND ANTIOCHUS, AND THEN RAISING HIS VOICE, SAID, ‘ANSWER THE SENATE BEFORE YOU STIR OUT OF THAT CIRCLE!’”

“The king, quite confounded at so haughty an order, after a moment’s reflection, replied that HE WOULD ACT ACCORDING TO THE DESIRE OF THE SENATE. The Roman, with a few words, strikes terror into the king of Syria and saves the King of Egypt.” – Ancient History, Book 19, Chapter 2, Section 2.

Such was the experience of Antiochus in Egypt, and instead of waxing “great” he was, on the contrary, greatly humiliated and made both to look and to feel very small, evidenced by the fact that he left Egypt in a “boiling passion.”

On the other hand, Rome’s power and prestige had for many years been rising everywhere, until she was now able by a word, to drive Antiochus, “bag and baggage,” out of Egypt, and compel him to relinquish all the fruits of his invasion. And this took place “in the latter time of their kingdom.” 168 B.C.

Thus the very event which is put forward as proof that Antiochus waxed “exceeding great” “toward the south,” and by which it is claimed that he fulfilled that part of the prophecy, is found contrariwise to disprove the claim, and at the same time to reveal the mightier power which in so summary a manner, deprived him of any greatness that he might be supposed or appeared to have had; while to that greater power, the very same year, both Egypt and Babylon surrendered their independence. Thus, Rome did wax “exceeding great” “toward the south” in a very marked manner; and the claim that she fulfilled that part of the prophecy is thereby fully established.

## ROME WAXES TOWARDS THE EAST AND ISRAEL

Then that Rome waxed “exceeding great” towards the east, we find that in 66 B.C. Pompey, the Roman general, was appointed to the “command in the east.” The next year (65 B.C.) “The last of the Seleucidae (one of the four horns) Antiochus 13 (Asiaticus) lost his kingdom to Pompey who made Syria a Roman province.” Chambers’ Encyclopedia. Thus again, Rome fulfils the prophecy.

And now, Rome in accordance with the prophecy finds her way to the Pleasant Land. History tells us that “When Alexandra died in 69 B.C. Aristobulus disputed the succession of Hyrcanus, his brother. War ensued, in which Hyrcanus besieged Aristobulus in Jerusalem. Having on the advice of his Idumean counselor, Antipater enlisted the help of Aretas (Harith) the king of the Nabataean Arabs.”

“In 66 B.C. Pompey had defeated Mithridates VI of Pontus and his son-in-law Tigranes. Learning of the war in Judea he sent, in 65 B.C., M. Aemilius Scaurus, Sulla’s step-son, to intervene, and to him both Hyrcanus and Aristobulus appealed. The latter won by bribery. Aretas retired and Aristobulus appeared to have triumphed. But Scaurus’s superior was at hand. Pompey reached Damascus and immediately deputations followed him there. Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, the latter exploited by Antipater, sent their delegation, and one more came from the Jewish nation, begging for the abolition of the kingship and the restoration of the sacerdotal theocracy. Pompey made Hyrcanus High Priest, and so Antipater secured power. Warfare broke out between the adherents of the two brothers: the Roman legion participated. Pompey captured Jerusalem and a terrible massacre ensued, the priests being slain at the altar. Over 12,000 Jews perished.” – Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 13, page 53.

Another record says: “In 65 B.C. when Syria was made a Roman province by Pompey, the Jews were still governed by a Hasmonaean prince. Aristobulus had lately driven his brother Hyrcanus from the chief priesthood, and was attacked by Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, the ally of Hyrcanus. Pompey’s lieutenant M. Aemilius Scaurus, intervened, and in 65 B.C. Pompey marched into Judea and took Jerusalem. From this time the Jews were practically under the government of Rome.” – Murray’s Bible Dictionary, Article, Roman Empire, page 750.

So “in the latter time of their kingdom.” exactly in the order set out in the prophecy, and without the ignominious defeats such as characterized Antiochus’ enterprises, Rome did wax “exceeding great” toward the south, toward the east and toward the pleasant land.

Then in further fulfillment of the prophecy, it was Rome that “stood up against the Prince of princes,” first when Herod sought to destroy Christ as an infant, and later when Pilate delivered Him to be crucified.

Thus, does history very definitely show that Rome fulfilled the prophecy respecting the 11th horn" TO THE VERY LETTER. Having disposed of this feature of the prophecy we will now turn our attention to the question of the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14.

## THE 2300 DAYS

In each of the 11th, 12th and 13th verses of Daniel 8, the word "sacrifice" appears, and it will be noticed that in each instance it is printed in italics, indicating that it is a supplied word, one that has been added. The Hebrew word for "sacrifice" is not to be found in the original writing, and this fact is admitted on all hands by commentators in general, and all other Hebrew students.

Then why should the word "sacrifice" appear in those Scriptures? Why should it be regarded by Bible students at all? It has no business there, and has been inserted wrongfully, though no doubt quite innocently and with the best of intentions on the part of the translators. The fact is, when the translators added the word, they did not understand what the "daily" had reference to, but because there were daily sacrifices offered in the temple, they doubtless supposed that it was to these that it had reference, and so inserted the word; but by so doing, the way was opened for a wrong meaning to be taken from the Scripture, and this is what invariably happens when men meddle with what God has caused to be written. In verse 14, however, the translators evidently saw no reason for adding "sacrifice" there, so did not insert it.

And now it is contended that "As the translators have supplied the word sacrifice in verses 11, 12 and 13, so should they have rendered the CORRECT TRANSLATION and applied the word 'sacrifice' in verse 14, and we would have the TRUE MEANING THUS, "Unto 2300 evening and morning sacrifices then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Now the writer of this statement tacitly admits, in common with all others that the word "sacrifice" is a supplied word but in order to bolster up a false theory,



he contends (notwithstanding the fact of its wrongful and unjustifiable insertion in verses 11, 12 and 13) that it should have been added in verse 14. And mark it, the only reason he advances, or can advance, for so doing, is the fact that it has been inserted in the other three verses. Then, he says, the translators "Would have rendered the correct translation," "and we would have the true meaning." PROFOUND LOGIC! Three errors plus one more error would give us the "correct translation."

And what kind of an argument is this? Because three mistakes have been made, another similar mistake ought to be made, and then we would have the "correct translation" and the "True meaning." WONDERFUL INDEED!

But, right here, let us call attention to another statement, that our critic makes, and one which, in order to emphasize, he has had printed in special type. See page 29 of his pamphlet. He says:

"Surely God's mind is not that small that he has to rely upon a sect of people to correct His visions or prophecies and to say what he meant. If God intended the prophecy to mean years, He alone would have known what word to have used and would have done so?"

Yes, we firmly believe that God does know just what words to use in order "to say what He meant" and does not have to rely even upon such a one as our critic, "to correct His visions or prophecies" and to say that the word "sacrifices" should be added in order to get the "true meaning" of the prophecy; and if he himself believed that God knew just what words to use in order "to say what He meant," he would not be found tampering with God's messages and attempting "to correct His visions and prophecies," as he is doing, by reading into them words, and meanings that are not there, and were never intended to be there. If God intended the word "sacrifices" to be put in Daniel 8:14 He would have put it there, but He didn't, and it is not there. Who but this critic is doing the very thing of which he accuses us. Is it not he that is presuming to correct God's visions and prophecies and to say what God meant?

But we are further told that the number 2300 in Daniel 8:14 is not correct and is “no doubt a numerical error according to the earliest versions which gave the number to be 2200. And then our critic goes on to say, “When Jesus was upon earth, he used the original which gave the rendering 2200, the same rendering as is also given by the older copies of the book of Daniel, noticed by the translator of the Vulgate, Jerome, while the Septuagint gives the number 2400.”

And yet in the face of all this, it will be found on page 29 of his pamphlet, that he quotes no less than seven different translations, all of which give the number as 2300, and to this list we could add several others. Then are we to accept the ONE translation – the Vatican Manuscript, which gives 2200 as against all other translations which give the number as 2300?

But on the authority of the Jewish Rabbi of Auckland, we can say that there is no possibility of the number 2300 being wrong.

Further, that number is confirmed by Dr. Hales, Dr. Adam Clarke, Bishop Newton, and many others.

And while it be true that the Septuagint does give 2400 in the text, a little closer study will reveal the fact that the alternative number of 2300 is also to be found at the foot of the page, which throws a big question mark against the 2400.

## THE 2200 DAY THEORY

But we will now investigate this 2200-day theory. On page 29 of his pamphlet, we read: “No doubt it will absolutely astonish Seventh Day Adventists to know that the word “days” is not in the original, and hence the “day for a year cannot justly be applied to the text.” Then he quotes seven translations, all of which give the rendering 2300 “evenings and mornings,” but not the word “days.” It is remarkable however, and significant, that while he made reference to and was acquainted with the Septuagint version, he did not give the

quotation there from, nor did he refer to the Douay translation. But we will give them both here.

Septuagint “And he said to him, evening and morning there shall be two thousand and four hundred DAYS and then the sanctuary shall be cleansed.”

Douay Version “And he said unto him, Unto evening and morning two thousand and three hundred DAYS, and the sanctuary shall be cleansed.”

It will be observed that these versions not only give the expressions “evenings and mornings” but they also render the word DAYS. Then Spurrell’s translation also renders it “And he answered him, Unto two thousand and three hundred DAYS; then the sanctuary shall be cleansed.” Here again we have the word DAYS used and also the number 2300.

Now it is contended that because the seven versions quoted by him do not mention “days” therefore those evenings and mornings cannot be regarded as prophetic days or reckoned as “a day for a year.” Our critic says, “Some will say, is it not the same ‘the evening and the morning were the first day’? No. it is not the same, for the main question asked is, how long would the sacrifices be abolished; and the Angel answers by giving the number of the sacrifices and there were two sacrifices per day.”

But he further gives us his enlarged interpretation of this verse as follows: “The question here asked is – how long shall such desolation by Antiochus be allowed to continue, and how long shall the sanctuary be polluted by such abomination of worship, as set up by Antiochus and how long shall the daily sacrifices be abolished, there being two sacrifices per day, one in the morning and one in the evening.”

We will compare this with the Scripture. The question as it reads in the Scripture is as follows: “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice (this word sacrifice is one of the supplied words and is not found in the original) and the transgression of desolation to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?”

Can we interpret this as asking “How long shall the sacrifices be abolished? Absolutely not. But this, we are told in a very authoritative, dogmatic, manner is what the Scripture means.

And then the Angel’s answer as given in the Scripture “Unto two thousand and three hundred days (or margin evenings and mornings); then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” And this we are informed, does not mean days or evenings and mornings but has reference to the “number of sacrifices” that were to be abolished.

Who is it, we again ask, that is presuming “to correct God’s visions and prophecies” and to say what God meant; that He meant sacrifices and not days?

The flimsy argument that in the original it does not read “days” but “evenings and mornings” counts for nothing. Dr. Albert Barnes says concerning this very Scripture (Daniel 8:14): “The language here is evidently that which was derived from Genesis 1, or which was common among the Hebrews, to speak of the ‘evening and the morning’ as constituting a day. There can be no doubt, however, that a day is intended by this, for this is the fair and obvious interpretation. The Greeks were accustomed to denote the period of a day in the same manner.”

Now the object of all this so-called “correct translation” and “true meaning” is to make it appear that Antiochus Epiphanes fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel 8:9-14, but so long as the Scripture reads “two thousand and three hundred days,” this cannot be done. By some means or other it must be shown that the number 2300 should be 2200, and the word “days” must be made to read sacrifices. Then with such a setting, a vain attempt is made to show that the desecration of the temple by Antiochus was a fulfillment of the prophecy. We will now see how this is done.

It is recorded in the Maccabees’ history that “On the fifteenth day of the month Caslev, in the hundred and forty fifth year, king Antiochus set up the

abominable idol of desolation upon the altar of God.” Read 1 Maccabees 1:57-62.

Thus, it was ON the 15th day of the month Caslev, in the 145th year that the temple was despoiled and the Jewish sacrifices stopped and the heathen idols set up in their place. Let it be noted that the 15th day was, itself, one of the days, the very first day of the desecration.

Then it is recorded in 1 Maccabees 4:52,53, that after the Jews had driven out their enemies. “On the five and twentieth day of the ninth month, which is called the month Casley, in the hundred forty and eighth year, they rose up before time – in the morning, and offered sacrifices according to the law, upon the new altar of burnt offerings which they had made.”

Then as ON the 25th day of the month Caslev, the Jewish sacrifices were resumed. The last day of the desecration was the 24th day. Thus, the temple was desecrated by Antiochus from the 15th of Caslev in the 145th year, to the 24th day of Caslev in the 148th year. Both days inclusive – a period of 3 years and 10 days. And this period of 3 years and 10 days is to be fitted into the prophecy of Daniel 9:14, and by this show that Antiochus fulfilled that prophecy.

## LAME FIGURING

In a pamphlet entitled “The 2300 days,” published some years ago by E. E. Franke, an effort is made to show that the figure 2300 in Daniel 8:14 should be 2200, and after referring to the history relating to the desecration of the temple by Antiochus, he says, “the actual historical occurrences fit these figures (2200 days) to a nicety.” He then informs us that the Jewish “religious year of 12 months consisted of 354 days” with “an intercalary month of 29 days every three years.” And after thus setting out his basis of calculation, he says, “Let us do some figuring.” And the following is his figuring:

3 years of 354 days each, equal	1062 days
1 Intercalary month	29 days

From 15th to 25th Caslev	10 days
<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>1101 days</u></b>

And now he adds, “This included the 25th day of Caslev which was the day that the daily evening and morning sacrifices were resumed, hence it is necessary to deduct this one day, as the abolition of sacrifices and desecration were brought to an end the preceding day (24th) and the sacrifices were resumed the 25th day. This makes our total just 1100 days. Counting two sacrifices each day, one evening and one morning, we have (1100 times 2) just 2200 sacrifices which were abolished.” And he finalizes his argument with the declaration that, “This establishes the fact that the more correct rendering of the text would be ‘Unto two thousand and two hundred evening-morning (sacrifices) then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.’

And thus, he attempts to fit Antiochus’ desecration of the temple into the 2200 figure. But now we will do a little figuring. While Mr. Franke was particular to explain that the 25th day should not be reckoned in (with which we agree) he, at the same time reckoned the 15th to the 25th as only 10 days. But 15 to 25 inclusive add up 11 days, and, deducting the 25th day, leaves 10 days. We have already drawn attention to the fact that the 15th day was the very first day of the desecration and must be counted. So instead of there being just 1100 days and 2200 sacrifices it will show as follows:

3 years of 354 days	1062 days
1 Intercalary month	29 days
From 15th to 24th	10 days
<b><u>Total of</u></b>	<b><u>1101 days</u></b>

And counting 2 sacrifices per day would be 2202 which does not fit the “figures to a nicety.”

Now, this latest champion, who has copied largely from Mr. Franke’s pamphlet, evidently saw the weakness of his figuring so he has put it a little differently. Here are his figures:

3 years of 354 days	1062 days
1 Intercalary month	29 days
From 15th to 24th	9 days
Total of	1100 days
Total of	2200 evening and morning sacrifices

Now any school boy knows that 15 to 24 inclusive counts 10 (and there can be no question but that both days must be included) and this would make the period 1101 days. So, we find that in both instances a vain attempt has been made to juggle out that one day in order to fit in their new theory that God meant 2200 days and not 2300. Evidently both realized that it was necessary to fit in the number of sacrifices accurately in order to claim it as a fulfillment of the prophecy or they would not have striven so to juggle away the odd day.

## THE JEWISH YEAR BOOK DEFEATS THE THEORY

But now that upon their own basis their arguments are defeated. It may be interesting to notice what the Jewish Year Book has to say with regard to the length of the years. From the current Jewish Year Book, on page 5, we take the following –

THE JEWISH YEAR 5692 is known as 692 on the short system, and is an INTERCALARY redundant year of 13 MONTHS, 55 SABBATHS, and 385 DAYS. It began on Saturday, September 12th, 1931, and concludes on Friday, September 30th, 1932.

5693 is known as 693 on the short system, and is a COMMON redundant year of 12 MONTHS, 51 Sabbaths, and 355 DAYS. It begins on Saturday, October 1st, 1932, and concludes on Wednesday, September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1933. These two Jewish years are shown as consisting of, not 354 days, but 355 days. And the intercalary month to consist of 30 days instead of 29; and this is the genuine Jewish calendar. So, if we should make the calculation upon this basis, the period during which the temple was desecrated by Antiochus will in no way fit into the prophecy of Daniel 8:14.

It would figure out as follows:

3 years of 355 days each	1065 days
1 Intercalary month	30 days
15th to 24th of the month, inclusive	10 days
<b><u>Total of</u></b>	<b><u>1105 days</u></b>

1105 times 2 would be 2210 evening and morning sacrifices.

## JEWISH YEARS NOT UNIFORM

But, after all, for anyone to represent the Jewish years as consisting of a uniform number of days, with an intercalary month of 29 days every three years, is altogether wrong and positively misleading. As a matter of fact, the Jewish years do not uniformly contain 354 days, nor is the intercalary month uniformly inserted every third year. For twice in every 19-year cycle does the embolismic year occur the second year from the preceding one, in other words, two embolismic years occur with but one ordinary year intervening.

Further, that intercalary month is not uniformly a month of 29 days, it is sometimes 30 days. It is true that some Encyclopedias make it appear that the regular Jewish year contains 354 days, but they are not strictly correct. From a publication entitled "The Jewish Religion," by M. Friedlander, we take the following extract:

"Neither the ordinary years nor the leap-years have a uniform duration; the former fluctuate between 353, 354 and 355 days; the latter between 383, 384, and 385 days. The following is the cause of this variety: There are certain days in the week which are never made the beginning of the new year (the 1st of Tishri). Whenever the astronomical beginning of the year happens to be on one of these days, a day is added to one year and taken from the next. The addition in the former case is made in the month Cheshvan, and the curtailing in the latter case in the month of Kislev." Page 363.



Thus, do we have it on Jewish authority that there is absolutely no uniformity in the length of the Jewish years. In order that all may see for themselves the extent of these variations, we have taken from the Encyclopedia Britannica the following tables which give the exact number of days in the years of the last completed Jewish cycle, and also of the current cycle. The Jewish cycles consist of 19 years, and the present year, 1933, is the twelfth year of the 300th cycle.

### 299th Cycle

<u>Jewish Number</u>		<b>(1st of Tishri)</b>
<u>Year of</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Commencement</u>
5663	355	Thursday 2 October, 1902
5664	354	Tuesday 22 September, 1903
5665	385	Saturday 10 September, 1904
5666	355	Sat, 30 September, 1905
5667	354	Thursday 20 September, 1906
5668	383	Monday 9 September, 1907
5669	355	Saturday 26 September, 1908
5670	383	Thursday 16 September, 1909
5671	354	Tuesday 4 October, 1910
5672	355	Saturday 23 September, 1911
5673	385	Thursday 12 September, 1912
5674	354	Thursday 2 October, 1913
5675	353	Monday 21 September, 1914
5676	385	Thursday 9 September, 1915
5677	354	Thursday 28 September, 1916
5678	355	Monday 17 September, 1917
5679	383	Saturday 7 September, 1918
5680	354	Thursday 25 September, 1919
5681	385	Monday 13 September, 1920

### 300th Cycle

<u>Jewish Number</u>		<b>(1st of Tishri)</b>
<u>Year of</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Commencement</u>
5682	355	Monday 3, October, 1921
5683	353	Saturday 23, September, 1922
5684	384	Tuesday 11, September, M1923
5685	355	Monday 29, September, 1924
5686	355	Saturday 19, September, 1925
5687	383	Thursday 9, September, 1926

5688	354	Tuesday 28, September, 1927
5689	385	Saturday 15, September, 1928
5690	353	Saturday 5, October, 1929
5691	354	Tuesday 23, September, 1930
5692	385	Saturday 12, September, 1931
5693	355	Saturday 1, October, 1932
5694	354	Thursday 21, September, 1933
5695	383	Monday 10, September, 1934
5696	355	Saturday 28, September, 1935
5697	354	Thursday 17, September, 1936
5698	385	Monday 6, September, 1937
5699	353	Monday 26, September, 1938
5700	385	Thursday 14, September, 1939

From these tables we see the varying lengths of the Jewish years. Also, it will be noticed that out of the whole 38 years (the two cycles) only 11 of them consist of 354 days not one-third of the total – So again we say, it is absolutely wrong to represent the ordinary Jewish years as consisting uniformly of 354 days, and to make that the basis of any time calculation.

If we take the total number of days of any 3 consecutive years of the above tables, we shall see that those 3- year periods will contain either 1092, 1093, 1094, 1121, 1122 or 1123 days, and in no instance will it be found that they total less than 1092 days. This is the very least number of days in a Jewish 3-year period according to these tables, and it cannot be disputed. Then to arrive at the number of days during which the temple was desecrated by Antiochus, we will calculate on the basis of the smallest 3-year period, viz., 1092 days. To this we add 10 days (from the 15th to the 24th of the month) and we have a total of 1102 days, and that period cannot be made any shorter. Then counting two sacrifices to each day, the total is 2204, which does not “fit these figures (“2200”) to a nicety.”

But further, if it were the case that that particular 3-year period in which the temple was desecrated, had consisted of 1093 days or any of the still larger numbers (and it is just as likely as not that it may have been so) then the misfit with the 2200 would be still worse. But on the smallest count (1092) with the 10 days added, it will not fit the 2200 sacrifice theory.

## THE THEORY EXPLODED

But now while we have examined this theory and dealt with it from the standpoint and upon the basis, put forward by its promulgators, we must now

point out that the premises upon which it is based are not sound. In formulating this theory it has, obviously, been taken for granted that the Jewish Calendar, as we now have it, was in operation at the time that Antiochus desolated the temple. But the very fact that Judas Maccabees, a Jew, in giving the years of the desolation, as the 145th to the 148th years of the Greek Kingdom and not mentioning Jewish time, is a strong indication that the Jewish calendar was not then operating.

On the other hand, the Encyclopedia Britannica tells us: “The Babylonian Calendar imposed by the kings of the first Dynasty of Babylon on all the cities immediately under their rule, was adopted by the Assyrians at the end of the second millennium B.C. was used by the Jews on their return from exile and was widely used in the Christian era. These were lunar months, and in general their length was 30 days.” – Volume 4, page 576, 14th Edition.

Also, Haydn’s Dictionary of Dates states: “The Jews usually employed the era of the Seleucidae until the 15th century when a new mode of computing was adopted!” Article ‘Jewish era and Calendar.’

In view of these statements then, the years of the desolation of the temple cannot be reckoned on the basis of the present Jewish calendar. They must be reckoned according to the Calendar actually operating at that time. That Calendar, as far as we can learn, was the Babylonian, and the Babylonian year, we are told, consisted of twelve months of 30 days each, equaling 360 days. Therefore, the period of the desolation of the temple, according to this count would be:

3 years of 360 days each	1080 days
15th to 24th Caslev	10 days
Total	1090 days

It is possible, however, that, as was done with the Egyptian calendar, “the missing 5 days were added on at the end, under the name of ‘days additional to the years.’” (Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 4, page 575). And if so, then,

by adding another 5 days for each of the three years, 15 days more – the total would reach 1105 days.

But neither 1090 or 1105 days, counting two sacrifices per day will give the required number of 2200. So, from every standpoint, the theory fails entirely, proving that neither the figure “2200” or the word “sacrifice” was ever intended by God to be read into the text.

Thus, the theory of the “2200 evening and morning sacrifices” falls to the ground defeated and completely so, and with its defeat dies out the last hope of linking Antiochus with the “little horn.”

And so, another Goliath has fallen and gone the way of his predecessors, while once more Truth has triumphed, as it always does and always will.

As we have viewed the methods employed in the constructing of this false theory, we have been reminded of an amusing story told by Dr. Munhall. “Some students one day disjointed ten or a dozen bugs of different kinds, and then artistically constructed one bug out of the parts of all the others. The professor of natural history in the university was old and quite near-sighted. They placed their bug on a table, and calling him in, said, ‘Professor we have made a most extraordinary find! Here is a bug, the like of which we have never seen or heard about. Can you tell us what it is?’ The Professor, adjusting his glasses, took a look, and then said, ‘Young gentlemen, THIS IS A HUMBUG.’” And the recorder of this story goes on to say, that there are some to-day “who claim to be very learned specialists and who have from various sources, gathered numerous theories which they declare are wonderful improvements, upon the teachings of the Bible, and when these theories are adjusted, we have the most striking and peculiar creature the world has ever seen. And this creature these learned specialists try to palm off as the religion of the Bible. But I call it humbug.”

And what shall we say with regard to the constituent parts of this new theory! What with juggled history, juggled figures, added and subtracted words, and

conjectural meanings, all dovetailed together we certainly have another most wonderful HUMBUG!

And now we will add what commentators and real deep Bible students have to say with regard to the 2300 days.

## VIEWS OF COMMENTATORS

“There is no number in the Bible whose genuineness is better ascertained than that of the 2300 days. It is found in all the printed Hebrew editions, in all the MSS. of Kennicott and De Rosei’s collations, and in all the ancient versions, except the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, which reads 2400, followed by Symmachus and some copies noticed by Jerome, 2200; both evidently literal errors in excess and defect.” ‘A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography.’ – Revelation William Hales, D.D., Volume 11, page 512, footnote.

“Though literally it be 2300 evenings and mornings, yet I think the prophetic day should be understood here as in other parts of this prophet, and must signify so many years!” – Dr. Adam Clarke.

Then in connection with Daniel 8:26 which reads: “Wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days.” Dr. Clarke, in his notes, says, “Not less than 2300 years.”

The 2300 days – “The sanctuary and host were trampled underfoot 2300 days (verse 14) and in Daniel’s prophecies, days are put for years.” – Sir Isaac Newton.

Bagster comments: “Two thousand and three hundred days (see margin) that is 2300 years.”

Bishop Newton says: “Two thousand three hundred years may properly enough be said to be for many days.”

“It is plain at once that this (the 2300 days) is not the usual literal expression for a space of between six and seven years. There are only three instances in all Scripture history where a period of above forty days is expressed in days only. Genesis 7:3 (24), Nehemiah 6:15; Esther 1:4. And it is without any precedent in Scripture, or in common usage, that periods of more than one year should be thus described.” – “First Elements of Sacred Prophecy.” Revelation, T. R. Birks, Chapter 13, page 357.

## DANIEL'S PROPHETIC PERIODS IN LUNI-SOLAR CYCLES

And now it may surprise and possibly interest our critics to learn that Daniel's prophetic periods of 1260 and 2300 days are both scientifically established. The science of astronomy has revealed the fact that both of these periods are lunar-solar cycles of immense importance. The 2300-year cycle, while being the most important time prophecy in the Bible, is also “the most perfect lunar-solar cycle known.” We quote from an article written by the celebrated British astronomer, E. W. Maunder, and published in the “International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.”

“THE LUNI-SOLAR CYCLES OF DANIEL. The season for which the sun and moon were appointed are mentioned in yet another connection. In the last vision given to Daniel the question was asked. ‘How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?’ and it was answered, ‘It shall be for a time, times (dual), and a half; and when they have made an end of breaking in pieces the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished’ (Daniel 12:62). From the parallel passage in Daniel 7:25 where it is said of the fourth beast, ‘He shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times (dual) and half a time.’ It is inferred that *mo-ed* in the first instance stands, like *iddan* in the second, for a year; or the period is equivalent to half a week of years. The parallel passages in Revelation 11:23; 12:6-14; 13:5 have caused these years to be taken as conventional months of 30 days and on the year-day principle of interpretation, the entire period

indicated would be one of 1260 typical years. This again is a lunar-solar cycle, since 1260 years contain 15,584 months correct to the nearest day.

“To the same prophet, Daniel, a further chronological vision was given, and yet more perfect cycle indicated in answer to the question, ‘How long shall be the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, and the transgression that makes desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?’ The answer was returned, ‘Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.’ (Daniel 8:13-14). Whatever may be the prophetic significance of the passage. Its astronomical significance is clear: 840,057 days are precisely 2300 solar years, or 28,447 lunar months, or 30,487 anomalistic months, the anomalistic month being the period in which the moon travels from perigee to perigee. IT IS THE MOST PERFECT LUNI-SOLAR CYCLE KNOWN, and restores the two great lights exactly to their former relationship. This fullest ‘season’ indicated by the sun and moon is given as that for the cleansing of the sanctuary, for the bringing in as it were, of the full and perfect jubilee.

“It is not possible at present to decide as to whether the Jews had learnt of this cycle and its significance from their astronomical observations. If so, they must have been far in advance in mathematical science of all other nations of antiquity. If not, then it must have been given them by Divine revelation and its astronomical significance has been left for modern science to reveal.”

Nor is Mr. Maunder the only astronomer who has made this discovery. Dr. H. Grattan Guinness, F.R.A.S., says: “The 2300 years cycle is not only a cycle of the tropical year and synodic month, but also (as was discovered in the preparation of the present tables) a cycle of the anomalistic month, the agreement being remarkable for its accuracy. The 840,057 days of 2300 years are just 30,487 anomalistic months.” – “Creation Centered in Christ,” Volume 2, page 13.

In this same book a further statement by Mr. A. Marth, another noted British astronomer, is cited as follows: “As regards the chief aim you have at heart,

the proving that Daniel's twenty-three hundred days refer to the solar-lunar cycle of twenty-three hundred years, it would have been sufficient to give the list of comparisons on page 25 of your tables."

Then with reference to these discoveries, Dr. Guinness quotes from another astronomic work, "The Handbook of Astronomy," Volume 2, page 467, in which George F. Chambers remarks: "Such are some of the adjustments which astronomy discloses between the prophetic times and periods which affect the material universe. They are adjustments of such a character as only modern science, with its instruments of exact precision, could discover, and were of necessity unknown to the prophets of bygone ages. The periods which the prophets foretold as destined to measure cycles of moral harmonization are themselves cycles of material harmonization. There is a mutual adjustment between the material and moral worlds. The course of revealed redemption chronology, Levitical and prophetic is in profound and exact agreement in all its details and all its extent with the time order of the universe." – "Creation Centered in Christ," Volume 2, page 81.

Thus do these celebrated British astronomers make clear the fact that the 2300 days of Daniel's prophecy not only represent 2300 years, but what is infinitely more important, they show that the prophetic period synchronizes with the astronomic cycle, the most perfect cycle known.

For the benefit of those who do not perhaps understand what these cycles are, it is stated that "A cycle is a period which brings into harmony different celestial revolutions containing a certain definite number of each without remainder or fraction." Or, to express it in another way. A lunar-solar cycle is a period of years, at the beginning of which both sun and moon have a common starting point, and at its close, a common termination, in their respective cycles. So while the orbits and revolutions of the sun, moon, and planets differ in length and time, and one planet will traverse its orbit and make its revolutions much oftener than another, yet as they both start from a given point in their respective cycles, and one will traverse its orbit and reach its starting point quicker than the other, there comes a time when in their



respective cycles that both once again reach the starting point at exactly the same moment, this is what constitutes a lunar-solar cycle, and this is what these astronomers tell us did happen at the close of the 2300-year period and thus constituted it a lunar-solar cycle, the most perfect cycle known.

Thus, the position held by Seventh-day Adventists for the past ninety years with regard to the 2300 days is fully established, incontestably confirmed.

That period specifically set forth to signalize the time of the cleansing of the Sanctuary, was first marked off prophetically by the prophet Daniel. It was, later, historically marked by the decree to rebuild and restore Jerusalem going forth and being put into effect in the year 457 B.C., and lastly, we find that it was marked off astronomically by Jehovah's unerring time-keeping system in the heavens, by "the most perfect lunar-solar cycle known" and which, in harmony with the prophetic period, had its starting point in the year 457 B.C. and its termination in the year A.D. 1844.

And may we not assume that it is because of the immense importance to all the world of the event, which the close of that 2300-year period was to usher in that Jehovah has scientifically as well as prophetically marked off that period?

Can we not also discern in this God's purpose, in that while men are led to make false applications of this most wonderful prophetic period, and thereby becloud its fearful import, as "the time is fulfilled" the Celestial time-piece, unaffected by man's opinions and theories, and holding all such as it were, in derision, chimes forth, "The hour of His judgment is come" (Revelation 14:6,7) declaring that the time has arrived when the Sanctuary referred to by Daniel the prophet, (Daniel 8:14) is about to be cleansed; that the Investigative Judgment (which, in the Jewish mind the Day of Atonement or the Cleansing of the Sanctuary typified) was about to be opened, and the lives and characters of all men examined, with the view to determining the rewards to be given "to every man" (Revelation 22:12; Matthew 16:27) when Christ returns again in the clouds of heaven.

## WHAT IS THE “DAILY?”

And now for the question of what is meant by the “daily” and the “transgression of desolation.” We have already pointed out that in Daniel 8:11, 12 and 13 the word “sacrifice” is not in the original, but is a supplied word. Then let us, for the time being, delete it from the Scripture, and then, with an open mind, enquire what does the word “daily” have reference to. With “sacrifice” deleted the Scripture will read:

Daniel 8:11 “And by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.”

Daniel 8:12 “And an host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression.

Daniel 8:13,14 “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot.” And he said unto me, “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.”

In addition to these texts there are two others that make reference to the daily which we must also consider.

Daniel 11:31 “And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily and they shall place the abomination that makes desolate.”

Daniel 12:11 “And from the time that the daily shall be taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.”

The original word for “daily” in all the foregoing texts is “tamid.” This word, Hebrew scholars tell us, is found in the Old Testament 104 times, and “it is translated ‘continually’ 53 times, ‘continual’ 27 times, ‘always’ 10 times, ‘daily’ 7 times, ‘ever’ 4 times, ‘perpetual’ twice, and ‘evermore’ once.

They also tell us that the word “tamid” alone, without any other word or expression to so designate it, could not be made to relate to sacrifice or offerings.

This is made clear from the fact that in Numbers 4:16, where we find the expression “daily meat offering,” “tamid” is the word used for “daily” and “minchah” for “meat-offering.”

Likewise in Numbers 29:6, we find “daily burnt-offering” and here again tamid is used, with “burnt-offering.” And these are the only texts in the Old Testament Scriptures in which tamid is translated “daily” apart from those found in Daniel, chapters 8, 11 and 12.

In both these texts in the Book of Numbers, as we have seen, another word is conjoined with tamid in the original, making clear that it was “daily meat-offering” and “daily burnt-offering.” But in Daniel 8:11,12,13; 11:31; and 12:11 the additional word appears in the original to warrant the insertion of the word “sacrifice.” To get the expression “daily sacrifice” in those five texts it is clear that, in addition to tamid, the word for sacrifice should also be there, but it is not, and therefore we repeat, the supplied word has no business in our Bibles.

Now, of those five Scriptures in Daniel, three of them make reference to a sanctuary in connection with the daily, thus indicating that the “daily” was connected with some religious system. And this is doubtless what influenced the translators in inserting the word “sacrifice” in our Bibles.

## THE BABYLONIAN “DAILY”

But the Jewish system was not the only one which had daily or continual offerings and to which that word “tamid” could be applied. The Babylonians and the Persians also had a religious system and in connection with which they likewise had daily or continual offerings.

This has been made manifest by the discovery of the Cylinder of Cyrus (538-529 B.C.), the inscription upon which has been translated as follows:-

“Daily he planned and in enmity, he allowed the regular offering to cease; he appointed – he established within the city.” – See ‘Landmarks of Civilization; Assyrian and Babylonian Literature,’ by Albert F. Harper, page 171.

Another translation reads: “He planned daily and in enmity he caused the established sacrifice to cease.” – ‘Archaeology and the Bible,’ by George A. Barton, Second Edition, page 385.

Still another translation “Daily he contrived. The continual offering he made to cease. By a yoke unrelaxing he ruined them all.” – “The Monuments and the Old Testament.” Price, page 222. Then Rogers in the Cuneiforms Parallels to the Old Testament, page 380, also gives the expression, ‘he caused the daily offering to cease.’ Thus “continual offering” or “daily offering” were expressions used in connection with Paganism in Daniel’s day.

## THE “DAILY” AS PAGANISM

Now Paganism was the dominant system of worship, both in Babylon and the Medo-Persian kingdom. It was also carried right over into the kingdom of Rome for several centuries, and according to the inscription found on the cylinder of Cyrus there can be little question but that, like the Jewish system, Paganism also had its “regular” or “continual offering.” Nor is this at all surprising, seeing that Paganism is Satan’s counterfeit of the worship of Jehovah.

Then, as a matter of fact, right in Daniel’s time, the worship of Jehovah and Paganism were in fierce conflict, as witnessed by the story of the three Hebrews and the Golden Image. And while, finally, Nebuchadnezzar embraced the true worship, and his son-in-law, Nabonidus, according to the cylinder had removed most of the images from Babylon, Cyrus, later, endeavored to restore the ancient pagan worship.

Under such circumstances, it would appear only reasonable to assume that it was to the pagan usage and not to the Jewish system that the “daily” mentioned in Daniel 8:11 and 12 had reference.

It is certain that the inscription found on the cylinder of Cyrus could have no reference to the act of Antiochus in causing the Jewish daily sacrifice to cease as that incident occurred 350 years later than the writing of the cylinder.

And now in Daniel 8:12 we read that “an host was given him (the little horn) against the daily by reason of transgression” or as the literal rendering of the original is “the daily in transgression.”

Respecting this Keil, in his Commentary on the Book of Daniel, page 299, says: “Hitzig says that a Hebrew reader could not understand the words otherwise than as meaning, ‘and a war-like expedition was made or conducted against the daily sacrifice with wickedness’ (i.e. the impure service of idols) while others translate, ‘and a host placed against the daily sacrifice on account of sin’ (Syrian, Grot., Harenb., J. D. Michaelis) or, ‘a host is given against the daily sacrifice in wickedness,’ Wiesler); or, ‘given against that which was continual with service of idols, i.e., so that, in the place of the ‘continual’ wickedness, the worship of idols is appointed (Hofman); or ‘the power of an army is given to it (the horn) against the daily sacrifices through wickedness,’ i.e. by the evil higher demons. (Ebrard).

But who will contend that the Jewish sacrifices were “continual with service of idols” or with “the impure service of idols?” We well know that it was not so! But we can say, however that the pagan “continual” was “with service of idols.”

Then what stronger evidence could we have than is here given that the “daily” mentioned in Daniel, chapters 8,11,12, does not have reference to the Jewish sacrifices, but to Paganism. But again, the Jewish translation of Daniel 8:11 renders tamid “continual” instead of “daily.” Another comment on this same verse says: “The most natural rendering is ‘and an host was appointed (or a

warfare was undertaken) against the continual (burnt-offering) with transgression.” – Driver on the Book of Daniel in Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, page 117.

And it would seem that the word “continual” would be the more appropriate word. On one occasion when Pastor Loughborough was conducting a meeting in Detroit, Michigan, there was present a gentleman who had been educated as a Jewish Rabbi, and who was well posted in Hebrew. At the close of the meeting Pastor Loughborough asked him what he understood by the “daily” in Daniel 9:12. He at once replied: “Oh, that means continual.” “What,” said Pastor Loughborough, “something that was to continue?” “O, No!” he said, “Something that had continued all the way along to oppose the work of God on earth.” “And what was that?” Pastor Loughborough enquired. His ready response was. “It was Paganism.”

## PAPACY VERSUS PAGANISM

And now we will consider the question propounded in Daniel 8:13, and the answer given in verse 14. “How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation to give both the sanctuary and the host, to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.”

We delete the supplied word “sacrifice” as it has no right there. The question clearly has reference to the length of time that would be covered by this vision – “how long” would the “daily” or “continual” (Paganism) reign, and “how long” would “the transgression of desolation” or “the abomination that makes desolate” reign. And the reply is, “unto 2300 days!” After which the sanctuary would be cleansed.

In order to help us get the correct understanding of this, we must also consider with it, the Scriptures found in Daniel 8:12 and 11:31.

In Daniel 8:12, we read that “an host was given him (the little horn) against the daily” or continual (against Paganism.)

Then in Daniel 11:31 we are told that “arms shall stand on his (the little horn’s) part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily (continual or Paganism) and they shall place the abomination that makes desolate.”

In these Scriptures we find that the daily or continual is taken away in order to place the “abomination that makes desolate,” and to do this “an host” is given the little horn and also “arms shall stand on his part.”

Thus, Paganism was to be replaced and the succeeding desolating power was to be placed through an host and arms that would come to its aid.

As we have already remarked, Rome was pagan for several centuries. In the year A.D. 330, Constantine, who was a pagan, removed his seat of Empire from Rome to Constantinople, and by this move the way was opened for the remodeling of pagan Rome into the Papal form of worship. It was in this way that the Dragon (Paganism) gave his seat and authority to the Beast (Revelation 13:2). In 2 Thessalonians 2:3,4,7 Paul makes reference to this as follows.

“Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; Who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sits in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now lets will let, until he be taken out of the way!”

This “mystery of iniquity” which was already working in Paul’s day, is none other than “the abomination that makes desolate” – the Papacy. This power did not come up at once, it developed gradually. It could not be established “until he who now lets (hinders) be taken out of the way.” That which hindered was Paganism, the hitherto established religion of Rome. But as we

come down the stream of time, we find that Clovis, king of the Franks, championed the cause of the papal body and through him Paganism was overthrown and the way opened for the establishment of the Papacy. But we will let the historian tell the story:

## CLOVIS CHAMPIONS PAPAL CAUSE

“In 493 Clovis married a Burgundian Princess, Clotilda. This Princess was a Christian and earnestly desired the conversion of her husband. He remained a pagan till the war against the Alemanni. The legend runs that, in the thickest of the fight, Clovis swore that he would be converted to the God of Clotilda if her God would grant him the victory. After subduing a part of the Alemanni Clovis went to Rheims, where he was baptized by St. Remigius on Christmas Day, 496 together with 3000 Franks.” – Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 5, page 856.

Gibbon, writing of this, says: “On the memorable day when Clovis ascended from the baptismal font, he alone, in the Christian world, deserved the name and prerogatives of a Catholic king. The eldest, or rather the only, son of the church was acknowledged by the clergy, as their lawful sovereign or glorious deliverer; and the arms of Clovis were strenuously supported by the zeal and favor of the Catholic faction.” Gibbon’s Rome, Volume 6, page 167.

And now the Historian’s History of the World says of the Catholic Party: “The baptism of Clovis had turned their eyes toward him as one who would not only free them from the persecution of their theological enemies, but procure for them and their church a speedy victory and a secure predominance.” – Volume 7, pages 471, 472.

Then in furtherance of the work that he had commenced we find that – “In 507, love of conquest concurring with zeal for the orthodox faith, Clovis marched to the south-west of Gaul against the heretic Visigoth, Alaric II, whom he defeated and slew at Vougle, near Poitiers.” – Chambers’ Encyclopedia, Volume III, page 302.



Then in the following year, “at the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508, Clovis complained, “It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portions of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God, and having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their province.” Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect that ‘doubtless the Lord would more readily lend His aid if some gift were made’ and in response, Clovis seized his battle-axe and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air he exclaimed, ‘There, on the spot where my Francisea shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostle.’” – Ecclesiastical Empire, page 257.

And thus, it was that “The decisive battle of Poitiers was followed by the conquest (A.D. 508) of Aquitain.” – Gibbon’s Fall, Chapter 38, paragraph 13.

And now history gives us the very definite statement regarding Clovis that, “BY his conversion he had the way to the triumph of Catholicism; He had saved the Roman Catholic Church from the Scylla and Charybdis of heresy and PAGANISM, planted it on a rock in the very centre of Europe and fixed its doctrines and traditions in the hearts of the conquerors of the West!” – Historian’s History of the World, Volume VIII, page 477.

Thus, with the conversion and baptism of Clovis and his 3000 Franks; and by his overthrowing Paganism, and by force of arms, championing the Papal cause, “a warlike expedition was made” and “an host was given” the little horn “against the daily,” and arms did “stand on his part.” This was accomplished in the year A.D. 508.

And so, the “daily” is definitely proved, beyond a shadow of a doubt, to refer to “Paganism,” and not to the Jewish sacrifices; and all attempts to fit “sacrifices” instead of days into Daniel 8:14, and to change the 2300 to 2200 in order to sustain a theory, with the view to undermining the Gift of Prophecy, are simply futile.

## THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION

And now the “abomination of desolation” was to be set up. In the 7th chapter of Daniel’s prophecy, we have brought to our view the four universal kingdoms, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome in the symbols of the four beasts.

Of the ten horns in the head of the fourth beast (which represented the ten divisions of western Rome) three were to be subdued by the little horn having “eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things.” This little horn being a symbol of the Papacy, it was by that power that the three horns were to be subdued. These three horns – the Heruli, the Vandals and the Ostrogoths – were Arian powers and had nothing in common with the Catholics; in fact, “the contest between the Arians and the Catholics was most bitter and unrelenting,” and so long as these Arian powers held sway “the Pope could not assert papal authority.”

So, they had to be subdued, and the prophecy said that they would be. Thus in A.D. 493 the Heruli were the first to fall, followed by the Vandals in A.D. 534, and lastly, the Ostrogoths in A.D. 538. And having disposed of these three opposing powers – the last being driven out of Rome in A.D. 538 – “there was nothing to hinder the Bishop of Rome from occupying the proud position for which he had so long been striving.” The Papacy was then in the ascendant and was “about to enter upon her long career of ecclesiastical tyranny,” while Paganism, having already been dethroned, ceased to be the state religion. Then “The church took the pagan philosophy and made it the buckler of faith against the heathen. She took the pagan Roman Pantheon, temple of all the gods and made it sacred to all the martyrs. So, it stands today. She took the pagan Sunday and made it the Christian Sunday!” So says the Catholic World for March, 1894, page 809.

And Dowling’s History of Romanism, page 124, also tells us that it was Pope Boniface IV who took the great pagan sanctuary of Rome, the temple of all gods, and dedicated it “to the blessed Virgin and all the saints.”

Thus, with the overthrow of the “daily” – Paganism – her “sanctuary of strength” was also “cast down,” while the “abomination that makes desolate” (the Papacy) was placed or “set up!”

## THE 1290 AND 1335 DAYS

And now, as an authenticating point of all this, we are instructed in Daniel 12:11 that “From the time that the daily (continual or Paganism) shall be taken away and the abomination that makes desolate (the Papacy) set up (i.e. from A.D. 508) there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days – 508 plus 1290 equals 1793.

That these days, in common with Daniel’s other prophetic periods, are symbolic and represent years, there can be no question. To argue as some do, that the days of Daniel’s prophecies and particularly the 2300 days, are literal days and not symbolic, is inconsistent. Where the prophecies use symbols, or symbolic language, in describing territories, or kingdoms, or systems of worship, or anything else, and time is connected with those symbols, then symbolic language is also used for the time periods.

So, we deal with the 1290 days as representing years. Then the 1290 years added to 508 (when Paganism was overthrown by Clovis) brings us to the year 1798. And what happened to mark that year? The Papacy received its deadly wound as predicted in Revelation 13:3 and was shorn of its temporal power, the Pope being taken prisoner on February 20 of that year and deported to France, where he died in August the following year and from that time to the present the Papacy has never regained its lost supremacy.

Further in Daniel 12:12 we read, “Blessed is he that waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.” 508 plus 1335 equals 1843.

The year 1843 brings us to the close of the 2300 days or years; and upon the completion of which period the cleansing of the sanctuary was to begin.

The declaration that “Unto two thousand and three hundred days (years) then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” is not the declaration of any man, but of the Angel. From this statement it is clear that at the close of the 2300-year period there would be in existence, somewhere, a sanctuary that was to be cleansed. It could not be the earthly sanctuary as that had long since ceased to exist.

We are told in Scripture, however, that the earthly sanctuary was a pattern of the heavenly by which we understand that there is a sanctuary in heaven, and that being the only one of which we have any knowledge, we can only conclude that it is that sanctuary that is to be cleansed. By the “cleansing” of the sanctuary we understand that as in the earthly sanctuary, on the day of atonement, the sins of the people were removed there from, so in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, the sins of God’s people are also to be finally blotted out and removed out of sight both of God and man eternally.

We are now living in the time when this final work is proceeding in the sanctuary in heaven having begun in the year A.D. 1844, and, ere it is too late, may all who read these lines be led to enquire into, and embrace fully, the plan of salvation, that as the record of their lives comes up in examination before the Heavenly Tribunal, their sins may be forever blotted out and their records made clean through the atoning blood of Christ, who at this moment stands ready to plead for all who will come to Him in all sincerity, truly repenting of every known sin, and none such will ever be turned away or cast off.