

## ABSTRACT

**“Daniel 11:2b–12:3: A Structural Proposal and Its Contribution to the Whole Book of Daniel (Part II)”**—This study explores the structural composition of Daniel 11:2b–12:3, with particular emphasis on the pivotal role of the Messiah’s death in 11:22b. Through a detailed analysis of the central chiastic structure in Daniel 11:16–30, the article identifies key literary markers that organize the narrative around five successive kingdoms. The findings highlight the internal coherence and eschatological unity of the prophecy, affirming its Christocentric focus within the larger canonical framework of the book of Daniel and Scripture as a whole.

**Keywords:** Daniel 11, prophecy, eschatology, Messiah, literary structure,

## RESUMEN

**“Daniel 11:2b-12:3: Una propuesta estructural y su contribución al conjunto del libro de Daniel (Parte II)”**— Este estudio examina el diseño estructural de Daniel 11:2b–12:3, destacando el papel central de la muerte del Mesías en el versículo 11:22b. A través del análisis del quiasmo central de Daniel 11:16–30, el artículo identifica marcadores literarios clave y divide la narrativa en cinco reinos. Los hallazgos resaltan la coherencia y unidad escatológica de la profecía, afirmando su enfoque cristocéntrico dentro del marco general de Daniel y las Escrituras.

**Palabras clave:** Daniel 11, profecía, escatología, Mesías, estructura literaria

## DANIEL 11:2B–12:3: A STRUCTURAL PROPOSAL AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE WHOLE BOOK OF DANIEL (PART II)

*Héctor Urrutia-Hernández*

### Introduction

In our previous article, we outlined the principal divisions within the literary structure of Dan 11:2b–12:3, anchoring it in the exposition of five kingdoms: Medo-Persia, Greco-Macedonia, Imperial Rome, Christian Rome, and the Messianic Kingdom. To these outlined sections, we integrated chapters 10:1–11:1a and 12:4–13 as the prologue and epilogue to this divine revelation, respectively, thus constructing a comprehensive seven-part macrostructure. This structural arrangement in Dan 10–12 is predicated on literary formulas that signify the inauguration of a distinct kingdom, rather than merely a succession of rulers within the same imperial dominion. The entire structure manifests as a chiasm, with the Roman Empire (Dan 11:16–30), specifically the demise of the prince of the covenant (Dan 11:22b), serving as the focal pivot. We then embarked on an analytical exploration of the chiasm's individual segments, focusing primarily on the sections pertaining to the kingdoms (Dan 11:2–12:3) and, with particular emphasis, on the central passage regarding the death of the Messiah (Dan 11:16–30).

This article delves into the central section of the chiasm (Dan 11:16–30), examining evidence that defines the boundaries of this pericope, as well as the internal literary markers that ensure cohesion, and the verbal parallels that establish chiastic microstructures around “the prince of the covenant.” Moreover, I have identified that each section corresponding to the different kingdoms in Dan 11:2–12:3 exhibits a distinct literary style. My investigation also includes a brief microstructural analysis of the text to uncover internal divisions within the principal blocks; finally, we discuss the implications of adopting this structure for Dan 11:2b–12:3.

### Outlining the Central Section D (11:16–30)

Given the divergent viewpoints among historicist commentators

regarding the precise junctures that delineate Greece from Imperial Rome (11:3//4; 13//14; 15//16, or 19//20) and Imperial Rome from Christian Rome (11:4//5; 20//21; 22//23; 28//29, or 30//31), it becomes imperative to articulate the rationale behind our positioning that Imperial Rome begins at 11:16 and concludes at 11:30.

We postulate that Imperial Rome is introduced in 11:16, since the focus of the narrative shifts from the conflicts between the northern and southern Greek kingdoms, which culminate in 11:15, to a new ruler in 11:16, whose domain is not circumscribed by any cardinal direction. While some conjecture that this figure represents the king of the north, such a designation is notably absent in the narrative following 11:15 and does not resurface until 11:40, although this latter king of the north does not correlate with any historical Seleucid monarch.

Additionally, the introduction of the ruler in 11:16 marks a departure in Dan 11's linguistic pattern; this king is introduced with a participle, breaking the sequential introduction of kings via nouns. This king's conquest of "the Glorious Land" further demarcates him; Brasil de Souza's chart draws a parallel to the little horn in 8:9 during its secular empire phase as the entity that previously conquered "the Glorious Land."<sup>1</sup>

Four distinct characteristics are ascribed to this emergent king/kingdom in 11:16: 1) he "shall act according to his own will," 2) "no one shall stand against him," 3) he shall establish himself in the Glorious Land, and 4) he wields destruction in his power. The initial two characteristics broadly describe his dominion, while the latter two pertain specifically to his impact on Judah.

Scholars across all interpretative schools situate Dan 11:15 within the reigns of either Antiochus III the Great<sup>2</sup> or of his son Antiochus IV Epiphanes,<sup>3</sup> both of whom ruled in the mid-2nd century BCE. Therefore, verse 16 is contextualized within this period, a time when Rome emerged as the preeminent kingdom. The year 168 BCE is marked by many historians as the termination of the empire initiated by Alexander the Great, following Rome's defeat of the last Macedonian king,

1. Elías Brasil de Souza, *El libro de Daniel* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 2019), 141. In 11:16 it says *'ereš-ḥaššebî*; in 8:9, *ḥaššebî* only appears.

2. For example, John J. Collins, *A Commentary of the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 371, 380; Tremper Longman III, *Daniel*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 31, 275.

3. For example, William H. Shea, *Daniel: Una guía para el estudio* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 2010), 242–243.

Perseus, at the Battle of Pydna. Concurrently, the Ptolemaic empire of Egypt faced its nadir, verging on absorption by the Seleucid empire. Rome asserted its supremacy unequivocally over Antiochus III with a decisive victory over Antiochus IV by prohibiting his conquest of Egypt, even going so far as to dictate Antiochus's placement on the Seleucid throne. By 202 BCE, Rome had also vanquished Carthage, its formidable adversary.

Hence, the initial phases described in 11:16—1) the king “shall do according to his own will,” and 2) “no one shall stand against him,”—distinctly attribute to Rome an unparalleled dominion over any contender. Furthermore, the introduction of the “mighty king” of Greece in 11:3, using the phrase *wəʾāsāh kirṣônô*, signifies the inception of a new empire, succeeding Persia. This precise phraseology (*wəʾāsāh kirṣônô*) in 11:16 introduces the advent of this novel king. Notably, this expression was exclusively associated with Alexander, differentiating him from any other Greek monarch.

This argument challenges the prevalent view among conservative scholars who situate the introduction of Imperial Rome in Dan 11:14,<sup>4</sup> which stated: “violent men of your people shall exalt themselves in fulfillment of the vision, but they shall fall.” Primarily, the term “violent men” refers explicitly to Jews, not Romans. The verb used, “shall exalt themselves,” is *nśʾ*, indicative of a rebellious uprising, rather than *ʾmd*, typically employed to denote the rise of a kingdom. Conversely, Rome was the sole kingdom that did not rebel against Egypt but was instrumental in its salvation. Moreover, Rome's actions were not motivated by a desire to fulfill “the vision [*hāzôn*],” whether referencing Dan 7 or Dan 8. The concluding phrase, “but they shall fall,” unequivocally does not describe Rome, given its eventual triumph.

Doukhan's stance, introducing Imperial Rome in Dan 11:4b, encounters several issues.<sup>5</sup> His interpretation extends Christian Rome's

---

4. Uriah Smith, *Las Profecías de Daniel y el Apocalipsis* (Mountain View, CA: Publicaciones Interamericanas, 1949), 1:197; Edwin R. Thiele, *Outline Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, MI: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1953), 114; C. Mervin Maxwell, *El misterio del futuro revelado* (Buenos Aires: ACES, 1981), 289–290. Desmond Ford, *דניאל* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1978), 263; Merling Alomía, *Daniel: El profeta mesiánico* (Lima: Ediciones Theologica, 2008), 416–418; Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2007), 418. For a more detailed critique of this position, see Héctor Urrutia, *Profecías apocalípticas de Daniel: Dios es mi Juez* (Santiago, Chile: Wandersleben Impresiones, 2012), 364–365.

5. Hotma Saor Parasian Silitonga, “Continuity and Change in World Rulers:

introduction to Dan 11:5 and posits its dominance over a span of 1260 years starting from Dan 11:8; he perceives Dan 11:13–25a as depicting the Catholic Counter-Reformation, spanning the years 1600 to 1789,<sup>6</sup> and interprets the death of “the prince of the covenant” as the martyrs of this Counter-Reformation period.<sup>7</sup> These interpretations do not align with the texts’ requisite prophetic accuracy.

Additionally, as Roy Gane proposes, the clear allusions to Imperial Rome from 11:16 challenge the extension of Greek kingdoms up to Dan 11:19.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, positioning religious Rome in the text at Dan 11:23, rather than at Dan 11:31, appears forced. Gane acknowledges that “Before this, the power in the king of the north’s position is depicted simply as a political (including military) power (vs. 21–30), but in verses 30–39, he appears as a religious-political power.”<sup>9</sup> Gane also concedes that Dan 11:22 signifies the crucifixion of Christ by Imperial Rome in AD 31. However, his narrative leaps over a millennium to 1095, marking the onset of the papal crusades against literal Egypt, extending to Dan 11:29, before reverting to the years 508–538 in Dan 11:30–31, which he identifies as the rise of papal power.<sup>10</sup>

The third phrase, “He shall stand in the Glorious Land,” elucidates the dominion of this kingdom over Judah. The Hebrew verb for “to stand,” *ʿmd*, employed throughout Dan 11:2b–12:3, signifies dominion. The fourth characteristic of this new king, “with destruction in his power” within the Glorious Land, narrows down the identity further. The noun *kālāh* meaning “destruction” or “annihilation” (as seen in 1 Sam 20:33 and Isa 10:23),<sup>11</sup> and the phrase *wākālā bəyādō*, translating literally to “and annihilation in/by his hand/power,” unequivocally points to Rome. Only Rome executed such destruction

---

A Comparative Study and Evaluation of Seventh Day Adventist Interpretations of Daniel 11” (PhD diss., AIIAS, 2001), 189.

6. Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded: An Exegetical, Historical, and Theological Study* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2019), 113.

7. Ibid., 113. Doukhan acknowledges that v. 22 is the center of the entire structure for evoking the death of the Messiah (259), the prince of the covenant is Christ crucified, but only as an allusion or parallel to the martyrs of the Counter Reformation (139–140).

8. Similarly, the preterist and futurist authors do not see the introduction of a new kingdom in 11:16.

9. Gane, 13.

10. Ibid., 12–15.

11. Ludwig Koehler y Walter Baumgartner, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 2:477, s.v. “כָּלָה”.

after Babylon's conquest in 586 BCE in 70 AD, thus excluding Antiochus III and Antiochus IV from fulfilling this prophecy. Antiochus III annexed Jerusalem through an alliance, not conquest. Antiochus IV inherited Jerusalem and lost it during the Maccabean revolt, hence Jerusalem did not suffer "destruction in his power."

Regarding the transition from the Roman Empire to Christian Rome (considering 11:4//5; 20//21; 22//23; 28//29; or 30//31 as potential junctures), we posit that 11:30 signifies the end of Imperial Rome, with 11:31 marking the advent of Christian Rome. Dan 11:30 begins with an invasion by "ships of the western coastlands" (NIV) or "ships of Kittim [Cyprus]" (NASB), an expression used to describe peoples coming from out of the limits of the kingdom,<sup>12</sup> appropriately representing the barbaric invasions. At this point, Rome defines itself, for it returns "in rage against the holy covenant, and do[es] damage" to faithful Christianity. In contrast, it shows "regard for those who forsake the holy covenant," in other words, with apostate Christianity.

Brasil de Souza's chart indicates that the daily sacrifice is removed in 11:31, an act attributed to the little horn in its religious conquests in Dan 8:11, signifying the Christian phase of Rome.<sup>13</sup> Dan 11:31 also references the establishment of "the abomination of desolation," linked in Dan 12:11 to the power of the inquisition (12:7). The dialogue between the angels and Daniel in Dan 12:4–13 provides crucial insights into the duration of this Roman phase and its commencement. As before, Daniel's concerns and the angel's explanations primarily address Rome's dual phases, especially emphasizing its religious phase (Dan 7:20–22, 24–27; 8:23–25).

The inquiry posed to the man clothed in linen in Dan 12:6, concerning "the fulfillment of these wonders" (*qēš happālā'ôt*), directly connects to the revelations delivered to Daniel from 11:2b through 12:3. Notably, the term *pl'* occurs in this specific context only in 11:36, where it characterizes the ascension of Christian Rome (11:36–39,

12. Although Kittim is the island of Cyprus, the term was used by the Jews in a figurative way to refer to any enemy that invaded from outside the limits of Palestine. Flavius Josephus says that the Hebrews used this designation "for all the islands and most of the maritime countries" (*Antiquities*, 1.6.1, 128); 1 Macc 1:1 says that Alexander the Great came from Kittim; 1 Macc 8:5 says that Perseus, the king of Macedonia is the king of Kittim; in the Qumran writings it is applied to the Romans, even though the Romans were not maritime peoples. Neither Alexander, nor Perseus, nor the Romans came from Cyprus, but from even further afield. For more details see Collins, *A Commentary of the Book*, 384.

13. Brasil de Souza, 141.

also referenced in 2 Thess 2).<sup>14</sup> However, in 12:7, the man in linen correlates the “marvels/wonders” with the persecution of the holy people, citing the 3 ½ prophetic times from Dan 7:25, which also pertains to the Christian Rome, the little horn in this passage. Thus, the entity that exalts itself in 11:36–39 is the same that persecutes the saints in 11:31–35, mirroring the actions of the little horn in Dan 7:25 that both challenge God and oppress the holy people.

The man clothed in linen explained that “to finish [*ûkəkallôt*]” the persecution of the holy people, the “marvels” “shall be finished [*tiklênâ*]” (12:7).<sup>15</sup> The persecution of “the holy *people* [*‘am*]” evoked in 12:7 refers to the persecution of “the *people* [*‘am*] who know their God” of 11:32, who “for many days they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plundering” (11:33), which persecution extends “until the time of the end” (11:35), a phrase that is repeated in 12:9. This persecution is instigated by the power called “the abomination of desolation” in 11:31. Since 12:7 explains that the persecution will last 3 ½ prophetic times, and 12:9 adds that it will extend “until the time of the end,” it indicates that “the abomination of desolation” (11:31) and persecutes the saints “until the time of the end” (11:35) is the power which the saints spoke of in Dan 12.

In addition to *‘am*, the sapiential terms further unite the section of Dan 11:31–35. “The *people* [*‘am*] who *know* [*yd’*] their God” (11:32) are equated with “those of the *people* [*‘am*] who *understand* [*škl*]” (11:33) and “those of understanding [*škl*] shall fall, to refine them” (11:35). Notably, the verbs “to refine them, purify them, and make them white” (11:35) are unique to 11:35 and 12:10 in the entirety of Daniel, establishing a thematic coherence within these passages. Moreover, the verb *kšl*,<sup>16</sup> meaning “to fall” or “to stumble,” links 11:33–35, as it recurs in 11:33, 34, and 35, adding an additional layer of textual unity.

The angel’s proclamation in Dan 12:11, “And from the time *that* the daily is taken away, and the abomination of desolation is set up, *there shall be* one thousand two hundred and ninety days” (12:11),<sup>17</sup> utilizes terminology introduced in 11:31 (“the daily”, “taken

14. *Pl’* is used only once more in 8:24, also describing the religious phase of Rome, through the figure of the little horn. Although in Dan 8:24 and 11:36 this term is a verb, in both cases it is a *niphal* participle, with a nominative sense.

15. Literally, “all *these* will finish”.

16. This verb (*kšl*) repeated in 11:33, 34 and 35 produces assonance in Hebrew with the verb *škl* that appears in 11:33 and 35.

17. Personal translation.

away” and “the abomination of desolation is set up.”). This solidifies the beginning of Christian Rome’s supremacy, sidelining Imperial Rome from the historical and prophetic narrative centerstage. The same terminology was previously used in 8:11, describing the activities of the little horn in its religious phase. In summary, Christian Rome is introduced through the depiction of its inquisitorial actions in 11:31–35; this is followed by a portrayal of its arrogance against God in 11:36–39; and finally, its inquisitorial behavior “at the time of the end” is described in 11:40–45.

### Internal Literary Markers in Daniel 11:16–30

The central passage of Dan 11:16–30 features internal literary markers (ILMs) that, while not demarcating the beginning or end of a section, play a crucial role in sustaining the unity of a literary block. This is especially true when such markers are exclusive to the section, endowing it with a unique identity. Understanding these markers will later assist in analyzing the microstructure of this unit.

The noun *pāneh* links verses 16–22. Although this noun is prevalent in Hebrew, appearing 33 times across the Hebrew portion of Daniel, its usage is mainly concentrated within Dan 11:2–12:3. Here, it is exclusively employed in verses 16, 17, 18, 19, and 22a, always attached with the third person masculine singular possessive suffix *āyw* (*pānāyw*). Each instance occurs within the narrative concerning the Roman kings (11:16–30), and all precede the mention of “the prince of the covenant” in 11:22b. This mention effectively bifurcates the discussion of Imperial Rome into two distinct periods: before and after the prince of the covenant (11:16–22a and 11:23–30).

Remarkably, this specific form of the noun, combined with the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix, is found only eight times in the entire book of Daniel, with five occurrences within Dan 11:16–22. This repeated usage underscores the cohesiveness of this segment. Particularly interesting is that, on some occasions, *pānāyw* is introduced by a preposition, an article, or a *waw*. However, the form *pānāyw*, that is, without any prefix and solely with the third person masculine singular suffix, appears only three times in the Hebrew text of Daniel, specifically in 11:17, 18, and 19. This triple occurrence tightly interlinks these verses.<sup>18</sup>

18. In ch. 10, which is the introduction to 11:2–12:3, for example, *pāneh* is used five times, but four of them are suffixed by the first person singular personal



The other two instances where *pānāyw* is found in Dan 11 are in verses 16 and 22a, marking the start and conclusion of the subsection that deals with Rome prior to the Messiah (11:22b). In these instances, *pānāyw* is preceded by prepositions: *lāpānāyw* (11:16) and *millāpānāyw* (11:22), respectively. This detailed examination of the internal literary markers not only highlights the intricate structure and thematic continuity within Dan 11:16–22a but also underscores the narrative’s focus on the Roman era, framing it within the broader prophetic discourse.

Another interesting link is the three times that *pānāyw* appears alone (11:17, 18, and 19); it is accompanied by a *weyiqtol* verb form. The three expressions are *wāyāšēm pānāyw* in 11:17; *wāyāšēm pānāyw* in 11:18 (*qere*), and *wāyāšēb pānāyw* in 11:19. The verb *wāyāšēm* at 11:17 and 18 (*qere*), is the verb *šym* “put”, which is only used five times in Daniel (1:7, 7, 8; 11:17 and 18), but it is only followed by *pānāyw* in 11:17 and 18 in the whole book. The verb *wāyāšēb* which comes from *šûb* “return,” and is used 16 times in the Hebrew Daniel, but only in 11:18 is it followed by *pānāyw*. Interestingly, there are manuscripts both in the Hebrew and the Greek of 11:18 have *wāyāšēm* in the place of *wāyāšēb* (*ketiv*). There are also manuscripts in Hebrew and Greek that have *wāyāšēm* in 11:19 instead of *wāyāšēb*.<sup>19</sup> It could be that the three verses of 11:17, 18, and 19 commence with the same verb and are followed by *pāneh*, in the same form *pānāyw*.

Regardless of the specific variant, these verses are audibly connected, producing alliteration and assonance when read in Hebrew. This auditory linkage suggests that the actions described by these verbs pertain to the same king, identified here as Julius Caesar. Thus, verse 11:16 introduces Rome, highlighting the defining traits of this new power, while verses 11:17–19 focus on the deeds of one particular king, historically significant as Julius Caesar.

The succession formula for the kings that follow this specific ruler in 11:17–19, leading up to the Messiah, employs a unique phrase within Daniel, *wāʾamad ʾal-kannô*, found only in 11:20 and 21 throughout the OT. This differs from the succession of Greek kings in 11:5–15,

---

pronoun *pānāy*, “before me,” and the fifth time with the third person singular pronoun, but prefixed by *waw*, *ūpānāyw* “and before him.”

19. See the corresponding critical apparatus in K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, y Gérard E. Weil, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2003), Dn 10:9–11.

where familial ties of the successors are emphasized. This prophetic detail accurately reflects the dynastic patterns of the northern and southern Greek kings, who established lines of descent exclusively from themselves,<sup>20</sup> except for Alexander the Great. According to Daniel's prophecy, his kingdom "shall be broken up and divided . . . but not among his posterity . . . for his kingdom shall be uprooted, even for others besides these" (Dan 11:4). In stark contrast, the Roman emperors, many of whom were either sexually impotent or whose sons died prematurely, led to a succession of rulers "in his place" on the throne, indicating a king other than his "son."<sup>21</sup>

Gane's interpretation of the unique phrase within Dan 11:20–45 suggests a different perspective than what the continuity of the text might imply. Instead of seeing it as a seamless transition within the Roman Empire, he perceives it as indicative of the fall of one kingdom and the emergence of another, thus extending the Greek kingdom up to 11:19, aligning with preterist and futurist scholars in this aspect. However, his approach diverges by segmenting Rome into three distinct phases: Republican (v. 20), Imperial (vv. 21–22), and Papal (vv. 23–45).<sup>22</sup> This segmentation contrasts with the broader thematic consistency across Daniel's visions, which typically bifurcate Rome into secular and religious phases. Notably, Revelation, composed during Imperial Rome's zenith, delineates religious Rome into multiple phases (pre- and post-deadly wound), portraying it as a future entity from John's standpoint. Recalling that Imperial Rome is given a proportionately larger segment in Dan 2, 7, and 8 than the preceding empires, and historically spanned a longer duration than the combined reigns of the other three empires, is pivotal. Moreover, within the quartet of prophetic sequences, it's observed that the initial empires progressively receive less textual space.<sup>23</sup> However, from Gane's perspective, there would be an exception in Dan 11:2b–12:3,

---

20. Absolutely all the Seleucid kings and all the Ptolemaic kings were descendants of the founding kings, who were generals of Alexander the Great, that is, of Seleucus I Nicator, and Ptolemy I Soter respectively.

21. Most of the Roman emperors in all their long history were succeeded on the throne by an adoptive son or a general, those who were succeeded by a son were exceptional. In all the 1st century only Vespasian (69–79) was succeeded by two of his sons: Titus (79–81) and Domitian (81–96).

22. Gane, 4–8.

23. For example, in Dan 11 there is no space for Babylon, and Medo-Persia only takes up half a verse (11:2b).

where Greece gets more detailed attention from the angel, while the expanding Roman empire is apparently limited to just two verses.

The narrative in Dan 11:20, which introduces a ruler who imposes taxes on the glorious kingdom, suggests a continuity within an already established realm rather than the emergence of a new kingdom. This interpretation stems from the notion that taxation implies governance over a consolidated kingdom. The phrase “shall arise in his place” (11:20) links this new king to the conquering king in 11:17–19, and these kings are introduced with the phrase *wəya’as habbā’* *’ēlāyw kiršônô*, uniting v. 16 to vv. 17–19, that describe a single king, assembling his actions with the phrases *wəyāsēm/wəyāsēb pānāyw*. The subsequent introduction of rulers in 11:20 and 11:21–22 employs *wə’āmad* *’al-kannô* with the subject in the participle form, mirroring the introduction in 11:16.

The phrase *wə’āmad* *’al-kannô*, combining the consecutive *waw* with the participle form of the subject, thus connects this new king with the same kingdom introduced in Dan 11:16. Precisely, Caesar Augustus, mentioned in Dan 11:20, emerged “in his place,” that is, in the position formerly held by Julius Caesar, who is referred to in Dan 11:17–19. Augustus was the adopted son of Julius Caesar. The subsequent mention of the phrase *wə’āmad* *’al-kannô* with the *waw* consecutive plus the participle subject occurs in Dan 11:21,<sup>24</sup> introducing a “vile [despicable] person” who, despite his despicableness, would achieve military success, including against “the prince of the covenant” (Dan 11:22). In the case of this despicable king, Tiberius Caesar, he succeeded Augustus, being likewise an adopted son. However, unlike Augustus, Tiberius was not favored. Thus, this specific description, unique to Dan 11:20–21, provides cohesiveness and unites the narrative from Dan 11:16 to 11:22a, leading us to the Messiah in Dan 11:22b. This distinctive phraseology differentiates the two Roman emperors during whose reigns the Messiah lived. Christ was born under Augustus’s rule, precisely when he was conducting a census (Luke 2:1), and died during the reign of Tiberius.

Another noteworthy aspect is the utilization of a verb with a consecutive *waw*, followed by the subject in participle form, a structure exclusively observed here: in Dan 11:20 (*weqatal*) and 11:21 (*weqatal*), as well as in Dan 11:16 (*weyiqtol*), throughout the entirety of Dan 11.

24. The phrase *wə’āmad* *’al-kannô*, followed by a subject participle, in 11:20 is in *hiphil* and in 11:21 in *niphal*.

The standard grammatical order in Hebrew (verb-subject-predicate) typically features the subject as a noun; however, in Dan 11:16, the subject is presented as a verb in participle form. This technique is uniquely employed in Dan 11:16, 11:20, and 11:21, contributing a distinctive quality and coherence to this section.

Traditional English translations render *wāyaʿaś habbāʾ ʿēlāyw kirṣônô* of 11:16 as “But he who comes *against* him shall do according to his own will” (NKJV, NASB, NRSV, etc.). Yet, the preposition translated as “against” is *ʿel*, which literally means “to” or “towards,” indicating direction rather than invasion or opposition. The preposition *ʿel* appears only five times in Dan 11:2b–12:3 (11:6, 7, 9, 16, 23). Excluding Dan 11:16, in the remaining instances, three convey the usual sense of direction (Dan 11:6, 9, and 23), with only Dan 11:7 necessitating translation as “with.” Notably, in these cases, it is never translated as “against.” Interestingly, the first and last occurrences of this preposition (Dan 11:6 and 23) are used within contexts of reconciliation rather than invasion. Thus, translating *ʿel* as “against” contradicts its use in the Danielic context. In 11:2b–12:3, Daniel employs the preposition *ʿal*, meaning “over,” to convey “against,”<sup>25</sup> and occasionally uses *ʿim*, “with” with that usage.<sup>26</sup>

The interpretation of “against” is derived from the assumption that “he who comes to *him* [to the king of the south],” refers to the king of the north, who, in verse 15, invaded the king of the south. However, the text does not label this figure as “the king of the north,” a designation explicitly used in the narrative concerning the Greek kings (Dan 11:6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15). The reference aligns exclusively with Rome in the historical context provided and based on the textual description of the king who will come.

Just as there are unifying elements in the narrative leading up to the Messiah, spanning the early Roman period (Dan 11:16–22a), so too are there connecting elements in the latter part of the story, from the Messiah to the fall of Imperial Rome (Dan 11:22b–30). A key term in this discussion is *bārît*, introduced in Dan 11:22b with the mention of “the prince of the *covenant*.” This term reappears only four times within Dan (11:28, 30 [2x], and 32) and is not used elsewhere in Daniel 10–12.<sup>27</sup> In Dan 11:28 and both instances in verse 30, the

25. Dan 11:5, 14, 24, 25, 28, 30, 34, 36, and 40.

26. Dan 11:11, 40.

27. The NASB and other versions have the word “alliance” in 11:6 and 23 which

“covenant” is described as “holy.” The designation “holy” in Daniel is consistently applied to that which is associated with God: celestial beings serving as His emissaries (Dan 4:13, 23; 8:13), the place of God’s dwelling (Dan 9:16, 20, 24; 11:45), and God’s people (Dan 12:7). Furthermore, the term “covenant,” exclusively used in the Hebrew section of Daniel, refers to God’s covenant with His people (Dan 9:4, 27; 11:22, 28, 30 [twice], and 32). Therefore, the “covenant,” referred to thrice as “holy,” must be understood as a divine covenant. Consequently, “the prince of the covenant” is best interpreted as a celestial figure, a divine representative, rather than an earthly prince, contrary to the assertions of both preterists and futurists regarding figures such as Onias III<sup>28</sup> or Ptolemy VI.<sup>29</sup>

The confirmation of this “holy covenant” occurs when the “anointed prince” is “cut off” (Dan 9:25a, 26a), indicating this as the “new covenant” to be “cut off” in line with Jer 31:31-33,<sup>30</sup> a prophet mentioned in Dan 9:1-2. Since the holy covenant of God with ancient geopolitical Israel was already in place (Dan 9:4), there was no need to await 69 prophetic weeks for it to be “cut off.” Thus, “the prince of the covenant” (Dan 11:22), associated with that covenant described as “holy” (Dan 11:28, 30), must establish this covenant with a new Israel, as the period of 70 weeks designated for ancient geopolitical Israel had concluded (Dan 9:24).

In addition, the assassination of this “prince of the covenant” (11:22) must correspond to the sacrifice that inaugurates the second covenant, for the Prince “shall be cut off” (9:26). This verb is used in the OT and the ancient Near East to describe the sacrifice that inaugurates a covenant. Therefore, interpreting the king who will later oppose the holy covenant (Dan 11:28, 30) as a Roman Emperor, subsequent to the cross, and those who apostatize from the holy covenant (Dan 11:30b) as those departing from Christianity rather than Judaism, negate any significance of ancient geopolitical Israel and its geographical boundaries. It also excludes Antiochus IV from this narrative.

---

implies secular kings. But this word is not derived from *bʿrît* “covenant” or “alliance,” but from *hbr* which means “to join;” the KJV and NIV translate it correctly.

28. For example Wood, 295.

29. For example: S. B. Miller, 307-308.

30. The Hebrew verb *krt* “to cut off” is used three times in Jer.31:31-33, where it is translated “to make” a covenant (the new) in KJV and NIV. The same verb is employed in Dan.9:26 to describe the death of the Messiah, literally “the Messiah will be cut off.” It is the only time Daniel uses it.

Indeed, while the term “covenant” is mentioned in Dan 11:32, it is solely in Daniel 11:28 and 11:30 where we encounter the phrase *‘al-bərīt qōdeš*, “against the holy *covenant*.” Daniel 11:32 transitions from a struggle “against the holy *covenant*” to describing a faction that will “violate the *covenant*” (NRSV). Thus, “the prince of the *covenant*” referred to in Dan 11:22b, whom the contemptible king opposes in Daniel 11:21, is connected with the actions described in Daniel 11:28 and 11:30, where the narrative focuses on an ongoing battle “against the holy *covenant*.” In Dan 11:28 and 11:30, the context does not pertain to papal persecution, as the entity known as “the abomination of desolation” (Dan 11:31) has yet to be established. Consequently, despite the distinctive language that differentiates them, the two segments of Rome’s history, as delineated in Dan 11:16–22a and Daniel 11:23–30, are unified through the figure of “the prince of the *covenant*” in Dan 11:22b.

### The Centrality of “the Prince of the Covenant”

“The prince of the *covenant*” and its significance in the section on Imperial Rome (11:16–30) is further emphasized by a parallel term identified within it. Frank Hardy discovered that the vv. 21–22a and 23–24, which immediately surround verse 22b, describe a coming in peace of the conquering king: *ûbā’ bəšalwâ*, “but he shall come in peaceably” (11:21), *bəšalwâ . . . yābô’*, “He shall enter peaceably” (11:24).<sup>31</sup> In the context of numerous conflicts between kings, these are the only instances where the word *šalwâ*, “peace,” “quietude,” or “calm,” appears in this chapter and throughout this final revelation (Dan 10–12). Hardy interprets this mention of a peaceful entry immediately before and after Dan 11:22 as “a reference to peaceful or non-violent activity, which provides a dramatic contrast with the violence done to the Prince of the *covenant* at the center of the section.”<sup>32</sup>

Contrasting with the notions of “peace” or “quietude,” we have found that the term *milhāmâ*, “war” or “battle,” is mentioned only in Dan 11:20, 25 within this entire revelation (Dan 10–12) and appears just once more throughout the Book of Daniel, in 9:26b, where it likewise denotes actions associated with the Roman Empire. These

31. Frank Hardy, “Some Context”, [https://www.daniel11prophecy.com/uploads/1/1/3/7/113721993/frank\\_hardy\\_context\\_summary.pdf](https://www.daniel11prophecy.com/uploads/1/1/3/7/113721993/frank_hardy_context_summary.pdf) (accessed January 25, 2024), 6.

32. *Ibid.*, 7.

terms establish a secondary framework around “the prince of the covenant.” Doukhan further notes that *nibzeh*, “the vile person” in 11:21, shares the same root as the noun *bizzâ* “plunder” in 11:24.<sup>33</sup> Although *nibzeh* is a verbal form, in Dan 11:21 it functions as a participle, that is, with a nominal function, actually serving as the subject of the sentence, thereby employing this root in both verses 21, 24<sup>34</sup> with a nominal sense. Compiling all these elements reveals a chiasmic structure with “the prince of the covenant” positioned at its core.

	<i>nāgîd bārît</i> (11:22)	
<i>ûbā' bəšalwā</i> (11:21b)		<i>bəšalwā... yābô'</i> (11:24a)
<i>nibzeh</i> (11:21a)		<i>bizzâ</i> (11:24b)
<i>milḥāmā</i> (11:20)		<i>milḥāmā</i> (11:25)

It is evident that this final revelation (Dan 10 to 12) is aligned with the previous revelations (Dan 7–12) that place the Messiah at their structural center (9:24–27). The antichrist, represented as the “little horn” (Dan 7 and 8) or as “the king of the north” (Dan 11), is not the center or climax of Daniel’s prophecies, whether these symbols are interpreted as Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Christian Rome, or some future antichrist. Significantly, *nāgîd* is used exclusively in 9:25, 26 and 11:22, and always to refer to the suffering Messiah. Although *śar* is also employed to represent the Messiah in Daniel (8:11, 25; 12:1), *śar* is used both for human leaders (1:7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18; 9:6, 8; 11:5) as well as heavenly, good (8:11, 25; 10:13; 12:1) and evil (10:13, 20, 21). The “prince” (*śar*) Michael, is the eschatological deliverer (12:1–3) in this revelation (10–12), but the center of it is the Messiah *nāgîd* and his vicarious death in 11:22b. Alberto Treiyer concludes that *nāgîd* in Daniel refers to the suffering Messiah, and *śar* to the eschatological priestly and warrior Messiah.<sup>35</sup> It is the vicarious death of the Messiah (11:22b) that enables the final victory and deliverance (12:1–3). The same power (imperial Rome) that takes the life of the Messiah (11:22; 9:26a) is the one that destroys the glorious earth (11:16; 9:26b).

33. Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 143.

34. *Bizzâ*, “spoil”, also appears in 11:33.

35. Alberto Treiyer, *El día de 1a Expiación y la Purificación del santuario: En el Pentateuco, en los libros históricos, en los Profetas, en Hebreos y en Apocalipsis* (Buenos Aires: Asociación Casa Editora Sudamericana, 1988), 317–318.



### Literary Styles in Dan 11:2–12:3

Another form of dividing the different kingdoms represented in this revelation is the way in which Daniel used different literary styles for each kingdom represented. The Persian kings are presented in the style of the numeric proverbs 3+1, which unite the sapiential gender (Prov 30:15, 18, 21, 29) with the classical prophetic (Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6).<sup>36</sup> The union of these two genders agrees with Daniel who is known as wise and as a prophet in the Scriptures. It is interesting that this style is never used again in this revelation. The kings of other kingdoms are introduced in a different form.

The Greek kings are introduced after the mention of Greece in 11:2c, and after the sudden death of its first king and the division of his kingdom (11:3–4). All of the section is centered on this division and the controversies of the kings of the north and of the south. This ends in 11:15, after which the king of the north is no longer mentioned until 11:40. The style here appears to be marking the warlike interaction between the kings of the north and of the south in an explicit form, and the familiar succession (“the daughter” 11:6, “him who begot her” 11:6, “a branch of her roots” 11:7, “his sons” 11:10, “[the sons] of your people” 11:14).

For the Roman kings a different style is used, that of succession. While the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kings were succeeded by their sons, the Roman emperors were not succeeded by their sons but rather another took the throne (11:20 and 21), or the resurgence of its kings is ambiguous (11:23–30). In addition, those kings are introduced not with nouns united to action verbs as occurs with Greek kings (11:3–15), but by participles: “he who comes” (11:16), “one who imposes taxes” (11:20), “a vile person”<sup>37</sup> (11:21), which is something distinctive within Dan 11.

The section on Christian Rome (11:31–45) is different from all the previous kingdoms, changing the personal style to a collective style, since individualization of the kings is lost, which makes it impossible to limit the actions of this power to some particular king or pope. All the section appears to actually describe a system; in fact, the word “king” only appears two times in all this section (11:36 and 40). In addition, in 11:31–39 the geographical indicators “north” and “south”

---

36. For a deeper study, see Urrutia, 352–353.

37. In Hebrew it is a participle.



disappear, they reappear in 11:40–45, but with a symbolic meaning. Also, the term “kingdom,” that is used for the sections of the Persian (11:2), Greek (11:4, 9), and Roman kings (11:17, 20, 21) disappears in the section on Christian Rome. Another peculiarity in 11:31–39 are the verbs for military conquest (*‘md*<sup>38</sup>, *bw*<sup>39</sup>, *šwb*<sup>40</sup>) which disappear in order to give place to religious persecution (11:31–35) and to self-exaltation (11:36–39). Finally, the religious language is incremented: *hll*, *miqdāš*, *tāmīd*, *məšômēm*, *haššiqûš*, *bārīt*, *hnp*, *‘am*, *’ēl*, *’ēlōhīm*, *mô’ēd*, *kbd*, *’ereš haššabī*, *’ōhel*, *har-šabī-qōdeš*, *šrp*, *brr*, *lbn*. This agrees with the religious phase of the power represented by the little horn in Dan 8:10–12.

We already said the kingdom of Michael is completely different to those anterior to it, from the prosaic gender it passes to the lyric, from wars and deaths it passes to resurrection and eternal life, from a succession of kings it passes to a single one, from the suffering of God’s people it passes to their liberation. With this pericope Daniel 11:2b–12:3 terminates with a happy ending, responding to Daniel’s discomforts in chapter 10, not only to a specific temporal and local level but to a universal and definitive level.

### Microstructural Details within Dan 11:2–12:3

The four blocks of the three empires (Medo-Persia, 11:2, Greco-Macedonia, 11:3–15 and Imperial Rome, 11:16–30), plus Christian Rome (11:31–45), can each be subdivided into minor blocks. In the fifth kingdom, that of Michael (12:1–3), we have found no minor divisions. The two first kingdoms are divided into two sections and the last two into three sections each, as follows:

- A. The three Persian kings, 11:2a.
  - B. The fourth Persian king, 11:2b.
- A. Greco-Macedonia united under one mighty king, 11:3.
  - B. Greco-Macedonia divide, 11:4–15.

In the Persian kings the last one is emphasized and in the Greek kings the first one is emphasized, by joining both pericopes a chiasmus is formed:

38. Dan 11:2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 14, 15, 15, 16, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 31

39. Dan 11:6, 6, 7, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10, 13, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 40, 41, 45.

40. Dan 11:9, 10, 13, 18, 18, 19, 28, 28, 29, 30, 30.

- A. Plurality of Persian kings, 11:2a.
- B. Singular Persian King, 11:2b.
- B'. Singular Greek King, 11:3–4a.
- A'. Plurality of Greek kings, 11:4b–15.

The other two blocks of the two Romes, are longer and have a clear tripartite division:

- A. Rome before Messiah, 11:16–22a.
- B. Rome against Messiah, 11:22b.
- A'. Rome after Messiah, 11:23–30.

It is interesting that the first section (A 11:16–22a) shows the growth of Rome, from republic to empire, mentioning the emperors who conquered their enemies and consolidated the kingdom, dominating everything, including “the Prince of the covenant” *nəgîd bərît*, who constitutes the central and climactic section of Rome’s career (B 11:22b). The last section (A’ 11:23–30), on the other hand, selected its last kings, who had to resort to strategies to keep the empire alive, until it fell when it was invaded by the “ships from Kittim” (11:30). So, this section could also be titled:

- A. Growth of Rome, 11:16–22a.
- B. Rome against Messiah, 11:22b.
- A'. Decline of Rome, 11:23–30.

It is also interesting that these sections (A 11:16–22a and A’ 11:23–30), while marking the conflicts and military strategies of Rome, also note the beginning and the end of the life of this empire and tie Rome to the people of God, first to literal Israel (11:16) and finally to spiritual Israel (11:30). In 11:16 the presence of Rome “in the Glorious Land”, *bə’eres-ħaşşəbî*, “with destruction in his power;” is noted, and in the final verse (11:30) noting the actions of Rome “against the holy covenant” *‘al-bərît-qôdeš*, thus marking the beginning (11:16) and ending (11:30) of Imperial Rome. This allows the following three sections to be entitled as follows:

- A. Rome against the *‘eres-ħaşşəbî*, 11:16–22a
- B. Rome against the *nəgîd bərît*, 11:22b
- A'. Rome against the *bərît-qôdeš*, 11:23–30

Religious Rome also has three sections, as follows:

- A. The Papacy against God's people "*until* the time of the end", 'ad-'ēt qēs, 11:31–35.
- B. The Papacy against God (self-exaltation), wəyitgaddēl 'al-kol-'ēl, 11:36–39.
- A'. The Papacy against God's people "*in* the time of the end", bə'ēt qēs, 11:40–45.

It is significant that the persecuting section of 11:31–35 ends with the mention of the Hebrew phrase 'ad-'ēt qēs, "*until* the time of the end" (11:35), and the final persecuting section of 11:40–45 begins with the phrase ūbə'ēt qēs, "*and in* the time of the end" (11:40), these being the only two times that mention "the time of the end" in all of the revelation/audition (11:2–12:3). The prepositions 'ad and bə, serve as markers for limiting the respective pericopes: 11:31–35 that deals with the persecution against the wise, which is "*until* the time of the end," and the final stage of papal supremacy (11:40–45) which begins "*in* the time of the end," leaving the self-exaltation of the pope in the middle (11:36–39).

Notice that if we continue to read from 11:35 to 11:40, skipping verses 36–39, we will notice a natural continuity, since section B) 11:36–39 describes the papal character instead of his works, as is done in A and A'; in addition, there is a change of literary style in the prophecy of Dan 11, it is in prose, but verses 36–39 are in poetic verse.<sup>41</sup> We understand that two periods of supremacy and persecution are announced on the part of Christian Rome, one stage before. It reaches "*until* the time of the end" ('ad-'ēt qēs, 11:35). The other stage appears "*in* the time of the end" itself (bə'ēt qēs, 11:40), but this will result in the definitive destruction of "the king of the north" (11:44–45).

Another structural detail is that Imperial Rome, as much as Christian Rome, has three parts, but both emphasize the central part. In the prophecy about Imperial Rome, the center is Christ and his willing humiliation (11:22b), and the central section of Christian Rome is the antichrist and his self-exaltation, signaling the same contrast that reveals the two sections of the macrostructure of the whole book, where the Aramaic section of chs. 2–7 has as its center the self-exaltation of the Babylonian kings in chs. 4 and 5, and the center

41. Hardy, "An Historicist", 138–142.

of the apocalyptic section of chs. 7–12 have as its center the voluntary humiliation of Messiah the Prince (9:24–27a).

The central personage, highlighted in each of these final sections, unites the four sections of the earthly kingdoms, marking one king. Among the Persian kings, it is the fourth; among the Greeks, it is the first; among the Roman kings, it is the Messiah; and among the popes, it is section 11:36–39. This implies the royalty of “the prince of the covenant.” Uniting all of these sections, we note that there is an alternation between the good and the bad: Good (11:2b), Bad (11:3), Good (11:22b), Bad (11:36–39), Good (12:1–3). Once again, in these five outstanding personages, “the prince of the covenant” occupies the central place, and the work of Artaxerxes makes a parallel with the work of Michael, leaving the cross in the center of history. Adding all the microstructural details, a complete structure of Dan 11:2–12:3 would be as follows:

A. Plurality of Persian kings, 11:2a	}	Medo-Persia
B. Persian king <b>singularized</b> , 11:2b		
B'. Greek king <b>singularized</b> , 11:3–4a	}	Greco-Macedonia
A'. Plurality of Greek kings, 11:4b–15		
A. Rome before the Messiah, against <i>'ereṣ-haṣṣābī</i> , 11:16–22a	}	Pagan Rome
B. Rome against the Messiah <b>singularized</b> , <i>nəgīd bārīt</i> , 11:22b		
A'. Rome after Messiah, against <i>bārīt-qôdeš</i> , 11:23–30		
A. Papacy against the saints “ <i>until</i> the end time,” <i>'ad-ēt qēš</i> , 11:31–35	}	Papal Rome
B. Papacy against God, <b>singularized</b> , <i>wəyitgaddēl 'al-kol-ēl</i> , 11:36–39		
A'. Papacy against the saints “ <i>in</i> the end time,” <i>bə-ēt qēš</i> , 11:40–45		
A. Standing up of Michael, <b>singularized</b> , 12:1–3	}	Kingdom of the Messiah

### Exegetical Implications

Undoubtedly, there is a consensus that the literary structure of a text holds exegetical implications. If this structure is valid and Dan 11:22b indeed represents the center of this entire revelation, it would suggest that, according to preterists and futurists, “the prince of the covenant”—who is identified by some as the high priest Onias III and by others as Ptolemy VI—would be the pivotal figure in this final revelation (Dan 10 to 12), which also concludes the entire Book of Daniel and provides the ultimate resolution to all of Daniel’s concerns. However, these scholars believe that “the prince of the covenant,” whether Onias III, Ptolemy VI or another, is only a secondary character in the narrative plot of Dan 11. For them, the central figure in chapters 10–12 is either Antiochus IV Epiphanes (preterists) or a future antichrist (futurists). Yet, the evidence supporting the proposed literary structure places not a pagan king but a messianic figure at its core, as indicated in Dan 11:22b. This interpretation aligns with the portrayal in Dan 10 and 12, where Michael (the great Prince) is depicted as a Messianic figure. Ellen White succinctly stated: “Let Daniel speak, let the Revelation speak, and tell what truth is. However, whatever phase of the subject is presented, uplift Jesus as the center of all hope.”<sup>42</sup>

Acknowledging Christ in Dan 11:22b compels us to consider Imperial Rome within this text, thereby precluding the application of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the remainder of the chapter, who lived two centuries before Christ (according to preterists) or to a future antichrist, leaving a vast temporal gap between Antiochus IV and the era of the “secret rapture” proposed by futurists. This recognition thus extends the messianic interpretation throughout the entire historic/prophetic narrative. It also dismisses the interpretations of some historicists who posit Christian Rome’s introduction at Dan 11:21.

If the divine Being whom Daniel beholds throughout this revelation (Dan 10–12) is the Messiah, and within the revelation of Dan 11:2b–12:3, the prince of the covenant (*nəgīd bərīt*) is depicted as the Messiah, manifested at a specific historical moment only to be assassinated (Dan 11:22b), then the culmination of the entire revelation (Dan 12:1–3) presents us with the triumphant Prince (*šar*) Michael. This suggests that the glorious figure in Dan 10, the prince of the covenant who perishes in Dan 11, and Michael, the victorious Prince

42. Ellen White, *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1923), 118.

in Dan 12, represent the same entity heralded in two distinct advents. The first advent is marked by his assassination during the reign of the vile Tiberius Caesar (Dan 11:21–22) in the era of Imperial Rome; the second advent foresees his victory over evil at history’s end, bestowing resurrection and “everlasting life” upon the faithful (Daniel 12:1–3). The glorious return of Michael at history’s conclusion and the deliverance it promises are assured by the historical fulfillment of the first advent of the suffering Messiah.

Now, if the glorious Being and Michael represent the same figure and unequivocally symbolize a divine entity, it logically follows that the prince of the covenant, who is to die as a human at a specific point in history, must also possess a divine nature. This interpretation, acknowledging the two advents of the Messiah, renders untenable any suggestion of a 2000-year parenthesis or a “secret rapture” occurring between these events—a concept not found in Daniel 11:2–12:3, despite the assertions of some dispensationalists.

The division into five kingdoms aligns with the sequence of empires in Dan 2, 7, and 8, with Dan 11 serving as the climax of the prophetic framework initiated in Dan 2. This alignment precludes excluding any of these kingdoms (except Babylon) or the insertion of new ones into the narrative of the ultimate conflict. Such consistency correlates with the kingdoms highlighted in the events of Revelation, echoing Ellen White’s statement: “the visions of John corroborate those of Daniel and give much additional light upon the subjects there introduced.”<sup>43</sup>

## General Conclusion

In a previous article, we introduced a chiasmic literary structure for Dan 10 to 12, spanning seven parts, with Rome serving as the central pericope (Dan 11:16–30), wherein the focal point is the death of the Messiah (Dan 11:22b). This positioning of the Messiah and His sacrifice at the heart of Dan 10 to 12 aligns with His central role throughout the Book of Daniel and indeed, the entirety of Scripture (John 5:39–40). Thus, this article delves deeper into the Rome pericope (Dan 11:16–30), defining its boundaries within the prophetic sequence and identifying internal elements that provide cohesion to this segment. We then center on the pivotal phrase of this section, “the prince of the covenant” from

---

43. Ellen White, *Early Writings* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1882), 137.

Dan 11:22b, which, encircled by critical terminology, forms a chiasmus with its core being the Messiah's death.

While not our primary focus, our analysis across every literary block from Dan 11:2b to 12:3 revealed subdivisions within each section, enhancing our understanding of the text. This exploration demonstrates a profound unity and continuous historical and prophetic narrative throughout Dan 11:2b to 12:3, precluding any temporal parenthesis as proposed by futurists. Furthermore, this distinctly eschatological prophecy cannot be confined to the pre-Christian era of Antiochus IV. The coherence of this structural arrangement and its parallelism with other prophetic narratives concerning kingdoms leave no room for the inclusion of additional empires, such as various Islamic manifestations, nor does it allow for the exclusion of any of the five kingdoms mentioned.

Indeed, the presence of Christ at the core of Dan 11:2b–12:3 may initially seem surprising, yet upon closer examination, it aligns harmoniously with the broader biblical narrative. This integration is not coincidental but rather a profound revelation like the experience of the disciples. Despite their initial inability to perceive the suffering Messiah in the OT, their understanding was transformed when the resurrected Jesus explained to them: “Everything that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms must be fulfilled” (Luke 24:44). This encounter prompted a significant opening of their “understanding” to “comprehend the Scriptures” (Luke 24:45), leading them to joyously realize: “Were not our hearts burning within us while he talked to us on the road, and while he opened the Scriptures to us?” (Luke 24:32).

Héctor Urrutia-Hernández  
urrutia.hector@gmail.com  
Independent Researcher  
Concepción, Chile

**Recibido:** 20 de mayo de 2022  
**Aceptado:** 30 de octubre de 2022

